

Charles darwin's bicentenary: time for "celebration"...or an inquest?

Opinion

Case Western Reserve University is about to celebrate the anniversary of Charles Darwin's birth in 1809, and the publication, in 1859, of his famous book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. However, only by confronting doubts can Darwin really be celebrated. Criticisms of Darwin are appropriate to an honest academic celebration, and should be encouraged and discussed. Failure to do so would betray science: most scientific theories and hypotheses are challenged vigorously, and usually modified every few years or even refuted. It is ironic that Darwinism seems to be the one theory which refuses to do much "evolving". To read the *Origin of Species* is to be continually amazed at the absence of anything approaching real scientific proof of Darwin's theories. Present instead are long strings of anecdotes, one after another, pulled together by perseverating theory. Darwin made an argument ("As this volume is one long argument..." (p. 384J) of great appeal and verbal ingenuity, often using the word "imaginary" (e. g., on pp. 66 and 71), but he never proved anything scientifically. "Origin of species" is one thing; "origin of genera and phyla" is quite another.

In background, I am a Roman Catholic psychiatrist. For most of my life I have believed, rather firmly, in Darwin's ideas. But during the. Past decade, I began to look more closely, and doubts arose. To say that finches' beaks changed may be all well and good, but the chain of theorizing that followed seemed to become fraught with wishful thinking and huge improbabilities, not backed by real evidence. Thus I became agnostic about Darwin, and published my findings in an article ("Why Evolutionary Theories Are Unbelievable", Social Justice Review, Jan.-Feb., 2004, pp. 148-151). The following points, some of which were made in that article, are respectfully offered as challenges to Darwin, a celebrated writer whose relevance is now rather dated.

Doubts arise about Darwin's ideas, first of all, because of their demonstrably negative impact on humanity. During the famous Scopes Trial of 1925, Clarence Darrow defended the views of George William Hunter, the use of whose textbook, *A Civic Biology*, had got John Scopes into trouble with the law. Basing his argument on evolution, Hunter posited a kind of "hierarchy" of the races of man, writing that:

At the present time there exist upon the earth five races or varieties of man, each very different from the others in instincts, social customs, and, to an extent, in structure. These are the Ethiopian or negro type, originating in Africa; the Malay or brown race, from the islands of the Pacific; the American Indian; the Mongolian or yellow race, including the natives of China and Japan and the Eskimos; and finally, the highest of all, inhabitants of Europe and America (p. 196).

Thus Darwinism, which began with condescending racialist notes about the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego in the nineteenth century, developed into a convenient rationale for various forms of apartheid in the twentieth.

Volume 7 Issue 1 - 2017

Samuel A Nigro M.D

Retired, Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, USA

Correspondence: Dr. Samuel A Nigro M.D., Retired, Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, 2517 Guilford Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118, USA, Tel 216 932-0575, Email sam@dochnigro.com

Received: June 20, 2016 | **Published:** February 06, 2017

Hunter, elaborating on the Darwinian mantra of the "war with all" in nature, expressed some interesting ideas about "the unfit":

If such people were lower animals, we would probably kill them off to prevent them from spreading. Humanity will not allow this [for the time being], but we do have the remedy of separating the sexes in asylums or other places and in various ways preventing intermarriage and the possibilities of perpetuating such a low and degenerate race. Remedies of this sort have been tried successfully in Europe and are now meeting with some success in this country.

Adolf Hitler explained what Hunter meant by "success" when he said that "if we did not respect the law of nature, imposing our will by the right of the stronger, the day would come when the wild animals would again devour us—then the insects would eat the wild animals, and finally nothing would exist except the microbes. By means of the struggle, the elites are continually renewed. The law of selection justifies this incessant struggle by allowing the survival of the finest." Thus, Hitler and others like him, following the path blazed by Darwin and his acolytes, the Hunters and Darrows, misunderstand the symphony of life and promote Darwin's grisly morning-after: fight, kill, survive—every creature for itself, getting all it can for itself, and getting rid of those decreed to be unfit.

The negative effect of Darwin's ideas must also include the acceptance of abortion as a medical procedure. There is an interesting paradox here. On the one hand, abortion is an extreme implementation of Darwinism's "kill if you can get away with it for your own benefit". But at the same time, abortion is a contradiction of the Darwinian imperative to perpetuate one's own genetic material through one's offspring.

Doubts arise about Darwin's ideas because of their requirement that similarity is relationship, or even identity. To claim that there is

a relationship, an identity, or a developmental linkage because of the presence of common construction material or similarities in design, is a pleasing scientific leap, but one lacking in real proof. (Darwin even claims that common "instincts" or "habits" tend to confirm his theory [p. 222].) But, for example, all creatures using oxygen are not identical, and neither are those using two legs, those whose cells comprise amino acids, or those who have genes. Similarity without identity can more easily be explained by the fact that there are common building blocks for all creatures: amino acids.

