

to lumping the *A. africanus* and the Hadar hominid samples together." Rak takes the position that the distinction is legitimate; his tone shows that a shrinking time gap represents a challenge to that position.

The basis for taxonomic differentiation of *afarensis* from other australopithecines may stand the test of time but if so, it will not be without challenge. Considerations such as those above illustrate that until the issue is settled, Albert's alleged broad consensus about the distinctiveness of *afarensis* and its prehuman status remains questionable.

Conclusion

Albert's article is valuable in that it brings up an issue that deserves to be treated with greater care by creationists, i.e., the basis for drawing conclusions about *afarensis* from the results of investigations done on other australopithecine forms. Albert is nonetheless incorrect in supposing that because this basis has not been made explicit one does not exist and my sympathies with his objections do not extend so far as to agree that creationist conclusions about *afarensis* (not prehuman; may not even be a distinct species) are essentially incorrect.

It is sometimes reasonable to link *non-afarensis* studies to *afarensis* but the evidence suggesting the connection needs to be pointed out. Creationist analysis has left unspecified part of the chain of reasoning leading to the conclusion that *afarensis* is not prehuman and has been correspondingly weak at that point. The preceding discussion shows that this is unnecessary, suggests briefly how work on *africanus* pertains to evaluation of *afarensis* and strengthens the applicability of criticisms such as those of Zuckerman and Oxnard.

References

AJP—American Journal of Primatology
AJPA—American Journal of Physical Anthropology

- Anon. 1983. Gish debates in Indiana, Ohio, and Montana. *Acts and Facts* 12, December, 1ff.
- Albert, L. H. 1865. 'Lucy' out of context. *The Skeptical Inquirer* 9:364-72.
- Boaz, N. T., F. C. Howell and M. L. McCrossin. 1982. Faunal age of the Usno, Shungura B and Hadar Formations, Ethiopia. *Nature* 300:633-5.
- Bowden, M. 1977 (first edition), 1981 (second edition). *Ape-Men: fact or fallacy?* Sovereign Publications, Bromley, Kent.
- DuBois, P. 1987. 'Lucy' out of context: a reply. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 24:117-9.
- Gish, D. T. 1975. Multivariate analysis: man . . . apes . . . australopithecines . . . each uniquely different. *Impact* 29:i-iv.
- _____ and R. B. Bliss (reviewed by W. R. Bird). 1981. Summary of scientific evidence for creation. *Impact* 96, part 2:i-iv.
- Johanson, D. C. and T. D. White. 1979. A systematic assessment of early African hominids. *Science* 203:321-30.
- McHenry, H. M. 1983. The capitata of *Australopithecus afarensis* and *A. africanus*. *AJPA*. 62:187-98.
- Oxnard, C. E. 1968. A note on the fragmentary Sterkfontein scapula. *AJPA* 28:213-7.
- _____ 1975. Uniqueness and diversity in human evolution: morphometric studies of Australopithecines. University of Chicago Press.
- _____ 1979. Human fossils: new views of old bones. *American Biology Teacher* 41:264-76.
- _____ 1983a. Sexual dimorphisms in the overall proportions of primates. *AJP*. 4:1-22.
- _____ 1983b. The order of men: a biomathematical anatomy of the primates. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- _____ S. S. Lieberman and B. R. Gelvin. 1985. Sexual dimorphisms in dental dimensions of higher primates. *AJP*. 8:127-52.
- Rak, Y. 1985. Australopithecine taxonomy and phylogeny in light of facial morphology. *AJPA*. 66:281-7.
- Stern J. T., Jr. and R. L. Susman. 1983. The locomotor anatomy of *Australopithecus afarensis*. *AJPA*. 60:279-317.
- Suzman, I. M. 1982. A comparative study of the Hadar and Sterkfontein australopithecine innominates (abstract). *AJPA*. 57:235.
- Zuckerman, S. 1970. *Beyond the ivory tower*. Taplinger, New York.

Editor's Note: For those readers interested in one of the more recent Oxnard books see Oxnard, C. E. 1987. *Fossils, teeth and sex: perspectives on human evolution*. University of Washington Press. Seattle.

