THE DIVINE ESSENCE IN EVOLUTIONARY THEORIZING — AN ANALYSIS OF THE RISE AND FALL OF EVOLUTIONARY NATURAL SELECTION, MUTATION, AND PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIA AS MECHANISMS OF MEGAEVOLUTION

RANDALL HEDTKE*

Received 14 April 1983, revised 6 December 1983

It is the author's thesis that true science, namely, experimentation and observation, is inseparably united with God. Science as a reasoning process and our ability to reason as human beings have the Creator as their common source. The inseparability between science and God is especially apparent in the question of the origin of life. This article describes the futility confronting materialistic theorizers to explain the origin of life without invoking miracles.

The problem confronting materialistic theorizers is the requirement of formulating a testable, on-going mechanism for the origin of life as opposed to a nontestable, discontinuous mechanism. The former is within the realm of science, while the latter is not. Darwin's on-going evolutionary natural selection mechanism met that requirement. The article goes on to explain how, when Darwin finally did deal honestly and objectively with the data, he abandoned evolutionary natural selection. Then, in order to avoid conceding to special creation and continue to meet the scientific requirement of postulating an on-going mechanism, he switched to Jean Lamrack's theory of acquired characters, which never had credibility. Darwin's correct insistence that a materialistic explanation for the origin of life must be by means of an on-going mechanism, perhaps can only be fully appreciated at a time when special creation is the predominant belief.

Darwin's reaction to the dilemma is contrasted to the reactions of Hugo De Vries and present-day evolutionists, like Stephen Jay Gould, who also found evolutionary natural selection untenable as an on-going mechanism. Their reaction has been to abandon true science by postulating periodic mutability and punctuated equilibria, which, because they are not on-going, are statements of belief. Essentially, they were led back to creation in spite of themselves. Science, within its limitations, will always reveal creation, because it reveals intelligent design in nature, while not revealing an on-going mechanism; together they add up to creation.

Introduction

There exists what may be described as a divine essence in evolutionary theorizing by proponents of evolution. This may sound blasphemous, since the philosophical purpose of evolution is to convince the public that life arose by chance, without the miraculous power of God. This divine essence is not revealed in the success, but rather in the failure of materialistic theorizers to formulate a scientifically legitimate theory for the origin of life. As the textbooks and the history of evolutionary theory reveal, the official version is not theistic evolution; it is atheistic evolution.

Divine essence describes the connection or interrelationship that exists between one's ability to reason as a human being and science which is basically a reasoning process. Divine essence, as manifested in evolutionary theorizing, is an invisible quality of God as described in Romans 1:20. Our reasoning ability and science have the Creator as their common source; consequently, they can never be separated. Because of this, anyone using science in an attempt to deny creation is attempting the impossible. They must, in fact, appeal to something that is a *supranatural* belief, meaning it is nonscientific in the sense that it is beyond observation and experimentation. A supranatural belief is inherently materialistic, rather than theistic.

Exactly what does happen when a theorist attempts to use science to explain the origin of life exclusive of divine creation? Divine essence, that subtle connection between science as a reasoning process and our ability to reason as human beings cannot be denied; therefore, only two futile options exist for the atheistic theorizer. One option will be to formulate a scientifically legitimate hypothesis based upon a testable, on-going mechanism. In the case of evolution, this type of hypothesis is destined for disproof because it cannot possibly be the truth if creation is valid. The second possible option is to formulate a supranatural hypothesis. A supranatural hypothesis is outside the realm of science because it is not on-going, therefore, not refutable. It is more accurate to describe a supranatural hypothesis as a belief based upon the investigator's personal philosophy, religion, or intuition. A supranatural belief is what divine essence drives a materialistic theorizer to formulate once the failure of a scientifically legitimate hypothesis is recognized. A supranatural belief has no scientific legitimacy and exists as a philosophical attempt to "ungod the universe."[1] Obviously, it has no appeal to creationists, nor is it a threat to one's belief in special creation.

