

3. EVOLUTION, CREATION, MANIFESTATION

That such a vague theory [of Darwinian evolution], one so insufficiently verifiable and so remote from the usual criteria applied to experimental science should become a dogma can only be explained [...] by sociological reasons. Society and science have been so immersed in the ideas of mechanicism, utilitarianism and free market economy that selection has replaced God as the supreme reality. (Ludwig Von Bertalanffy)

In 1859 Darwin published *The Origin of Species*. Though the appearance of the book created a small scandal, it was soon accepted with enthusiasm by a growing number of people, as if the intellectual milieu of the time had been waiting for such an explanation ... Karl Marx dedicated *The Capital* to Darwin, realizing that the latter's hypothesis provided him with a "scientific" basis for materialism. Later, Freud was to base many of his theories about the prehistory of man on Darwin. More than a century later, Richard Dawkins would write: "Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist."

Darwinism is then presented, at the beginning of the 21st century, as much more than a theory: it is believed to be "scientifically proven". The majority of men of science do not question it—even though no one is in agreement as to the exact meaning of the "evolution" in question, its causes and its processes. It is often claimed that only the "religious fundamentalists" are opposed to it, those who affirm that according to the Bible, the world was created in six days. Whoever doubts it is either labelled a "creationist" or an enemy of "science".

However, and in spite of what its defenders claim and the image projected by the media, there has always been opposition to Darwinism not only from religious circles, but also from great scientists such as Louis Agassiz, George Mivart, Richard Goldschmidt, Pierre Grassé, Michael Polanyi, Wolfgang Pauli, Fred Hoyle, Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Gerald Kerkut and many more. many would be surprised to learn that nowadays, scientific and philosophical criticisms of Darwinism are constantly on the rise.

According to Michael Denton:

The overriding supremacy of the myth has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved 100 years ago and that all subsequent biological research [...] has provided ever increasing evidence for Darwinian ideas. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The term "evolution" brings up many semantic problems, for it is used in a way that covers a wide range of meanings. Phillip E. Johnson notes that:

"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. [...] Much confusion results from the fact that a single term—"evolution"—is used to designate processes that may have little or nothing in common. A shift in the relative numbers of dark and light moths in a population is called evolution, and so is the creative

process that produced the cell, the multi-cellular organism, the eye, and the human mind. The semantic implication is that evolution is fundamentally a single process, and Darwinists enthusiastically exploit that implication as a substitute for scientific evidence.

It has been known for a long time that small changes occur within every species. Agriculturalists and livestock farmers have been producing varieties with different characteristics for millennia: selective breeding of horses, dogs and other domestic animals through careful cross-breeding, the creation of vegetable strains that are larger or more productive are all based on these small variations transmitted to the next generation which, in their sum total, end by producing very specific varieties. Every species possesses an adaptability that permits it to accommodate many variations within itself: think of the enormous variety of dog breeds, or human ethnicities. However, at one point in time the breeder (of whom it is said acts 500 times more quickly than nature) reaches the limit of possibilities and cannot produce further changes. Throughout all the selective crosses, one can never cross the boundary of the species itself: and this leads us to think that the boundaries are well guarded.

Scientifically many cases of minor evolutions have also been observed. Thus, insects become resistant to pesticides, bacteria to antibiotics, HIV to antiviral drugs, etc. Wild animals adapt to changes in the environment. The problem arises when one tries to extrapolate these small changes within species and take them to the infinite. How can one take the immense leap from a germ that is resistant to an antibiotic to a cell that ends by forming a plant or a reptile that becomes a bird? Can the entire process of life and its enormous variety be explained through these minuscule evolutions? How to explain the rise of photosynthesis, the passage from a plant to an animal, from an invertebrate to a vertebrate, sexual reproduction, animal instincts, the change from cold to warm blood, the birth of consciousness and the great leap from animal to man? According to Ernst Mayr, one of the most brilliant evolutionists, evolution from one species to another “is nothing but the extrapolation and magnification of events that take place within populations and species”.

Lee Spetner warns: “Let’s not confuse the little the theory may explain with all that it claims and with all the average layman has been led to think it explains.”

The most direct, clear and evident “scientific” proof that there has been an evolution in which some species have been progressively transformed into others should be supported by the fossil record. The latter preserves plants and animals from the extremely remote past by virtue of petrification. Thus, it constitutes the only possibility for observation, imperfect though it may be, of what occurred in epochs far removed from the present. Now, although it records some fossils of “intermediate” animals now extinct, among known species, the fossil record does not in any way uphold the Darwinist hypothesis. The overwhelming majority of data suggests a very different succession from what Darwinism predicts.

In the animal world the most striking thing about species today is their discontinuity. The living world consists mostly of gaps between species; gaps that remain unbridgeable even in the imagination. The fossil record indicates clearly that the living world also consisted of gaps in every past age from the most recent to the most remote. Yet Darwinists believe that while the present consists of gaps, the past was a perfect continuity of evolving species—even though this continuity is not recorded in the rocks—and they have devoted immense efforts to find credible sequences of fossil ancestors and descendants.