FEMINISM, HUMANISM AND EVOLUTION

DAVID A. KAUFMANN*

Received 6 August 1987 Revised 19 October 1987

Abstract

Feminism is an ideology based on the anti-Christian philosophy of humanism. Evolution, through genetic, embryological and DNA evidence along with the bizarre technological possibility of male pregnancy and childbirth, has become the scientific framework on which feminism rests. This has resulted in the individual replacing the family as the functional unit in secular society. In contrast, the doctrine of creation establishes the divine order of the sexes with the family as the functional unit in a Christian society.

Introduction

When history of the U.S.A. is finally recorded, it will be said that the decades of 1971-80 and 1981-90 were the decades of feminism. It is during these time spans that females have gained much equality with males in the family, the church and society. A comprehensive definition of feminism is given by Schlafly (1985):

Feminism is an ideology which teaches that women have been mistreated since time began, and that even in America women are discriminated against by an oppressive male-dominated society.

Feminism is a political movement which teaches that a just society must mandate identical treatment for men and women in every phase of our lives, no matter how reasonable it is to treat them differently; and that gender must never be used as the criterion for any decision.

Feminism is an economic movement which teaches that true fulfillment and 'liberation' for women are in a paying job rather than in the confining repetitious drudgery of the home, and that childcare must not be allowed to interfere with a woman's career. Feminism is a psychological outlook on life which is basically negative; it teaches women that the odds are stacked so

*David A. Kaufmann, Ph.D., Department of Exercise and Sport Science, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

severely against them that they probably cannot succeed in whatever they attempt.

Although most people do not realize it, feminism and Biblical Christianity are antithetical belief systems. According to Naomi Goldenberg (1979, p. 22), a leading spokeswoman for feminism:

Jesus Christ cannot symbolize a liberation of women. A culture that maintains a masculine image for its highest divinity cannot allow its women to experience themselves as equals to men. In order to develop a theology of women's liberation, feminists have to leave Christ and the Bible behind them.

Actually feminism is an ideology based on the anti-Christian philosophy of humanism. The eleventh principle of the *Humanist Manifesto II* (Kurtz, 1973) claims that society should eliminate all discrimination based on sex:

This means equality of opportunity and recognition of talent and merit. We believe in equal rights for both men and women to fulfill their unique careers and potentialities as they see fit, free of invidious discrimination.

This principle has led Gloria Steinem (1985) to profess her famous antireligion quote: "By the year 2000 we will, I hope, raise our children to believe in human potential, not God." Theodore Letis (1982-3, p. 187) has summed up feminist theology in his essay "Feminine Spirituality" by stating:

It is not faulty exegesis, nor sexist translations that are oppressors of women—it is the religious systems of Judaism and Christianity . . . Scripture, as well as the Christian God are considered not just irrelevant for women, but are regarded as primeval enemies of all women and true spirituality.

Feminists claim that Biblical creationism is at the root of sexual abuse. Thorkelson (1986) quotes Rev. Mary Potter as saying: "The church teachings about creation, suffering and Christology all contribute to oppression of women and children."

Evolution: Feminism's Scientific Foundation

Since feminism is in conflict with Biblical Christianity and has made phenomenal advancement not only in our society, but in most Christian churches, what has been the stimulus for this significant growth? I contend that the validity and promotion of feminism is substantiated by the doctrine of neodarwinian evolution.

Genetic Evidence

Creation argues that man was created first (Genesis 2:7, 21-25) and woman was formed out of the side of the first man, to be an helpmate to him. This is the reason that the New Testament teaches that the husband is the head of the family (I Timothy 2:11-15; Ephesians 5:22-24). Feminism rejects this order in the family and claims that women are equal to men in every sense, including ability. It insists that a woman can do anything a man can do and vice versa. Sometimes it even claims that women are essentially superior to men, and of course, being humanistic, it must stand on the bulwark of secular science, evolution. In order to

proclaim an original equality of the sexes, evolutionists expound the ultimate unity of the male and female genders eons ago when they speculate about the origin of the first sexual signs. According to Margulis and Sagan (1986, p. 201):

When meiotic sex first evolved, isogyny (identical gametes) was the rule. Sexual partners were identical in appearance, as many sexual protocists (unicellular and multicellular eukaryotic microorganisms) still are today. (parentheses added)

Superiority of the Female Chromosome

Chromosomes entirely determine the genetically transmitted sex in vertebrate animals, and hormones trigger the actual specific functioning of sex. An XY chromosome contributes to becoming a male while an XX chromosome contributes to becoming a female. According to Nowak (1980, pp. 24-5):