As an example of a supranatural belief, let us consider comparative anatomy, which is frequently mentioned as evidence for evolution. Comparative anatomy means to compare body parts and, according to the evolutionary belief, anytime similarities are observed among plants or animals it is taken to mean they evolved from a common ancestor. The impossible test for that belief would be to go back in time and

*Mr. Randall Hedtke's address is Route 1, Clearwater, Minnesota 55320.

witness evolution. One may make comparisons down to the molecular level, but it will never ever tell us how life originated. The *supernatural* belief for comparative anatomy is that life was divinely created with a plan involving similarities. A creationist would not expect every animal or plant to be different from each other in every detail. The creationist belief is no more testable than the supranatural belief, but being no less scientific than the evolution belief, which is itself nonscience, it is equally worthy of consideration. The creation interpretation for this type of evidence is obvious to the layman, but for the more technical evidence we need the aid of creation scientists.

To summarize, then, the two options for a materialistic theorizer of origins are to formulate a scientifically legitimate hypothesis, which will be disproved, or the last resort, formulate a supranatural belief which is nonscience.

Now let us consider the efforts of several evolutionists as they attempt to overcome divine essence as it pertains to the all-important question of a mechanism for evolution.

Three Concepts of Natural Selection

Three concepts of natural selection exist; one concept exists only in the minds of evolutionists and the other two concepts actually occur in nature. Darwin's concept of *evolutionary natural selection* postulated that nature could eliminate certain traits and preserve other traits in healthy organisms, consequently, creating new kinds. A second concept of natural selection, and the original one, dating back to 1836, was conceived by one Edward Blyth, a zoologist, as a conservative, not a creative mechanism, which would preserve the status quo by eliminating defective organisms.[2] This occurs when, for example, wolves tend to prey upon old and diseased deer.[3] A third concept, also a non-creative concept of natural selection, *random natural selection*, postulates that, although variations exist and competition exists, it is chance that determines which live or die.[4] This is observed when, for example, animals graze or when a bat flies around at dusk devouring insects that happen to stimulate its sonar system or when a robin removes an earthworm from the soil, etc.

Only Darwin's evolutionary natural selection is materialistic because it claims to be creative by means of a naturalistic mechanism.

Charles Darwin's And Jean Lamarck's Scientifically Legitimate Hypotheses

Although *The Origin of Species* is a totally biased presentation of the evidence for the origin of life, it must be acknowledged that the alleged mechanism for evolution, evolutionary natural selection, is within the realm of legitimate science. Darwin's evolutionary natural selection is not supranatural. It is on-going and therefore testable, making it legitimate science.

As stated previously, Darwin's concept of evolutionary natural selection postulated that nature could eliminate certain traits and preserve other traits in healthy organisms, consequently creating new kinds. The alleged elimination of short-necked giraffes while preserving longer necked giraffes is an example. Just how on-going natural selection is, Darwin explained as follows:

> It may metaphorically be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising, throughout the world, the slightest variations; rejecting those that are bad, preserving and adding up all that are good; silently and insensibly working, whenever and wherever opportunity offers, at the improvement of each organic and inorganic condition of life.[5]

Obviously, the test for evolutionary natural selection is to observe it in action in the environment. Darwin never observed his concept of natural selection when he wrote the *Origin* and had to fall back on imaginary examples. The lack of observation of evolutionary natural selection combined with the problem of incipient organs (partly developed organs) led Darwin to abandon evolutionary natural selection in the sixth edition of the Origin. In this edition Darwin attempted to overcome the objections of St. George Mivart pertaining to incipient organs. Mivart's objection was that natural selection would be ineffective in preserving rudimentary organs since they would not be of any advantage until fully developed. For example, what advantage would there be in the first minute movement of the eye of the flat-fish to the upper side of the head? This argument can be made for every organ in every organism. To answer this objection Darwin was forced to go to Jean Lamarck's now defunct theory of acquired characters. He finally ended up stating the following about his own theory:

> I have now considered enough, perhaps more than enough, of the cases, selected with care by a skillful naturalist, to prove that natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures; and I have shown, as I hope, that there is no great difficulty on this head.[6]

That spells the end of evolutionary natural selection as a credible scientific hypothesis; the inevitable disproof became manifest. Exactly how and why Darwin abandoned natural selection is explained in detail in *The Secret of the Sixth Edition*.[7] The sixth edition of the *Origin* was published in 1872, and we see, then, that Darwin learned what Asa Gray, Father of American Botany, made clear in 1860: Natural selection cannot create organs, but "the organs being given, natural selection may account for some improvement . . ."[8]

But just what did Darwin mean when he stated at the end of the quote "that there is no great difficulty on this head?" Obviously there is the utmost difficulty, if natural selection cannot account for the beginning stages of development of an organ, it cannot account for the existence of fully developed organs either. The statement becomes clear when one realizes that Darwin did not abandon evolution, only the mechanism.