That amino acids make up living things no more proves an identity relationship among different creatures than the use of blocks of Italian marble proves that two buildings are related. Similarity is not identity, even if the building-blocks are essentially the same in composition. Man has 75% of his genes in common with the dog and the grey wolf, and 40% in common with the banana plant, as well as having about 200 genes in common with bacteria. The most that one can reasonably point to is common construction, common material, common design, and perhaps even common function. But there is no proof of developmental identity. The teeth of a shark are no more developmentally related to your teeth than they are to the teeth of a chainsaw.

Further doubts arise because of the stability of creatures. Significant changes do occur within species when their regulatory genes and molecules are teased by events affecting them. This is well demonstrated by the study of bacteria and other microorganisms (as well as finch beaks). The intensive breeding of dogs over several thousand generations and 130,000 years has resulted in the approximately 150 breeds of dogs that exist today. But, any dog is still a dog, and genetically identical to the grey wolf. Even with the significant changes due to regulatory genes and molecular alterations, whether in microorganisms, finches or dogs, the organism is still the same organism and there is no hint of major change in terms of new genera or phyla, much less changes of microorganisms to finches to dogs or vice versa. Cosmetic changes are not the same as major developmental genus/phylum recombinations into new, markedly different creatures. Overall, to extrapolate natural adjustments to natural modifications under appropriate natural situations, whether random or by manipulation, and call it "natural selection or preservation of favoured races", implying that nature can select and leap to create new genera beyond the intrinsic original genus itself and leading to the alleged "phylogenetic tree of life", is more fantasy than established fact. There is no reasonable evidence for genus/phylum leaps.

Even more doubts about Darwin's ideas arise because of the available time during which "natural selection" has allegedly created identifiable major changes and adjustments resulting in new genera and the "phylogenetic tree". Much can be learned from viral, bacteriologic, and immunologic studies and from studies of unicellular creatures, all of which are often touted as examples of evolution in action, proving that new phylogenetic creatures are possible. However, studies reveal mutation rates inadequate for the creation of complex animals. A human "generation" is about 20 years, compared with a generation rate of 20 minutes for bacteria. A trillion bacteria need 65,000 generations (or 4 years) for a two-amino-acid mutation. Extrapolated to us, about 1.3 million generations of humans would be needed for a comparable two-amino-acid chemical mutation in a population of a trillion people. That would be 26 million years for the first mutation. Sequential positive mutational evolution into the 3.5 billion base pairs of human DNA would require $91 \times (91 \text{ million billion})$ years, and the universe is said to be 15 billion years old. So how many years does it take for positive mutations to produce a

finch, a horse, a cow, or any creature—with all these mutations going on in myriad cliff-edge directions at the same time?

So, let us speed up the process and not use a bacterial generation rate of 20 minutes, extrapolated. Instead, let us assume that all creatures have developed from simple molecules over 3.5 billion years. (Bacteria are said to have existed for 3.5 billion years.) To get to us humans, with 3.5 billion base pairs, now requires one pair of amino acid positive mutations compounded uninterruptedly each year for 3.5 billion years (with automatic pass-through implementation and acceptance by all the sub-gene proteins automatically following the new gene's directions). Or, if humans began development 2 million years ago, as believed, and the first Homo sapiens arrived 50,000 years ago, then 1,795 positive mutations each year are needed for the 97,500 twenty-year human generations (with an impossible one-offspring-each-year in those 20 years of productivity) during 1,950,000 years, to get to modern humans with 3.5 billion base pairs. It is actually more difficult because of the demographics: an estimated 5 million humans lived in 8000 B.C. and the total number of humans ever born is about 106 billion as of 2006, numbers far below the trillions of bacteria from which most mutational data are obtained. (All this is magnified by the fact that recent evolutionists claim that humans' ancestors branched from bacteria 2 billion years ago instead of 3.5 billion years, providing even less time for all human evolution.)

Further doubts arise because of the need to compensate for the approximately 100 negative or neutral mutations that occur for every positive mutation. Given the profound aimlessness and lack of direct design (except for the fanciful "natural selection") required by Darwinism, all the cumulative attributes of positive mutations must also apply to the harmful/negative mutations which are not immediately lethal. Thus, positive complexification, even if geometrically or sexually compounded, will be delayed by a factor equal to the rate of geometrically or sexually compounded negative mutations. Or else each negative mutation must be offset by a counteracting positive mutation, but each of these offsetting positive mutations will also occur alongside at least another ten harmful and ninety neutral ones. If there are at least ten negative mutations, as generally accepted, for each positive one, the creation of complex amino-acid creatures from the first single-amino-acid creatures does not add up. And if there are at least ninety neutral mutations (going nowhere) for each positive one, positive complexification will be delayed by a factor of 100 for each paired amino acid change or equivalent needed for each creature's advance in evolution. So the odds are for 100 neutral-or-worse changes to one change towards advancement.

