

Evolution 101

Lesson 19

Charles Darwin made two unreasonable extrapolations to support his idea of origin of species by natural selection.

First, he assumed that infinite changes in species had occurred even though only limited changes had ever been observed. For example, artificial selection of sugar beets for sugar content quickly reached a plateau and has remained stable ever since.

For a breeder to establish a desirable new trait, he must eliminate the organisms not possessing it lest interbreeding wipes out the desired trait. Natural selection does not do this.

Instead, natural selection acts as a sieve which eliminates weaklings or those with incomplete structures (arms, legs, eyes, etc.) that may have arisen because of mutations. An arm becoming a wing, for example, would be a bad arm and discarded by natural selection before becoming a good wing. Not one incipient structure (an eye or wing coming into being) has ever been found in either living or fossil specimens. Natural selection is a conservation mechanism, not one of innovation as required by evolution. Evolution requires new traits. Natural selection does not provide any; it merely selects what is already present.

Second, Charles Darwin assumed that unlimited time was available for natural selection to do its job. But more time, according to the Second Law, guarantees equilibrium or stability, not an increase in order and complexity. The longer a gambler stays in Las Vegas the more likely it is that he will go broke.

NATURAL SELECTION, or survival of the fittest, is now recognized as a tautology, arguing in a circle. Who survives? The fit! Who are the fit? Those who survive!

Some phrase it this way: Who are the fit? Those who leave the most offspring. Who leaves the most offspring? The fit!

Or, which species survive? Those that adapt! Which species adapt? Those that survive!

There is no worthwhile information in a tautology. The real issue, however, is arrival, not survival.

MUTATIONS OBEY THE SECOND LAW

Mutations (rare and random changes in complex living systems) do not provide new traits to be selected. They merely rearrange the traits that already exist in a species, sometimes repeating, sometimes deleting what is already there. As expected on the basis of the Second Law (order to disorder), most mutations are either lethal or harmful to the organism experiencing them. Perhaps one mutation out of a thousand might be neutral.

After 150 years, the evolutionists are still looking for a mechanism that will work. One cannot really believe in evolution if no one can demonstrate how it works. Theorizing about it is not enough.

THE FOSSILS SAY NO!

Even if evolution really were possible, the fossil record demonstrates that evolution still did not happen. There is not a single, indisputable multi-cellular organism leading to the lowest stratum of fossils called the Cambrian. There are, however, billions of highly complex animals from all of the major categories, with one possible exception, that appear abruptly with no precursors (as though specially created).

If evolution had ever taken place, billions of transitional forms of animals and plants should be found fossilized in the rocks.

There should be fossil animals showing the transition from the invertebrates to vertebrates, from fishes to amphibians, from amphibians to reptiles and from reptiles to birds and mammals. Among the mammals, there should be an unbroken series of transitions from monkey-like creatures to humans. What does the fossil record show? Not one indisputable transitional creature bridging a gap between the categories just listed. The millions of missing links are still missing.

David B. Kitts, Oklahoma University paleontologist, admits, *“Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of 'seeing' evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists the most notorious of which is the presence of 'gaps' in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and paleontology does not provide them.”*

CHARLES DARWIN WAS A MALE CHAUVINIST

Charles Darwin may have been a kind, gentle old man who loved pigeons, barnacles and earthworms but he was also a male chauvinist if one can believe **Descent of Man**, 2nd edition:

“The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shown by man's attaining to higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than can woman whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the use of the senses or hands.

“In order that a woman should reach the same standard as man, she ought, when nearly adult, be trained to energy and perseverance, and to have her reason and imagination exercised to the highest point; and then she would probably transmit these qualities chiefly to her adult daughters.”

There is no evidence that he ever regretted his putdown of women. Evolution is a bad tree that bears bad fruit.