At first glance, it seems incredible that Darwin would switch to Lamarck's mechanism for evolution when it had been published prior to his own theory and had never been widely accepted. On the other hand, it does make sense, if Darwin was determined to be true to science. Any scientifically legitimate mechanism for evolution would have to be slow and continuous or on-going as opposed to sudden and discontinuous. Finding evolutionary natural selection

inadequate, Darwin switched to the only other choice he had that was also slow and continuous, namely, Lamarck's acquired characters. Darwin's line of thought is revealed as follows:

> Under a scientific point of view, and as leading to further investigation, but little advantage is gained by believing that new forms are suddenly developed in an inexplicable manner from old and widely different forms, over the old belief in the creation of species from the dust of the earth.[9]

We see, then, that Darwin had the issue properly in hand. A sudden, discontinuous mechanism had no scientific validity and would open the door to creationism, consequently, failing in the philosophical objective to "ungod the universe." Ironically, today Lamarck's theory of acquired traits is included in introductory biology textbooks as an example of a defunct theory, while Darwin's theory of evolutionary natural selection is taught as valid. Darwin must be given credit for maintaining scientific integrity by not switching to supranatural belief. Now let us learn how Hugo De Vries reacted to a similar predicament thirty-seven years later.

Hugo De Vries' Supranatural Belief

Hugo De Vries' two volume work, *The Mutation Theory*, may serve to illustrate a supranatural belief in origins. Published in 1909, *The Mutation Theory* succeeded in temporarily saving Darwin's evolutionary natural selection theory from growing criticism. The problem was that ordinary variability could not provide the unlimited variability needed for evolution. De Vries concluded that his alleged unlimited variability in the form of mutations still could not save evolutionary natural selection. That part of *The Mutation Theory* has not been made public by Darwin's proponents.

De Vries made his position clear when he stated "the great service which Darwin did was that he demonstrated the possibility of accounting for the evolution of the whole animal and vegetable kingdom without invoking the aid of supernatural agencies."[10] This tells us that in the absence of a scientifically legitimate naturalistic explanation for origins he would choose a materialistic supranatural belief rather than a supernatural belief.

De Vries' mental odyssey is interesting to follow because he began the first volume with an attempt to preserve evolutionary natural selection as a scientifically legitimate hypothesis, but concluded the second volume with an abandonment of evolutionary natural selection as well as legitimate science and is forced to formulate a supranatural belief for origins.

De Vries Attempts to Save Evolutionary Natural Selection

Initially De Vries attempted to preserve Darwin's scientifically legitimate theory by trying to prove that Darwin did incorporate mutations as providing unlimited material for evolutionary natural selection:

> Darwin asserts again and again that it must not be forgotten that under the term of variations mere individual differences are included. His variability is therefore always understood in a double sense. It consists on the one hand of individual differences and on the other of single variations. The latter are sporadic, spontaneous changes corresponding to our Mutations.[11]

But in opposition to De Vries opinion, Darwin dismisses mutations or "sports" as having any part of his theory. Referring to artificial selection, Darwin states that "man often begins his selection by a form or sport considerably departing from the parent form. Very differently does the natural law of selection act; the varieties selected differ only slightly from the parent forms . . ."[12] Not only does Darwin make a distinction between mutations and ordinary variability, but he discounts mutations entirely from his theory.