There are only a very few fossils of small multicellular creatures prior to the Cambrian period (600 million years ago). But shortly thereafter (some 10 million years, a short space of time in geological terms), in the Cambrian period, an immense profusion of biological forms, much more complex than the previous ones, suddenly appeared in close waves of succession. This explosion is known as the “biological Big Bang”. Vegetable and animal forms appear to emerge all of a sudden, with new structures and forms that are quite elaborate and complete, very different from one another, with no apparent ancestors, and not representing the end of a sequence full of transitions. The changes that have occurred after that period are like variations on a basic theme which, according to the fossil record, appeared suddenly and spontaneously.

The evolutionary line [from ape to man] is hotly debated, and few theories are universally accepted. As the geneticist Richard Lewontin, along with many others admits, no species of hominidae can be considered our direct ancestor. Although “officially” paleontologists—and the media in innumerable publications—present an ostensibly clear and continuous picture of the entire process as a direct line with numerous intermediate species, this is far from the reality of things.

Aside from the imaginative and unrealistic reconstruction of his appearance and form of life, nothing else suggests that these hominidae were direct ancestors of *Homo Sapiens*. It has been said that the appearance of the genus *Homo* is similar to the sudden apparition (in geological terms) of orders such as the reptiles or mammals.

Evolutionism emphasizes the continuity of life, which is very true. But it is equally true that life is discontinuous. Discontinuity between species, discontinuity between man and other hominidae. Gilbert K. Chesterton observes:

If you leave off looking at books about beasts and men, if you begin to look at beasts and men then [...] you will observe that the startling thing is not how like man is to the brutes, but how unlike he is. It is the monstrous scale of his divergence that requires an explanation. That man and brute are like is, in a sense, a truism; but that being so like they should then be so insanely unlike, that is the shock and the enigma.

In answer to the question if chance and natural selection weren't enough to explain evolution, M. P. Schützenberger answers:

Let us even suppose that some mutations have made feathers appear. One needs blind (Darwinist) faith to believe that only by chance have all additional hereditary

modifications appeared in birds so as to transform them into such perfect flying machines.

Only a prior plan would allow a view of which changes conform to a viable pattern and which do not. This would oblige us to return to the use of a concept exiled from scientific vocabulary: *purpose*.

Angus Menuge rejected the possibility of a creation starting out from simple units and building up to large structures (“bottom-up” design) owing to his experience as a computer technician:

As [computer] programs become more complex, it becomes virtually impossible to get them to work if they are written from the bottom-up, one instruction at a time. With so many details, it is highly likely that some critical task is specified incompletely or in the wrong order. To avoid such errors, programmers find it essential to use top-down design. [...] In fact, even with top-down design, programmers find that it is necessary to do two levels of testing to produce a functional program. One level, *unit testing*, tests the function of a module in isolation from the whole program. The other level, *integration testing*, ensures that when all the modules are assembled, they interact in such a way as to solve the overall problem. Both kinds of testing are needed; it is a fallacy of composition to argue that since all the parts of a system work, the assembled system will also work.

For the Dalai Lama:

How do we explain the emergence of consciousness? What marks the transition from non-sentient to sentient beings? A model of increasing complexity based on evolution through natural selection is simply a descriptive hypothesis, a kind of euphemism for “mystery,” and not a satisfactory explanation.

Everything appears to indicate that much in the natural order comes “from within”, and that nature, like a crystal, is capable of self-organization. Here the model is not the watchmaker building a watch, but a bud opening to display its implicit possibilities. According to Nagel, “The process seems to be one of the universe gradually waking up.”

Science as conceived by its followers can only accept natural causes—making of the “natural” a concept equivalent to the “perceptible”—to thereby explain any process: it thus finds itself forced to support Darwinism so as to avoid opening the door to non-materialistic explanations. Jean Rostand—for whom evolution is “the only rational interpretation of the genesis of man [...] and of the world in general”—expressed his distress very clearly:

The world postulated by transformism is a fairy-like world, phantasmagoric, surrealistic. The chief point, to which one always returns, is that we have never been present, even in a small way, at one authentic phenomenon of evolution [...]. We keep the impression that nature today has nothing to offer that might be capable of reducing our embarrassment before the veritable organic metamorphoses implied in the transformist thesis. We keep the impression that, in the matter of the genesis of the species as in that of the genesis of life, the forces that constructed nature are now

absent from nature. [...] I firmly believe—*because I see no means of doing otherwise*—that mammals come from lizards, and lizards from fish; but when I declare and when I think such a thing, I try not to avoid seeing its indigestible enormity and I prefer to leave vague the origin of these scandalous metamorphoses rather than add to their improbability that of a ludicrous interpretation.