Compared to the necessary 1,795 positive mutations yearly for 1,950,000 years (supra), there will have been 17,950 negative and 161,550 neutral ones each year. (And if mutations were so frequent in the past as to be able to meet these requirements, then why did the copious mutation process stop?)

Sexual interaction and compounding seem to be further confounded if not precluded because the creation of hybrids almost always results in sterile offspring (Darwin wrote about that in Chapter IX with the defensive admission that such was "not acquired by natural selection"—right: How about "natural obstruction"?). Regardless, creatures cannot reproduce well if they differ more than a little in their genetic basis from their partner's genetic identity—or is the explanation that the partner had the same positive mutation at the same time?

Consideration of the difference tolerance of living creatures casts doubt on Darwin's ideas. For example, humans have 30,000 genes (or maybe twice that many, according to some). About one-third of

human gene functions are known. Another third of human genes have non-human homologues found in other species. And a third of human genes have unknown functions. All genes are composed of four bases: adenine, taurine, guanine and cytosine. All creatures are composed of proteins of these four bases and another sixteen amino acids. The human genome contains 3.5 billion base pairs of DNA; and about one in a thousand base pairs are different between humans, while the rest are identical. Thus there is a very limited polymorphism within human biological being—about three million bases in DNA (given 30,000 genes), with the remaining 3,497,000,000 base pairs maintaining the stability of the species. The human creature can tolerate one in a thousand differences without major loss, but changes in excess of that involve illness, loss of function, and other negative effects including death. It seems that the difference tolerance has been maximized and stabilized for human beings and for all other species. That is, genes determine and preserve a creature within certain limits. One is justified in thinking that such is the case for all creatures because that is all we find—stable creatures! In other words, to break away from the stable mold into a really new and different genus or phylum defies belief, because the “evolving” creature cannot live long, if at all, with a major change exceeding its defined difference tolerance, which is not very much in comparison with all the coded genetic information.

Each creature is a symphony, not a bored chaos trying to climb out of itself. The interaction among the proteins is stabilized in such a way that the creature remains alive and viable, in communion with the universe at the level which the stable complex of amino acids allows. To look at the totality of a complex creature is to be astonished that it is there at all, and that it does not fall apart easily. It is undeniable that once amino-acid creatures become stabilized, they like it that way. The stability of the limited and low-frequency polymorphism of species renders improbable any major new changes worthy of the alleged “phylogenetic tree”, or even meaningful major new functions.

Doubt exists about Darwin’s ideas of self-integration and self-creation, because there is absolutely no evidence of such self-reorganization where there ought to be. Why cannot life be recreated for the molecules and cells if they are supposed to be able to “naturally select” by themselves? If you break up a few cells, they do not reconstitute back into cells—which should be easier than relying on a random accumulation of molecules, as is supposed to have happened originally. If the creature put itself together once upon a time, then it should be able to do so again, especially if the molecules are already there. (It is more likely that evolution “works” only retrospectively, when the “target” is known in advance. But that is really only clever anecdotal “evidence”, such as Darwin provided in abundance.)

Personal experience creates further doubts about Darwin’s ideas. As a physician, I alter the chemistry of my patients day-in and day-out, but I see no evidence that natural selection for the next generation proceeds from my induced positive chemical changes. In medicine, all we see is really the opposite of positive natural selection. Today physicians flood humans with chemical alterations; but, where are the stabilizing selections, the recombinant and accumulating enhancement of offspring? There is no natural selection of the positive effects of medications, but negative outcomes are readily incorporated, e.g., the disaster of thalidomide is a glaring example of toxic genetic selection. To tamper with the basic intrinsic chemistry of amino acids is usually a very bad thing.

If natural selection is supposed to work in our favour, why is breast cancer so markedly on the increase? Why are autism, attention deficit disorder, learning disabilities and gender disturbances all becoming more frequent, year after year? Where is this good and cumulative

process of natural selection that supposedly got us to where we are? Experience militates against the view that groups of people improve and become healthier by means of natural selection. In fact, we see only the opposite. The “natural selection or preservation of favoured races” is really nothing but wishful thinking.