Darwin's thinking is in agreement with Alfred Wallace's opinion on the subject. According to Wallace, only individual variations or fluctuating variability provide the material from which evolutionary natural selection forms new species. His belief is "that animals and plants do vary in the manner and the amount requisite." While "single variations he regards as absolutely without significance; they have played no part, or at least hardly any, in the origin of species."[13]

We have been discussing three kinds of variability—individual variations or fluctuating variability, single variations, and mutations. De Vries insisted that Darwin meant for single variations to mean mutations or sports. The question becomes academic because in the fifth edition of the *Origin*. Darwin also discounts single variations as being of any significance for his theory:

> Nevertheless, until reading an able and valuable article in the "North British Review" (1867), I did not appreciate how rarely single variations, whether slight or strongly-marked, could be perpetuated.

Darwin continues with the following example of a single variation:

> If, for instance a bird of some kind could procure its food more easily by having its beak curved, and if one were born with its beak strongly curved, and which consequently flourished, nevertheless there would be a very poor chance of this one individual perpetuating its kind to the exclusion of the common form . . ."[14]

We learn from this example that the single variation is not a new trait, as would be the case with a mutation, rather a deviation of a trait that is already present. The one similarity that a single variation shares with mutations is that they would both occur at a very low frequency in a gene pool, and that would prevent it from ever supplanting other traits.

Aware of the concession regarding single variations that Darwin made in the fifth edition of the *Origin*, De Vries blames it on the pressure of criticism: "It was only by the pressure of criticism that he finally gave the place of honor to the ever present individual variations."[15]

De Vries Abandons Evolutionary Natural Selection

Finding himself unable to save evolutionary natural selection by having his mutation theory provide unlimited variability, De Vries attacks what he formerly tried to protect. He enlists the aid of others in this attack by reporting that "E. D. Cope was the first to clearly formulate objections against the doctrine of

selection. Selection preserves the good and weeds out the bad, but whence does the good arise? Obviously ordinary variability is not sufficient, and causes of an entirely different kind must be sought for." Also, "Carl Semper similarly rejects the selection theory."[16] Another of De Vries contemporaries points out "that individual variability is static rather than kinetic; and therefore does not provide material for natural selection."[17] Finally, Lord Salisbury, in his presidential address at the meeting of the British Association in Oxford in 1894, stated:

> The theory of selection is by no means to be regarded as proven; for a host of difficulties stand in the way of the acceptance of the explanation of evolution by the accumulation of ordinary (individual) variations.[18]

It becomes obvious from these quotations that at the turn of the century Darwinian evolution was on the verge of being tossed on the junk heap of discarded theories. De Vries himself categorically states his objections:

> It is an absolutely unproved assumption that individual variation extends its range by selection and increases "to an enormous extent." This is the weak point in . . . selection theory.[19]

And he insists "we require proof that this increase and accumulation takes place 'to the amount requisite' for the origin of species and subspecies; and this proof Wallace neither brings forward nor seeks."[20] He objects that "fluctuating variability is very limited" and "that the ordinary variability, as always manifested, is not sufficient" to create new kinds. He also points out that "fluctuating variability is linear; it oscillates only in a plus and a minus direction, whilst adaptation demands a variability which will produce variations in all directions."[21]

His conclusion is tantamount to informing the scientific community that it had promoted a theory that is incompetent to account for the origin of species: "Thus we see that the current form of the theory of selection cannot supply the kind of variability which the theory demands, whilst the doctrine of mutation can supply it . . ."[22]

What remains of Darwin's evolutionary natural selection hypothesis? Originally De Vries attempted to incorporate his mutation theory into evolutionary natural selection without disturbing its credibility. But now we learn that evolutionary natural selection is no longer a viable creative mechanism; it has been supplanted by De Vries' mutation theory. Mutations have become a means and an end in themselves while evolutionary natural selection has been relegated to its original concept of a conservative, not a creative mechanism, which was its legitimate intent as conceived by Edward Blyth:

> Natural selection is a sieve. It creates nothing, as is so often assumed; it only sifts. In other words, "the sieve of selection does no more than eliminate those of less fitness . . ."[23]

We see, then, that De Vries learned what Blyth made clear in 1836. It is interesting to note that one of the reasons De Vries gives for abandoning evolutionary natural selection pertains to the old problem of incipient organs. De Vries explains the difficulty as follows:

> The first insignificant beginnings of new characters do not come under the operation of natural selection since they are of no significance in the struggle for existence. This is the best known objection against the prevailing form of the theory of selection.[24]

We see, then, that De Vries finally comprehended what Darwin made clear in 1872. He continues by pointing out that his mutation theory overcomes the difficulty of incipient organs: "In the doctrine of mutation, however, these slow transitions and these slight advantages have no place."[25] He also adds that evolutionary natural selection cannot explain the existence of useless or harmful characters.

