

The shaky basics of evolution theory

Introduction

This essay points out flaws in the evolution theory from a biological view. The essay comes from Siku Andrea's "Inverz evolúció. Tejút Bt., Budapest, 1997" (in Hungarian)

In this essay we examine the extremely doubtful aspects of Darwin's theory. According to the evolutionists, Darwin's theory of evolution is a scientific fact. However, after careful study of this theory the following question arises: "What makes this one theory scientifically accepted?"

The teachings of Vedic literature and the modern science both agree that the goal of real science is to establish the absolute truth. The inductive method of gathering of knowledge has three aspects: observation and collection of evidence; constructing a hypothesis on this to explain the observations and evidence; and, to properly prove the hypothesis there has to be evidence and observations to support it.

After satisfying these three requirements, we can re-examine the hypothesis to see if it answers all the related questions that arise. The theory should not have any such part, which we cannot answer and prove with appropriate evidences. If there are still some unsolved questions, then we cannot claim that the theory is true. It is vital that the theory answers all the questions, or if it is raising more unsolved questions, whether its continued use is helping us to progress or not. If the theory is true, there will be no contradictions or vague points. Any hypothesis, which does not fulfill these requirements is pure mental speculation.

Does Darwin's evolution theory fulfill these requirements?

Proper observation and trustworthy experiment

The Vedas describe the methods used by modern science and by Darwin for acquiring empirical knowledge as uncertain, because they rely on observations using imperfect human senses and consequently the explanation derived may be wrong.

We often do not hear and see what is observable. We do not have the acute vision of the hawks which can see a mouse from high in the sky. We cannot observe many stars, nor any bacteria as they are too dim and too small respectively. As soon as darkness falls we can barely see anything, so we use lights. There are many animals spend their active life in the night hours, they can see far better than man. Our hearing is poor too. Dolphins and bats have far more acute hearing than man. Our sense of smell is also poorly developed as are our other senses. As we age our senses deteriorate. So theories relying purely on observation using our senses, will have many errors. This is not just because our senses are imperfect but also because we make mistakes in observation. There is also a tendency to observe what we wish to observe and thus cheat in attaining our goal. This also cheats others. These are the four main defects of humans. Because of these defects the Vedic scriptures consider that empirically acquired knowledge is neither bona-fide nor perfect if the conclusions disagree with the Vedic conclusions.

It is known from Darwin's notes that he arrived at his theory before he started his observations. His theory clearly gave direction to his future research. For example, he admitted that he 'let his theory guide his observations' He wrote: "I am a firm believer that without speculation there is no good and original observation." Therefore, by knowingly giving direction to his observations, Darwin ignored

contradictory facts. He only looked for observations which can "shed light on the origin of the species, which is the secret of all secrets".

The original purpose of his journey had the goal of exploring the geology of unknown regions. But the information he collected he used for expounding his theory on the origin of species. He wrote that beside his geological exploration he also collected animals; briefly describing each and carrying out dissections. However, because he was not a trained biologist and his knowledge of anatomy was not good, his drawings and the notes that he made during his travels were almost useless. His diary containing details of his daily observations and exploration have been carefully examined and the following are the most often used keywords: Probably - 157; law - 153; analogy - 142; cause - 125; theory - 112; argument - 98; explanation - 65; necessary - 62; possible - 50; certain - 37; accident - 35.

He used the words "selection" once, "deduction" four and the word "fight" occurred only eleven times.

It is obvious that the vocabulary of his diary indicates a more philosophical work than a biological treatise. Moreover, as everybody agrees that Darwin's theory is the result of very broad, bold and original speculations. However, using his empirical process, which amounted to mental speculation, makes it impossible to get complete knowledge.

In summary, Darwin's observations were not objective because he noted down only those that supported his preconceived ideas. In his diary there are no questions about evolution, still this diary is what he used as the basis of his theory. His research work was empirical so it includes the four defects of human beings. Darwin was not a trained biologist, he was an amateur.

In conclusion Darwin's theory does not fulfill the first requirement mentioned in the start of this section, as his theory is based on subjective speculation rather than objective observation.

The description of the phenomena

From Darwin's diary we know that he would never published his ideas about origin of the species, if he had not been sent a paper written by young naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace. Wallace had sent his paper to Darwin. Darwin consulted Lyell, the eminent geologist. Lyell told Darwin "If you want to have priority then better publish your work!" Darwin had not published his theory because he feared the reactions of contemporary scientists and from the established church. After publishing a joint paper with Wallace in 1858, Darwin, overpowered by jealousy quickly began to work on his book.

After doing nothing for twenty years, Darwin hurriedly finished the first edition of his book, in just thirteen months. However, he had to correct repeatedly his manuscript because at first he had difficulty in formulating his hypothesis and arguments.

The first edition of his book omitted the most sensitive chapter on the origin of humans and the descent of certain other living entities. He eventually gained the courage to publish this chapter only after a further twelve years. He reasoned that it was unnecessary and would be harmful to his book to present the theory with insufficient evidence. Interestingly, even now there is not enough supporting evidence for Darwin's theory.

What are the deficiencies in the theory of evolution? To accept an assertion as a scientific fact we have to answer the following questions: what, where, when and how? The first step is to construct a hypothesis based on observation and experiment. In the case of evolution this means the following things:

1. It is necessary to have examples of one species turning into another species.
2. The mechanisms driving evolution have to be described.
3. It has to be shown at which stage in the process of change each species lies and precisely from which species it was derived from.

The evolutionists have no satisfactory answers to these questions. Evolution theory is an amazingly simple and attractive hypothesis. As was known long before Darwin, the major problem with it are the huge gaps in evidence. The irony is that Darwin's book, which became famous because of its explanation of the origin of species does not describe such origins.

Proof

In this section, we discuss proof. Darwin could not produce any tangible evidence to support and prove the validity of his theory of evolution. He had very vague explanations and on many questions evasive answers. In answer to those who asked why certain animal species develop more intellectual ability than other animals for whom, such a development could be very favorable? Or, why have monkeys not developed the intellectual abilities of humans? He would answer that the reasons could differ. However, because the relative probability of such hypothetical events cannot be established it is pointless discussing them. He would further say that we should not expect any answer on the last question if we cannot answer the question, why did one uncivilized human develop higher level of civilization than another. This is all Darwin could say on evolution of humans.

St George Mivart, an eminent anatomist and biologist, who was consulted by Darwin on the anatomy of newts and monkeys, held an extensive correspondence with Darwin and later published "On the Genesis of Species" which marshaled the arguments against natural selection.

A characteristic of all placental mammals is milk glands. The young are totally dependent for food on the milk produced. So whilst it "must be certainly true" that milk glands evolved a long time ago it cannot be known how and when they developed. Even if this development occurred once, why did it remain permanent? The evolutionists' answer to this question is that placental mammals descended from the monotreme mammals, in which milk glands developed for the first time. These egg laying mammals are the ancestors of marsupial mammals and placental mammals.

Taking the monotreme platypus or echidnas as examples, the young attach to the mother using sticky hairs, the milk oozes from the glands, there are no teats, the milk soaks the youngsters and the mother and the young lick it up. The young are extremely undeveloped at birth, the eggs are very "primitive". The monotremes are thus an improbable ancestor of marsupials and placental mammals. The eggs are so "primitive" that is hard to imagine a reptilian or fish ancestor as virtually all reptiles and fish have more "advanced" eggs.