More doubts about Darwin come into play in consideration of the initial creation of complex protein molecules outside the cell. For example, the great British scientist Bernard Lavelle has stated that “a small protein molecule of 100 amino acid residues would require some ten to the 130th power trial assemblies to obtain the correct sequence. The probability of achieving this within a billion years is effectively zero.” The creation of thousands of protein chains in and out of cells, and their organization into functioning and stable reproducing creatures, appears overwhelmingly improbable. Think of 3.5 billion base pairs per human. Think of any major protein molecule in any creature’s body—insulin has 51 amino acids, hemoglobin 574, and myosin 6100. Another scientist, Walter T. Brown, Jr., has written:

Laboratory-synthesized amino acids always form in equal amounts of mirror-image structures termed left-handed’ and ‘right-handed’. Amino acids that [make up] the proteins found in living things, including plants, animals, bacteria, moles and even viruses, are essentially all left-handed. The mathematical probability that chance processes can produce just one tiny protein molecule with only left-handed amino acids is virtually zero.

Like all scientists, Darwin has problems with the Principle of Uncertainty. It says that “if you know how fast you are going, you don’t know where you are; and if you know where you are, you don’t know how fast you are going.” Practically, this means that as you study something and “tease it apart” to get to a certain point, you are altering it in such a way that you cannot really be certain as to what you are discovering. Thus, one ends up with “probability”. Materialist reduction creates artificiality, which is not necessarily the reality; or if it is the reality, you cannot know that with perfect certainty. Only by an accurate philosophical understanding of material, formal, efficient and final causes, determined by non-biological spirit, can the Principle of Uncertainty be overcome.

The Darwinian “struggle for life” is certainly open to doubt. This is not to deny the individual struggle for survival. However, there is no good evidence for any demand for ascendancy by a total species—only by a few arrogant humans. Clearly, increasing food and/or amino acids at a certain point typically leads to a lessening of reproduction. There is no observed striving, in any species, always to increase to the utmost at all times. Individuals of most species (especially humans) try to work together. In nature, the symphonic working-together is obvious, in spite of the entropic loss necessary for the conservation of energy. There is not the “fight to the death” posited for all creatures by the Darwinists. There is neither “survival” nor reproduction” of the “fittest”. Nowhere is offspring-survival as low as the Darwinians’ figure of 20% or less for all species. Indeed, the harmony and symphony of life as a totum on the planet is amazing, and the basis for all environmentalism. For rational people, the accurate understanding of life is in itself a contradiction of Darwin.

More doubt is cast upon Darwin’s ideas by the transparently evident psychological needs of those scientists who are greatly comforted by the anti-authoritarian aura of “evolution” in spite of their pleasure in complying with peer pressure. The unscientific untouchability of the Creed of Darwin enables these scientists to sleep in the security that materialism is the only “ism” in which they have to believe. Nevertheless, when scientists proclaim and protect the “science” of evolution dogmatically, they stand Galileo on his head.

Perhaps the primary advantage in trumpeting evolution is that it allows atheists to sound off like the fundamentalists they really are. Rather than defending evolution with consistent scientific confirmations, Darwinians are apt to rely on anti-religious propaganda, as if religion is the only alternative to evolution. Darwinism is a valiant attempt to explain life without God, but in making the attempt, its adherents create tendentious purposes beyond science, and cease to be purely scientific.

Conclusion

Some years ago, Mr. Richard Dawkins published *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design*. One may say, in its favour, that it was a popular success. One may also suggest that the author, as is usual with him, indulges a monomaniacal compulsiveness as he attempts to reify his mathematical hypothesizing with no evidence except for a series of sketches. His computing and sketching totally ignore the left-handedness of most of life's proteins. Here is a quotation from the book, giving the author's reason for using a high rate of mutation in his sketches and calculations: "In real life, the probability that a gene will mutate is often less than one in a million. and humans haven't the patience to wait a million generations for a mutation!"

Well, some of us do have the patience to figure out what that statement glosses over. For humans, with 30,000 genes, a 20-year generation length, and one-in-a-million genes mutating, 6×10^{-9} (600 billion) years are needed to develop those genes—and that is only the genes them-selves: each human has 10 trillion cells, filled with trillions more subgenetic proteins, all communicating by pathways made up of more trillions of complex proteins. Mr. Dawkins dismisses this as solved by "embryology", a word he invokes for all the postgenetic protein linkages and the millions of protein pathways present. His "cumulative accumulation", which cannot be confirmed for positive mutations, is woefully inadequate for the development of all living beings, and not just humans. A better title for the book would be *The Manic Sketchrnaker: Why Sketching Evolution with a Pencil Reveals the Need for a Pencil-sharpener*.

Darwin must be doubted, because the career of life on earth reveals an ascent, in a symphony of increasing anti-entropic complexity, and not universal warfare. No one has ever witnessed or documented the evolution of one genus from another. Instead, there is a "science of the gaps", with evolutionists leaping from fossil to fossil and claiming a relationship when, at best, there are only common construction blocks. Our civilization itself constitutes a general disproof of Darwinism's cruel evolution with its every-creature-for-itself. We can look around and see our fellow creatures working transcendently together in harmony with Nature's environmental symphony.