Thus we see that De Vries began by attempting to preserve evolutionary natural selection, by incorporating mutations into the theory, but realizing that that maneuver would not solve the problem of incipient organs, ends up, like Darwin, abandoning evolutionary natural selection. This leaves him with one remaining option which is evolution without selection, in other words, evolution by mutations. This is a scientifically legitimate hypothesis, the test being to observe mutations in the environment. We know that mutations do occur; the question is whether or not they are the kind that would make evolution possible.

Evolution Mutations Versus Creation Mutations

Previously we noted that De Vries commented as follows regarding individual variations: "It is an absolutely unproved assumption that individual variation extends its range by selection and increase 'to an enormous extent.' And he insisted, "We require proof that this increase and accumulation takes place 'to the amount requisite' for the origin of species and subspecies; and this proof Wallace neither brings forward nor seeks." He also objected that, "fluctuating variability is very limited" and that "the oridinary variability, as it is always manifested, is not sufficient" to create new kinds. These very same criticisms also apply to mutations. Do mutations occur of the type and range to make evolution possible? A mutation that can honestly be said to be evolutionary would have to meet the following criteria:

1. Since existence depends upon survival factors, it must be obvious that the mutation will enable the plant or animal to more easily survive in a natural environment. This would exclude frequently mentioned mutations such as seedless oranges, polled Herefords, and albino plants and animals, which make all of them less fit for survival. It is absurd to expect a useful-for-survival mutation to occur when all plants and animals are and have been surviving indefinitely, at least where there is no technological interference by humans. We can never scientifically prove the causes for any nontechnological extinctions in the past which may have been caused by catastrophes rather than survival inabilities. Technology is the present-day catastrophe for many species of plants and animals.

2. The mutation must be hereditary. There must be evidence that the mutation can be passed on to offspring in natural conditions.

3. The mutation must be natural, not the result of human interference such as with chemicals or radiation.

4. It must be proved that the "mutation" is new and not a previously unrecognized or unmanifested gene in the genotype of a species. This point has proved to be De Vries' downfall. Most of *The Mutation Theory* consists of experiments that he conducted with the evening primrose. *Oenothera Lamarckiana,* an unfortunate choice. Today it is conceded that the "mutations" in *O. Lamarckiana* that De Vries described are really within the range of the fluctuating variability of that species.[26] De Vries even went so far as to give new species names to variations of *O. Lamarckiana.* (Oenothera "species are now recognized as structurally hybrid races within a species.) It is interesting to note that De Vries was warned that confusing fluctuating variability with mutations could occur:

> The extreme opponents of my theory maintain that there are no mutations at all . . . What I have described as discontinuous changes, are, in their opinion, merely the extreme deviations brought about by ordinary variability; for the further these are from the mean, the rarer they are, and the greater are the intervals by which they are separated.[27]

And in another place he quotes a Mr. MacDougal as follows:

> The greatest misunderstanding which may likely arise in the consideration of these results will be that founded on the error of confusing fluctuating variability and mutability.[28]

5. Would the mutation result in megaevolution? For example, a mutation making a plant or animal smaller or larger would not conceivably warrant the belief that the organism would eventually become a new kind.

6. Finally, the mutation must be progressive, not entropic. Evolution postulates that life developed from simple to complex. On the other hand, mutations such as those already cited, including hemophilia and short-legged Ancon sheep, may be regarded as degenerative mutations. From the concept of creation we can assume that the world began in a state of perfection. Since that time, probably beginning with man's fall into sin, entropy has taken its toll. All of the mutations that I have mentioned are something less than what previously existed; a loss of perfection. Viewing mutations as degradations is in line with the second law of thermodynamics which states that matter goes from order to disorder.

