Darwin's evolution-theory in crisis

by

Martin Euser

August, 2009

Introduction

The following note is a brief compilation of informative links about insights and findings concerning fundamental problems of Darwin's evolution-theory. Some ideas as where to go are offered near the end of the document. In some of these links you will have to focus on the evidence and logic offered, and ignore suggestive claims pertaining to religious views. I am only concerned with facts, evidence and logic in this note.

The problem

It has become clear that there is something lacking in evolution-theory. There is a lack of understanding of how certain mechanisms would work. Especially how "natural selection" would lead to the exceedingly complicated biochemistry in cells, complicated machinery such as the flagella in bacteria, (see first video), "creatures that defy evolution", to name a few riddles for the "Darwinists", as I will name the followers of his theory (and the modern synthesis that includes genetics).
No mechanism has been shown for the transformation of one species into another, despite the claim of evolution-theory that species transform.
No mechanism is known for the emergence of life out of so-called dead matter.

Cause and effect reversals are common in Darwinistic accounts . See the excellent "16 theses which refute Darwinian Evolution" Alfred Russel Wallace understood this very well.
Among other things, he understood that artistic expression, humor, mathematical ability, etc., cannot be explained on the basis of Darwinist principles. Note, that I don't have a problem with the idea of *some sort* of evolution going on in nature. I just want to point out that the old-fashioned evolution-theory has so many shortcomings, and tautologies (as acknowledged by British geneticist C. H. Waddington, see previous link) that it should be replaced by some better conceived theory. It would be fair if biologists would concede that and help to change the way their pet-theory is presented in schools and universities. I say "pet-theory", because so many scientists cling to it as if their life depends on it.

The fifth of these 16 theses deals with "the detailed operation of

natural selection". The "doubting Thomas" shows that "natural selection" is a meaningless term. See also his fourth thesis.

Survival of a species in a changing environment seems to have to do with it's ability to adapt to these changing circumstances. Organisms also have the ability to adapt their environment to a degree, as plants and animals influence their environment in many ways, by their feeding habits, their dung, spreading of seeds, etc. Note, that the ability to adapt is totally consistent with a spiritual view on life.
Besides the "struggle for life", one can observe a lot of cooperation in nature, called mutualism and co-operation in biology.

Frauds have been perpetrated occasionally (or more than that, who will tell?) by researchers, in order to build false evidence for the current evolution-theory.
Strangely, little or no mention of this is made in textbooks on biology. There are even textbooks on the market that include "evidence" for Darwinian evolution, despite the fact that this evidence is since long known to have been fabricated.
A little Google search on "fraud with evolution theory" reveals countless links to be studied. Here, one has to carefully separate any claims made for the correctness of religious views from the **evidence and logic offered** against claims of the Darwinian evolution-theory adherents. The evidence and logic is worth the study.

It is now becoming apparent that "the scientific theories of origins cannot be verified or falsified definitively on scientific grounds." So, these theories cannot be called scientific at all, because the criterion of falsification is part of the scientific discipline. Exit Darwin's theory and the modern synthesis.

Which way out?

Is there an alternative for Darwinian evolution/modern synthesis? Yes, there is, but it has to be developed much further.
The difficulty lies with a good analysis of our view on life, nature and ourselves. Our concepts of matter, life, body, mind, spirit, time, space, and a whole lot more are outdated.
As long as philosophers of science don't understand the difference between knowledge and understanding (or information and insight), what the mutual relation between whole and part is, to name a few things, then there is little hope of anything substantial coming from that corner.
Scientism doesn't contribute anything useful in this respect.

Few people seem to realize how much our whole philosophy of life has become stuck in seventeenth and nineteenth century ideas.

I am convinced that a synthesis between substance philosophy and process philosophy is in order. Alfred North Whitehead has speculated a bit on permanence vs. flux, bipolarity of matter (particle/wave duality), and some other useful notions.
See his lectures/book on "Process and Reality".
His work should be continued, as well as research on the qualia problem, which in the end could yield a new epistemology and ontology.

Four levels or categories or spheres of influence can be discerned in the psychological as well as in the biological domain.
I discuss some of this in my blog (first see appendix of my e-book.)

A very preliminary list of these:

1. Potentiality & potency
2. Social level, interaction, meaning, creativity, morality
3. Information, form, pattern, construction
4. Physical domain, body as molecular aggregate

These four levels and their interactions need a lot of research.
It is to be expected that philosophers of science and other interested people will devote some time to research these notions, because these are simply indispensable and necessary for the development of a more holistic, integrated science.
A good example of the difference between level or category 4 and 3 is DNA. The code or pattern embedded in the DNA can be transferred to other media, written in the sand, stored on a computer disk, etc.
Now that I am referring to DNA:
no mechanism or natural law is known to explain the origin of DNA. There are no known natural forces which produce structures with high information content.

As regards category 2 and 3: it seems to me that attributing meaning to a pattern differs categorically from the pattern itself. Likewise, creating a painting or writing a book is not in the same category, I think, as the information content or finished painting itself. These matters have not been sufficiently researched in philosophy.
I hope to do some more research and reflection in this connection.
People who want to contribute can reach me through this contact-form.

Further reading:

1. Philip Johnson - Darwin on trial

2. Thoughts-on-Evolution

3. Unmasking evolution. Real facts against unwarranted conclusions

4. A growing number of scientists that have signed a list for "more examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory."
"They are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life."