The parroting of biological vignettes of superficial similarity for a limited group of organisms cannot be applied to all, much less used to construct an alleged "phylogenetic tree of life". Simplistic theories of common descent and natural selection are inept trivializations. Genuine universal kinship cannot be inferred just because all creatures are composed of amino acids. Darwin's evolution is inconsistent with Einstein's insight that "God does not play dice with the universe."

In closing these notes on "doubts about Darwin", it seems appropriate to return to the very beginning, and

Darwin's own notes, recorded on the famous voyage of H.M.S. Beagle. Writing about the natives of the island of Tierra del Fuego, at the southern tip of South America, he said this:

Viewing such men, one can hardly make oneself believe that they are fellow-creatures, and inhabitants of the same world. It is a common subject of conjecture what pleasures in life some of the lower animals can enjoy: how much more reasonably the same question may be asked with respect to these barbarians! At night, five or six human beings, naked and scarcely protected from the wind and rain of this tempestuous climate, sleep on the wet ground coiled up like animals.

...The different tribes when at war are cannibals... it is certainly true, that when pressed in the winter by hunger, they kill and devour their old women before they kill their dogs..

...Was a more horrid deed ever perpetrated, than that witnessed on the west coast by (Admiral) Byron, who saw a wretched mother pick up her bleeding dying infant-boy, whom her husband had mercilessly dashed on the stones for dropping a basket of sea-eggs!..

The voyage of the Beagle has been by far the most important event in my life . . . the sight of a naked savage in his native land is an event which can never be forgotten.

Now we know where Darwin "got it". And he organized it all to theoretical effect, calling it "evolution" and "natural selection". The unfit animals, which now include humans—us—are able to be named, and targeted! "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em"? So Darwin, all unaware, did intellectually what he saw done materially by the natives, and brought us back to a primitive, anti-life, unloving, cold and irreligious war of one with all.

Why evolutionary theories are unbelievable

Belief in evolution was possible for me during medical school to the degree that I was rapidly losing my Catholic faith. Then I read a book review in *Scientific American* (around 1956?) on *The Phenomenon of Man*, Teilhard de Chardin's seminal work. The reviewer, one of the Huxleys, I think, wrote a startling review in that he acknowledged the profundity of Teilhard's ideas but was still hopeful that someone someday would refute Teilhard because such was beyond Huxley's ability.

1. Immediately bought and read *The Phenomenon of Man* and have been a Teilhardian ever since. He literally saved my soul. I have all of his translated works. Teilhard gave evolution a religious understanding for me. My interpretation of his work, simply put, is that evolution demonstrated the appearance of a level of animal awareness followed by a level of consciousness of consciousness (C2) confined to humans; and that the next level of evolution would be a personal transition back to God. Although I know many disagree. Still, with Teilhard's theories, as I have interpreted them, I was able to maintain complete and absolute unflinching faith in Jesus, His Church and evolution. Until now.

During the past several decades, I have become more and more aware that theories of evolution leave much to be desired, so much so that I offer this article to provide three major reasons why evolution cannot be believed any longer. Teilhardian ideas may serve well for those believing in evolution, but evolution itself no longer needs to be believed because of:

- a. Examples of extreme improbabilities in the universe which absolutely render evolution untenable.
- b. Critiques which incontrovertibly undermine evolutionary theories and
- c. The biases of scientists

I. Four examples of why evolution is improbable

Godel's Theorems are totally unpredictable and unprobable! & Wei's first theorem is that in a system of complexity, questions exist that are neither provable nor disprovable on the basis of the axioms in the system; that is, true statements are undecidable even if known to be true because they cannot be decided as true on the basis of the system as known. Godel's second theorem is that the system is always incomplete because new undecidable elements will always be present such that contradictions occur when the system claims it has decided all; that is, the system will generate more undecidability.

Godel's Theorems apply to the most spiritual formalities of the human mind's mathematical spirit, i.e., formal mathematics. If undecidability and incompleteness are present in such an extreme mathematical formality, how much more so are they present in everything else man does. Basically, Godel's Theorems prove the Doctrine of Original Sin, the need for the sacrament of penance, and that there is a future eternity. Godel's Theorems mean that, in the human complex, things will go wrong and there will always be a "defect" of sorts about which forgiveness and corrective action will be needed.

Furthermore, this human complex continues to become increasingly complex and it will never end as long as the system continues. Godel's Theorems prove that man is on a treadmill of physical and mental entropy(sin), perpetually needing the sacrament of penance. From science to bombs, from the Bible to pornography, from Walt Disney to Michael Eisner, from birth to abortion, from marital bliss to gratuitous sex, from the Summa to the New York Times, from the Church to solipsism, from the universal magisterium to power, from Isaac Newton to Peter Singer, man will be sinful at worst and undecidable/incomplete at best.