These, then, are what I conceive as being the criteria necessary in order to claim honestly that a particular mutation is evolutionary. These are the criteria that the theory of evolution itself demands. When one reads about mutations in a textbook, the author generally states something to the effect that most mutations are harmful, which is an indication of creation and entropy, but does not list any useful mutations. That kind of statement is demeaning to science, because it is the theorist's responsibility to prove that all of the vital components of his theory really do exist. A critic of a theory should not be placed in the position of trying to prove that evolutionary mutations do not occur. It must be this way for the sake of science, otherwise chaos would reign with everyone insisting upon the truth of their theory without having to provide any facts to substantiate it.

Periodic Mutability or Punctuated Equilibria

Previously I stated that mutations, as a means and an end in themselves for evolution were testable by observation. But that requires that the occurrence of evolutionary mutations be regarded as continuous. Unfortunately, De Vries made his mutation theory a supranatural belief by describing the occurrence of alleged evolutionary mutations as periodic. The following quotes from *The Mutation Theory* show how De Vries made the occurrence of alleged evolutionary mutations periodic rather than continuous, converting it into a supranatural belief about origins.

> The ancestors of species that exist today have on this theory passed through immutable and mutable periods; the division of the large species into elementary species would be the result of the last or of some of the last periods of mutability.[29]
>
> But if mutability is a periodic phenomenon, we get around the difficulty of having to suppose that mutations should appear equally at all times . . .[30]
>
> But not all plants and animals are mutable at the present time; on the contrary, mutability is a very rare phenomenon.[31]
>
> Without giving a definite expression of opinion, it does not seem to me to be likely that mutability has continued throughout geological times without interruption. Therefore I think it more probable that there has been alternation between mutable and immutable periods.[32]
>
> How quickly have the individual periods of mutation followed on one another? We have very few data which enable us to arrive at any conclusion on this point. As is well known, the parts of plants which have been preserved in the sepulchers of the pyramids along with the mummies, and in other monuments of the same period, such as flowers, leaves, fruits, cereals, straw, and weeds of the fields, prove the great antiquity of many species which are still existing. Numerous species are no doubt older than the pyramids, and have therefore remained unchanged for a period of at least 4,000 years. The remains of lake dwellings, the drawings on Roman coins, and many other facts of the same kind conduce to similar estimates. We may therefore assume as a provisional conclusion that a few thousand years elapse on the average between two successive periods of mutations.[33]

De Vries seemed to have been unaware that in the last quote he is providing evidence for creation and the immutability of species.

Thirty-seven years after the publication of the sixth edition of the *Origin,* Hugo De Vries was led by divine essence to the same conclusion as Darwin, that evolutionary natural selection is a scientific failure. Both men were forced into a position of having to formulate a new mechanism for evolution or abandon it. But the similarity ends there. Darwin, you will recall, determined to switch to Lamarck's continuous theory of acquired characters, a testable hypothesis:

consequently, preserving both scientific legitimacy and the philosophical objective to "ungod the universe." On the other hand, De Vries, by switching to periodic mutability, a supranatural belief, as the mechanism for evolution, unlike Darwin, abandoned legitimate science but preserved what was more important to him, the philosophy that "ungods the universe."

If God's invisible presence (the divine essence in evolutionary theorizing) will not permit the formulation of a valid, materialistic scientifically legitimate hypothesis about origins, then it follows that the available evidence will ultimately lead theorizers to creation. Now let us see if that is not the case as far as punctuated equilibria is concerned.

Punctuated Equilibria

Recently, some seventy years after De Vries published his mutation theory, some evolutionists have renewed the theory of periodic mutability, without giving De Vries credit, under a new label called punctuated equilibria. Like De Vries and Darwin before them, they were forced to conclude that evolutionary natural selection is a scientific failure. Their reason for abandoning evolutionary natural selection is an additional problem long kept out of introductory biology textbooks, namely, the lack of intermediate fossils which evolution predicts. If evolution had occurred by the slow, continuous process of evolutionary natural selection, we should find numerous weird, transitional fossils in the earth's crust showing a change from one kind to another. Georges Cuvier, Father of Paleontology, explained the problem as follows—before the *Origin* was written:

> If the fossils do not show us the course of the supposed transmutations, what reason was there to believe that these unusual events had actually occurred? The fossils were our only record of life in the remote past and their lesson was obvious and not at all, Cuvier believed, what the transformists would have liked it to be. Not a continuous series of almost similar creatures but rather an interrupted sequence of dissimilar forms was what was discovered. "We may," said Cuvier, "respond to them in their own system, that, if the species have changed by degrees, we should find some traces of these gradual modification; between the paleotherium and today's species we should find some intermediary forms; this has not yet happened."[34]

Here we have a problem similar to the question of evolutionary mutations. Like evolutionary mutations, it is the theorist's responsibility to prove that transitional fossils do exist in a quantity large enough to make it conclusive; a critic need not attempt to prove that they do not. The universal strategy of evolutionists is to emphasize the positive data and ignore the negative. Creation, by the way, does not predict intermediate fossils.

According to punctuated equilibria, massive gene mutations occurred periodically in the past, a discontinuous process not presently observable and therefore not science. To illustrate the belief, let us consider what would be required to change a seed-eating bird into a woodpecking bird? The following mutations would have to occur: A mutation to lengthen the tongue, to make it sticky, to harden the beak, to lengthen the beak, to provide a cushion between the beak and skull, to rearrange toes and strengthen tail feathers, etc. These mutations would have to occur simultaneously in order to make the woodpecker functional. Some of these mutations would actually be detrimental if they occurred in the wrong order. For example, a long tongue in a short beak or the instinct to peck before a cushion of cartilage had evolved. A similar argument may be made for every living thing.

I said that periodic mutability and punctuated equilibria as scientific theories are really materialistic supranatural beliefs, but are they? Haven't evolutionists, in spite of their best efforts not to, been led back to creation? Isn't it obvious that the Creator will not be denied? The purpose of science is to attempt to make true statements about the environment. Science cannot prove the past nor predict the future, but within its limitations and because creation is the truth, the evidence will always lead one to creation and not to a materialistic theory of origins. Long ago Darwin explained where present-day evolutionists have come, as follows:

> He who believes that some ancient form was transformed suddenly through an internal force or tendency . . . will be compelled to believe that many structures beautifully adapted to all the other parts of the same creature and to the surrounding conditions, have been suddenly produced; and of such complex and wonderful coadaptations, he will not be able to assign a shadow of an explanation. He will be forced to admit that these great and sudden transformations have left no trace of their action on the embryo. To admit all this is, as it seems to me, to enter into the realms of miracle, and to leave those of science.[35]

The only difference between creation and punctuated equilibria is that the evolutionists want, for philosophical reasons, miracles without the Miracle Maker.

Conclusion

People and the environment are the subjects of study for scientists. Is their attitude toward their subjects of study altruistic or condescending? It is plain that, as far as the question of origins is concerned, they have a condescending attitude toward the public and young people in particular. Does any other field of science have such an unprofessional record of suppressing information that the public has every right to know? Contradictory information about naturalistic explanations for origins is never widely publicized nor entered into introductory textbooks. Yet, as we have seen, negative data doggedly keep reappearing among evolutionists, but they, just as doggedly, keep suppressing it. Should evolutionists be permitted to dictate a curriculum on their subject? Should we be learning from them when they have made it abundantly clear that they cannot learn from each other?

Has there ever been a greater misappropriation of taxpayers' hard-earned money? How else can one describe the funds absorbed by public school systems, which have been subverted to teach the evolution philosophy of origins? The indoctrination of many students to the evolution philosophy is directly contrary to the wishes of many taxpayers who have made

an effort outside the public school system to teach their children that they are the descendants of a created order and have an everlasting soul.