The level of passion with which the theory of evolution is defended and the irritation that is often shown when it is put to question are highly significant; add to this the intolerance towards those who do not accept it and are systematically qualified as “enemies of science” and “creationists”. Many scientists who doubt the theory are shunned and their careers blocked by an “Inquisition” of “fundamentalist” scientists. No blatantly anti-Darwinist article can get published in any of the most prestigious scientific journals. James M. Tour noted: “my recent advice to my graduate students has been direct and revealing: If you disagree with Darwinian Theory, keep it to yourselves if you value your careers, unless, of course, you’re one of those champions for proclamation....”

But if we begin to deny that natural facts can have causes that transcend the plane on which they occur, then instead of recognizing the ignorance of science or its lack of competence to resolve certain questions, a theory giving a possible naturalistic explanation is put forth and defended as being obvious.

One of the worst outcomes of the widespread acceptance of evolutionism is pan-Darwinism: the attempt to explain every aspect of human behaviour in evolutionary terms. The method is being used in an increasing variety of fields: sociology, psychology, religion, and so forth. Extreme Darwinism is a metaphysical system used to try to explain everything. Divulged by numerous publications, it has come to be the universal wild card: why do people dream, why does marriage exist, why suicide, why rape, why homosexuality, why laughter, why altruism, why music, why religion... Everything is explained *a posteriori*: if a man behaves in such a way, it is because in the course of evolution it proved to be a selective advantage. If the opposite behaviour is observed, no problem: this can also be explained in evolutionary terms. Since none of it can be proved, anything goes.

Schumacher speaks with irony about the absurdity of such a model of the universe:

One can just see it, can’t one: organic compounds getting together and surrounding themselves by membranes—nothing could be simpler for these clever compounds—and lo! There is the cell, and once the cell has been born there is nothing to stop the emergence of Shakespeare, although it will obviously take a bit of time. There is therefore no need to speak of miracles *or to admit any lack of knowledge*. It is one of the great paradoxes of our age that people claiming the proud title of “scientist” dare to offer such undisciplined and reckless speculations as contributions to scientific knowledge, and *that they get away with it*.

According to Franklin Harold:

The origin of life stands as the most profound mystery in biology; and we note in passing that, despite all the achievements of investigators in pre-biotic biochemistry,

it remains utterly beyond our comprehension.

Many thinkers and scientists believe that evolution has been guided in some way. In this vein, they speak of “evolutionary tendencies” in certain directions, tendencies to create more elaborate and complex elements. An “orientation” of this kind would permit some light to be shed upon the formation of very complex organs like the eye, of which a haphazard formation appears simply impossible.

For Giuseppe Sermonti:

The view is gaining ever wider support that this something (that makes a horse different from a fly) is not to be found in the innermost molecular heart of the cell, but perhaps in some vague “field” that unfolds to the point of being the very form of a fly or a cat. [...] It is not the genes that elicit nascent form, but the nascent form that selects the genes and recruits them for its program.

That the form should choose the genes it needs, as Sermonti proposes, may appear opposite to the usual scientific way of thinking. Yet as Schumacher observes, this kind of relationship is common in everyday life:

To say that life is nothing but a property of certain peculiar combinations of atoms is like saying that Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* is nothing but a property of a peculiar combination of letters. The truth is that the peculiar combination of letters is nothing but a property of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*. The French or German versions of the play “own” different combinations of letters.

According to James Barham, “Given its colossal philosophical pretensions compared with its modest scientific achievements, the theory of natural selection may one day come to be seen as a blunder of historic proportions”.

According to Richard Milton:

Where you would expect to find penetrating questions being asked of neo-Darwinism, there is only an insistence on adhering to the received wisdom of reductionist science. Where you would expect vigorous public debate, there is only a nervous, artificial consensus among academics and a complete absence of dialogue in the press and on television.

Rémy Chauvin criticizes the blindness of many scientists:

It means confronting the problem, irritating for a materialist, of the *undeniable intelligence* that looms in the prodigious biological machines we have before our eyes. What is shocking is the naive attempt to elude the problem by attributing to natural selection all the powers that used to be attributed, no less naively, to Providence.

Mae-Wan Ho and Peter Saunders add:

The most important thing to recognize about the alternative is that it is not a theory, as neo-Darwinism claims to be, but a paradigm. It is a way of approaching problems, rather than a solution.

The Darwinist evolution of beings is a secularized version—dispensing with the vertical dimension—of the metaphysical doctrine of gradation, or the “great chain of beings”, a chain that extends from the One to all beings, passing through intermediate hypostases, and uniting all creatures to one another and to their Origin. In the East this basic tenet is part of the conception of the world, but Arthur O. Lovejoy puts forth that this idea was also very much present in ancient western wisdom:

Albertus Magnus, writing in *De animalibus* (Lib. II), had already laid it down that “nature does not make [animal] kinds separate without making something intermediate between them; for nature does not pass from extreme to extreme *nisi per medium*.” Thomas [Aquinas] accordingly dwells upon the “wonderful linkage of beings (*connexio rerum*)” which nature “reveals to our view. The lowest member of the higher genus is always found to border upon the highest member of the lower genus.”