Never more evident than by Godel's Theorems is proven the need for sacramental grace to mitigate and overcome the omnipresent potential for incompleteness and undecidability leading to anti-transcendental outcomes (entropy and sin). The only way to overcome Godel's Theorems is by confession followed by the other sacraments. We are undecidable, incomplete and sinful. We need reparation and all other sacraments in all that we do. In fact, we need God to complete ourselves! Science cannot account for these Divine Reminders of our defects, which includes the arrogance of scientists. Godel's Theorems prove that.

The great british scientist bernard lovel has stated

That the moment one second after its expansion started, had the rate of expansion been reduced by only one part in a thousand billion, then the universe would have collapsed after a few million years... the only universe that can exist in the sense that it can be known, is simply the one which satisfied the narrow conditions necessary for the development of intelligent life.

This scientist also said:

Assembling a small protein molecule of 100 amino acid residues would require some 10 to the 130th power trial assemblies to obtain the correct sequence. The probability of achieving this within a billion years is effectively zero.

So try assembling a human animal. The expansion of the universe and molecular complexification are to win the lottery over and over again. The improbability is astronomical.

Another internationally renowned scientist, Walter T. Brown, Jr. said

Laboratory synthesized amino acids always form in equal amounts of mirror-image structures termed "left handed" and "right handed." Amino acids that comprise the proteins found in living things, including plants, animals, bacteria, molds and even viruses, are essentially all left handed. The mathematical probability that chance processes can produce just one tiny protein molecule with only left handed amino acids is virtually zero.

Evolution cannot account for this improbability.

Freedom! As I describe it in "The Attainment of Psychological Freedom" (Social Justice Review, November/December 2002, pp. 176-179), personal freedom is subordinate to the transcendentals. Freedom is not "anything goes" but consists of acts of transcendental intent for truth, oneness, good and beauty. Psychological freedom is an ontological natural activity of man, distinguishing him from subhumans, by which he, through intellect and will seeking perfection, achieve transcendental existence, that is, knowing, loving and serving God in this life and attaining ultimate freedom with God in the next. Psychological freedom consists not only of the chosen act itself but of its transcendental intention. By such transcendental intention, man can be free unlike all other creatures which remain confined to matter. It is against common sense and evolution itself to proclaim otherwise. That man's psychological freedom goes beyond matter is undeniable. This fact confirms a limitless future with God, i.e., the ultimate freedom from matter. No one who tries to understand the planet, the mind, and science, can deny the awesome significance of psychological freedom as we escape from matter. Only a theophobe would deny an even more free future. This personal "evolution" is confirmed by human psychological freedom which itself proves a fantastic transcendental freedom in our future beyond all comprehension, except by the word "eternity." How can evolution account for this except by paradoxically denying itself?

II. Critiques which incontrovertibly undermine evolutionary theories

1. Dennis Bonnett's Origin of the Human Species — which defines well the problems of evolutionary theory recognizing it as a philosophy of atheistic naturalism and not science.
2. Forbidden Archeology the Hidden History of the Human race (by Michael A. Cremo & Richard L. Thompson) details unimpeachable findings of anatomically modern humans in Early Pleistocene and Pliocene — findings which invalidate contemporary human evolution theory totally. Besides that, this book is filled with documented archeological findings many times over debunking evolutionary theory.
3. The Atomic Constants, Light and Time (by Trevor Norman and Barry Setterfield) assert that the best speed of light readings from 1740 to 1983 show a decay rate in the speed of light from 2.79 kilometers per second per year. One can only shake one's head at their findings. Their data is quite impressive. It needs to be confirmed. Another book proposing the same idea is Faster Than the Speed of Light/The Story of a Scientific Speculation by Joao Magueijo. The results of a decrease in the speed of light are astonishing! Such is almost unbelievable, but the evidence seems to be there. Do we unscientifically discard it because it does not fit? Do we call the researchers frauds? Do we see another improbability which can only confirm God's presence because evolution is unnecessary to explain it all?

4. The book Intelligent Design Creationism and its Critics/ Philosophical, Theological and Scientific Perspectives deserves consideration regardless of the negative review in the New York Times book review (April 4, 2002). That reviewer's criticism emphasizes that "imperfections in the biological world" argue against God.

Odd arrangements and funny solutions are the proof of evolution — paths that a sensible God would never tread but that a natural process, constrained by history, follows perforce.