We creationists may rest assured in our belief in a miraculous creation. We may watch, not in a condescending way, but with sympathy, the futile ceaseless striving of those who would attempt scientifically to "ungod the universe." On the other hand, we should respond with indignation whenever a supranatural belief is presented to students as legitimate science. If there is such a thing as historical science and if speculation is science, then everyone must realize that one individual's speculation about the evidence is as good as another's. This is called "applied creation."[36] As explained at the beginning of this essay in regard to comparative anatomy and all other evidence, students must be informed of creation interpretations of the evidence for evolution. This prevents evolutionists from achieving their philosophical goal to "ungod the universe" and simultaneously reform both science and the curriculum. The basis for applied creation is taken from the National Education Association code of ethics which states: "In fulfillment of the educator's responsibility to the student, the educator shall not unreasonably deny students access to varying points of view." The purpose of applied creation is not to teach special creation apart from the evolution curriculum; it functions to eliminate bias within the evolution curriculum. Stated simply, applied creation is the acknowledgement that, in any scientific theory for the origin of life, students have the right to know when any of the evidence also fits the concept of special creation. In addition, students have the right to know when any evidence contradicts said theory. Applied creation makes no pretense of being scientific; it functions as a curriculum tool to keep the evolution curriculum honest and objective. What many people fail to accept in the creation-evolution controversy is the existence of an educational imperative entirely independent of creation science or evolution science. No student can make judgments on the quality of the evidence if there is no viable alternative to consider. Without an alternative, poor quality evidence for evolution becomes impressive; without applied creation, education becomes indoctrination.

References

1. Gillespie, N.C. 1979. Charles Darwin and the problem of creation. The University of Chicago Press, p. 3.
2. Eiseley, L. 1979. Darwin and the mysterious Mr. X. E. P. Dutton, N.Y.
3. Mowat, F. 1963. Never cry wolf. Dell Publishing Co., Inc., N.Y.
4. Hedtke, R. 1983. The secret of the sixth edition. Vantage Press, N.Y., pp. 49-74.
5. Darwin, C. 1872. The origin of species. The Modern Library, N.Y., p. 66.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 178.
7. Hedtke, *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-48.
8. Gray, A. 1860. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection. *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, 29(86):179.
9. Darwin, *Op. cit.*, p. 369.
10. De Vries, H. 1909. The mutation theory. Vol. I. The Open Court Publishing Co., London. Kraus Reprint Co., 1969. New York, p. 257.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
12. Darwin, F., ed. 1909. The foundations of the origin of species. Cambridge University Press. Kraus Reprint Co., 1969. New York, p. 95.
13. De Vries, *Op. cit.*, p. 40.
14. Darwin, C., *Op. cit.*, pp. 70-71.
15. De Vries, *Op. cit.*, p. 39.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
21. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 609.
22. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 611.
23. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 609.
24. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 611.
25. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 611.
26. Mahadeva, M., and S. Randerson. 1982. Mutation Mumbo Jumbo. *The Science Teacher*, 49(3):34-48.
27. De Vries, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 600.
28. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 601.
29. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 205.
30. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 206.
31. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 658.
32. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 660.
33. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 669-670.
34. Coleman, W. 1964. Georges Cuvier—zoologist—a study in the history of evolution theory. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. p. 150.
35. Darwin, C., *Op. cit.*, p. 183.
36. Hedtke, R., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 123-136.

BOOK REVIEWS

From Fish to Gish, by Marvin L. Lubenow; CLP Publishers, Box 15908, San Diego, Ca. 92115. 1983, 293 pages. $9.95

Reviewed by Douglas E. Cox*

This book tells the story of the creation-evolution debates of the past 10 years, involving Drs. Henry Morris and Duane Gish of the Institute of Creation Research in San Diego. The majority of the debates occurred in universities across the U.S., but others were held in Canada, England, Australia, and even the Netherlands. The book documents the origin of the debates, and the influence they have had in bringing the Creationist viewpoint into prominence in the past few years.

Lubenow recounts his experience in organizing one of the debates at Colorado State University. He explains the presentations used in practically every debate by Morris and Gish, but the greater part of the book describes the various arguments and debating strategies employed by the evolutionist opponents. Lubenow relates often amusing, and sometimes embarrassing incidents, and captures the intense emotions and drama characterizing many of the debates. Appendices list the debates by cities, and names of evolutionist participants.

The book will be especially valuable to anyone planning to organize or participate in one of these affairs, and will interest all those wishing to be informed about the creation-evolution controversy.

*Mr. Douglas E. Cox's address is 199 B Erb St., East, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2J 1M7.