

Darwin's Monkey-Business

The most implosive secret of the world-wide intellectual establishment is the rapid crumbling of Darwinian evolution theory. As early as the 1966 Wistar Institute Symposium, Sir Peter Medawar expressed this widespread skepticism on behalf of an imposing assembly of scientists. The fantastical idea that all life began from non-life, then evolved by gradual random mutation and natural selection from a single-celled common ancestor into complex higher life forms, has fallen on hard times.

Molecular biologist Michael Denton spoke for many scientists in his lucid, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, when he wrote that "Ultimately the Darwinian theory of evolution is...the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century," a pseudo-scientific Genesis story that presents God as a blind process instead of a willful creator. Well, the reputational fur – or rather, feathers - are flying.

And yet the broader public is largely unaware of this bitter dispute. Museums and textbooks continue to display standard models of, for example, the famous "horse sequence" (tiny weird horse transforms into normal big horse over millennia). But Dr. Niles Eldredge, a curator of the American Museum of Natural History, says "It [the horse sequence] has been presented as the literal truth in textbook after textbook," and complains that this is both "speculative," and "lamentable." Meaning, possibly a lie.

The public also believes all critics of evolution theory are religious nuts, when in fact the main thrust of criticism comes from a wide variety of fields within science itself, mostly from agnostics doubting Darwin as much as God.

Their main bone (sorry) of contention is that if Darwin's theory of random mutation and natural selection were true, then just as there is plenty of fossil evidence for all the known species, there ought to be lots of it for the millions of "transitional forms" of plants and animals that gradually evolved into their final forms.

But no Sir. Once a loon, or a bat, or a lobster, well, that's it. You're stuck. For 500 million years, from first lobster fossil to the living model dropped in your boiling kettle - there's no change. The overwhelming impression to be gotten from a study of the fossil record is not evolution, but stasis. No one has ever found a maybe, or partly loon, or bat, or horse. You know: something on the way to becoming those species from whatever it was before.

Some argue that even the basic idea of gradual evolution is self-defeating because if species depend on optimal adaptation for survival, then anything on the way to becoming optimal couldn't survive to adapt, could it?

And then, there's the problem of simultaneity. The evolution of interactive parts of organisms

(the iris, the cornea, the eyelid flap, say) would all have to change at once. How could a blind process orchestrate such harmony? There is no good answer. And that's why Darwin himself said "the [human] eye, to this day, gives me a cold shudder," and, "the sight of a feather in a peacock's tail...makes me sick."

Perhaps the most disturbing fact for evolutionists is that more than three quarters of the earth's crust is lifeless. No fossils. Then, in the so-called "Cambrian explosion," life suddenly appears, demonstrating most of the same species we know today, with the same huge gaps between them, and no evidence of any transitional forms whatsoever. Even modern agnostic scientists routinely refer to this as "abrupt appearance," or "creation."

Fish appeared abruptly in complex form (Ommanney: "a veritable explosion."); same with reptiles, and birds (Ager: "we find not gradual evolution, but...sudden explosion"); and the primates, says Johansen, "Spring out of nowhere, as it were. They are here today. They have no yesterday."

It's the same for man. Geneticist Richard C. Lewontin, former president of the Society for the Study of Evolution, and Professor of Zoology at Harvard, says "There is a vast weight of empirical evidence about the universe which says that unless you invoke supernatural causes, the birds [and life in general] could not have arisen from muck by any natural processes" (though he himself would prefer a natural answer). And about man evolving from apes, he says in his 1982 book, *Human Diversity*, "All the fossils which have been dug up and are claimed to be ancestors - we haven't the faintest idea whether they are ancestors."

Probability crunchers, information theorists, and molecular biologists are also weighing in against evolution theory. Computers programmed to mimic Darwinian evolution just jam up. The likelihood of random creation of only one single protein (of some 200,000 human proteins), is one in one billion. So Nobel Laureate Francis Crick, discoverer of DNA, says the whole field has "too much speculation running after too few facts"... and has suggested life came to earth by "panspermia" - seeding from outer space. According to famous astronomer and mathematics Professor Fred Hoyle, the information content of a single enzyme is unimaginably vast. "Evolutionary processes would require several Hubble times [the time since creation of the universe]. The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein." By now, Darwin's theory sounds like monkey-business.

© William Gairdner