So says scientist Stephen J. Gould, who obviously does not understand or believe that God created a free world with entropy and evil, including misguided freedom. The New York Times reviewer says that the book is not "a slam-dunk for theism" and that the case for an "intellectually fulfilled creationist" is not made. On the other hand, most assuredly, the case for an intellectually fulfilled evolutionist has not been made either, but the dishonest press and reviewers are as dishonest as the evolution scientists they promote. This book may not confirm God, but nothing confirms evolution.

III. The biases of scientists

- i. (Contrary to popular lore, the Galileo controversy proves not the misdeeds of the Church, but the untrustworthiness of scientists and anti-God promoters. Galileo was not even honest, having fraudulently presented the telescope as his own invention to the Venetian Senate. An, accurate reading of the Church vs.

Galileo is that Galileo was making outrageous claims that he had proven that the earth moved around the sun by his calculations from ocean tides. Galileo did not prove such. And he had no right to be making grandiose claims about the alleged implications of such. He was eventually proven correct in the late 19th century by stellar parallax and by Foucault's pendulum experiment, but Galileo did not prove any heliocentrism in his day. The anti-historical, anti-scientific, untrue portrayal of the Church v. Galileo is an incontrovertible proof of the gullibility of the scientific community.

- ii. The failure of scientists to acknowledge the debt owed to the Church for "science" itself is another proof of theophobic neuroses. The Parisian clerics Jean Buridan and Bishop Oresme gave birth to contemporary science. While there were several false starts of science elsewhere in the previous thousands of years, such early science efforts were stillbirths because the belief systems extant in those times were not able to sustain viable scientific processes.

Only Christianity had (and has) a linear outlook of the earth in terms of a natural beginning and natural end such that stable scientific procedures remained. The unique linearity of Christian theology impelled these Parisian clerics to believe that God gave motion to the planets and that this motion could be studied. In brief, profoundly but simply put, the idea of an interminable treadmill at birth and re-birth would no longer paralyze nascent scientific efforts to study the world. Only Christianity would give a linear existence requiring the study of linear motion. And that is how contemporary science began. (Read Stanley L. Jaki's A Mind's Matter —

An Intellectual Autobiography)

- iii. Scientists discredit themselves by abortion, which discredits all who are not against abortion as a "medical procedure." Actually, anyone for abortion or who does not protest abortion has forfeited the right for moral argumentation about anything and has proven themselves gullible and susceptible to anti-life activity, discrediting them completely.

First of all, one must realize that abortionists would be willing to kill you. (Anyone who performs, is for, or does not protest abortion IS an abortionist!) Abortionists may not kill you now, but they would have then. Because abortionists would have killed you, they cannot be believed about anything, right or wrong.

Second, abortion is unacceptable because of the advances of science in terms of the uniqueness of each human individual. Today life is known in its uniqueness to basic material units at the level of one cell, one crystal, one bacterium, one virus, one molecule, one atom, and subatomic particles or waves as the case may be. Presently today we have molecule-sized circuitry, quantum-dot-cellular-automata and precisely patterned electron housing. Microanalytic techniques include laser pulses, micromotion, microknives, and micropipettes all with calculations in nanoseconds.

There is nanotechnology! It is absurd for scientists, or anyone else for that matter, to deny the unique humanity and personhood internal to the undeniable beginning of each human being with the union of one sperm and one egg, the significance of which is awesome and undeniable (except for those who are unpersons, a status determined by the lack of commitment to the human species from natural beginning to natural end).

Abortion is micro victimization, a cruelly impersonal annihilation. Acceptance of abortion proves untrustability.

- iv. Read Moths and Men/An Evolutionary Tale: The Untold Story of Science and the Peppered Moth by Judith Hooper. This book demonstrates fraud science run amok. It is a story of "human ambitions and self delusions shared amongst some of the most renowned evolutionary biologists of our era." The author describes the lepidopterists' studies thought to demonstrate natural selection in action as the white moth converts into a dark moth. And the whole thing was another scientific fraud. This is the story of an Oxford biologist, E.B. Ford, and an amateur lepidopterist, H.B.D. Kettleman. The Ford-Kettleman experiments were the most famous examples of evolution and one can still find textbooks showing the speckled moth showing up like a beacon while the dark moth is neatly concealed. Unfortunately, there turned out to be nothing "natural" about it. Some of Britain's most brilliant scientists promoted pure scientific fraud.

- v. Read The Savior of Science by Stanley Jaki and find Darwin to be a plagiarizer of ideas set down by another person some 20 years before. Find that Darwin stated "in the literal sense of the word, natural selection is a false term." In addition, "Selection in Relation to Sex" (the very subtitle of the Descent) has never to this day been demonstrated in wild populations and, in fact, counter-examples are abundant, i.e., the cuckoo, wherein the male is promiscuous and the female polyandrous, using other birds' nests for hatching their eggs. (Cuckoos and most other animals care little for "sex-selecting", it would appear.)

Conclusion

Until evolutionists, Darwinists, the press and media make the case for evolution by surviving the same degree of criticism inflicted upon creationists and intelligent design advocates, equal consideration, elaboration and promotion of both views is the only intellectually decent and honest way to proceed.

Teilhard's evolutionary scheme, as I project it, meant that evolution was a progressive sanctification and emancipation beginning with molecular complexification to the degree of matter folding back on itself to reflection, further leading to cerebral folding back on itself

resulting in reflection on reflection free from matter by "consciousness squared" (C2), clearly adumbrating another level of freedom to spirituality by personal evolution to eternity with God.

If one believes in evolution, one has to be unscientific to assert th man is the ultimate end of evolution, if evolution. Given that, and proper understood in Teilhardian terms, evolution is no problem and demands ; assent to a level of freedom at least equal to the immense difference levels of freedom between man and subhuman creatures. Interpreted such a way, one can almost hope that evolutionary theories were tru However, it does not mean evolution is true or necessary. Indeed, tl evidence against evolution is overwhelming. The probability of evolutic is about nil in terms of proof offered, the improbabilities to be explain (and accounted for, the cogent intelligent criticism of evolution from mar perspectives, and because of the theophobic biases of scientists themselves.

Ben Stein Provokes Liberals' Wrath Ben Stein is known to many as an actor on Comedy Central. But the funniest part about his latest movie called Expelled is not any clever lines spoken by Stein but the hysterical way the liberals are trying to discourage people from seeing it.

Stein's critics don't effectively refute anything in Expelled; they just use epithets to ridicule it and hope they can make it go away. However, it won't go away; evu Scientific Ameri-can, which labeled the movie "shameful," concedes that it cannot be ignored.

The movie is about how scientists who dare to criticize Darwinism or discuss the contrary theory called IntelligentDesign (ID) are expelled, tired, denied tenure, blacklisted, and bitterly denounced. Academic freedom doesn't extend to this issue. The message of Stein's critics comes through loud and clear. They don't want anybody to challenge Darwinian or-thodoxy or suggest that Intelligent Design might be an expla-nation of the origin of life „di, i3e444.

Stein, who serves as his own narrator in the movie, is very deadpan about it all. I le doesn't try to convince the audi-ence that Darwinism is a fraud, or that God created the world, or even that some unidentified Intelligent Design might have started life on Earth. Stein merely shows the intolerance of the universities, the government, the courts, the grant-making foundations and the media, and their determination to sup- press any mention of Intelligent Design. The only question posed by the movie is why, oh why, is there such a deliberate, consistent, widespread, vindictive ef-fort to silence all criticism of dogmatic Darwinism or discussion of alternate theories of the origin of life? Stein interviews scientists who were blacklisted, denied grants, and ostracizedin the academic community because they dared to write or speak the forbidden words.

The liberals are particularly upset because the movie iden-tifies Darwinism, rather than evolution, as the sacred word that must be

isolated from criticism. But that semantic choice makes good sense because Darwinism is easily defined by Darwin's own writings, whereas the word evolution is subject to different and even contrary definitions.Stein spent two years traveling the world to gather material for this movie. He interviewed scores of scientists and academics who say they were retaliated against because of questioning Darwin's theories.

Stein interviewed Dr. Richard Sternberg, a biologist who lost his position at the prestigious Smithsonian Institution after he published a peer-reviewed article that mentioned Intelligent Design. Other academics who said they were victims of the anti-ID campus police included astrobiologist Guillermo Gonzalez, denied tenure at Iowa State University, na d Caroline Crocker, who lost her professorship at George Mason University.

Stein dares to include some filming at the death camps in Nazi Germany as a backdrop for interviews that explain Charles Darwin's considerable influence on Adolf Hitler and his well-known atrocities. The Darwin-Hitler connection was not a Stein discovery; Darwin's influence on Hitler's political worldview, and Hitler's rejection of the sacredness of human life, is acknowledged in standard biographies of Hitler.

Stein also addresses how Darwin's theories influenced one of the U.S.'s most embarrassing periods, the eugenicsfad of the early 20th century Thousands o fAmericans were legally sterilized as physically or mentally unfit. Mandatory sterilization based on Darwin's theories was even approved by the U.S. Supreme Court, with Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes writing his famous line, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough." Stein also reminds us that Margaret Sanger was a eugenicist who wanted to eliminate the races she believed were inferior.

Stein's message is that the attack on freedom of inquiry is anti-science, anti-American, and anti-the whole concept of learning. His dramatization should force the public, and maybe even academia. to address this extraordinary intolerance of diversity.

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

None.

Funding

None.