The X chromosome is far more vigorous than the Y chromosome. Occasionally, chromosomes may be lost (or even gained) amid the complex events surrounding conception. If an X chromosome is lost from an XX pair or a Y chromosome from an XY pair, the fertilized X cell still survives and multiplies, eventually producing a female body, though one lacking in fertility. But the loss of an X chromosome from an XY combination is lethal. No human has ever been found with a Y as the sole sex chromosome . . . The X chromosome, as you can see, is basic and indispensable; the Y chromosome simply an embellishment upon nature's original theme. The female form is first; the male a modification. The female-base principle thus makes its debut.

In line with this reasoning of female superiority, she further argues that primitive gonads in the embryo are basically feminine. They normally become ovaries, and in order to depart from natural development they must be programmed to become testes. She continued:

For the first six weeks, the embryo, whether XX or XY, coasts along in sexual ambiguity. But at the end of this time, by some mechanism as yet unknown, the Y chromosome of the male embryo will trigger the gonads into developing as testicles. The XX embryo, on the other hand, will yet remain for a time as primitive, all-purpose organs . . . 'Actually the gonad is an ovary, not because it has that structure, but rather because it is not a testis,' said J. Gillman of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and many other researchers concur. Gradually over the second six weeks of the XX individual's life, these gonads, these 'presumptive ovaries,' as they have been referred to, do indeed develop into true ovaries complete with lifetime supply of eggs with which a female is normally born.

Because of this new evidence, which is interpreted by humanistic pre-suppositions, she argues that intelligent Christians should correct Scripture to agree with this scientific discovery:

God looked at Eve and said: 'It is not good for her to be alone.' Therefore with his almighty power he concocted the magic of the Y chromo-

some and of testosterone. Man is really a variant upon the original first model, woman (Eve). Therefore, the primordial fetus was female. If one wants to be mythologically symbolic, we would have to say Eve preceded Adam and that the Biblical story is a reflection on ancient male chauvinism.

According to her, the female is nature's original model and has triggered mankind's evolutionary heritage. Nature, not culture has given women a superiority over men. Of course, the creationist reply to this logic would be: the XY male and XX female configurations do not require that the female was formed first. The Creator could have modified the male cellular material (XY) by eliminating the Y and duplicating the X. Whatever result this causes in embryology (female-ness) would then come second or after the creation of man. The fact that male and female development runs somewhat (but by no means entirely) parallel during the early weeks of pregnancy does not demand that the female condition was "primitive."

DNA Evidence

Schmeck (1986, pp. 7B, 8B) reports the work of Wilson, Cann and Stone whose studies of the DNA from the placentas of 147 humans from the U.S.A., Europe, Africa, Australia and Asia trace the entire human race back to one primordial female. They analyzed the changes of DNA, the substance of genes, from the oxidative organelles, mitochondria, that are inherited only through the mother. Their calculations, based on evolutionary presuppositions, of the slow changes of DNA from humans from the five populous continents indicate that everyone alive today may be a descendant of a single female ancestor who lived in Africa 140,000 to 280,000 years ago. This argument attempts to refute the claim in Genesis that man was created first. Creationists, however embrace this concept of monogenesis. Biblically, all people except Adam and Eve have been engendered by Eve. The DNA evidence fits neatly into the creationist model of origins.

Can Man Have Babies?

In an attempt to prove total equality between men and women, technology has developed a way to enable men to give birth. Kent (1986) reported that male pregnancy would involve fertilizing a donated egg with sperm outside the body. The embryo would be implanted into the bowel area, where it could attach itself either to the kidney or large intestine. The fetus would be delivered by Cesarean section. The author quotes Dr. John Parsons, senior registrar and lecturer in obstetrics at King's College Hospital: "it can be done, and undoubtedly, someone will do it." In true anti-Christian fashion the article suggests that candidates for male pregnancy might be homosexuals, transsexuals or men whose wives are infertile.

Were All Evolutionists Feminists?

As shown, the latest evolutionary thinking and research has firmly established a scientific basis for total equality between the sexes. But this has not always been the case. Hrdy (1981, p. 12) reports that Herbert Spencer, a 19th century English evolutionist, thought

"females never had been inherently equal to males and could never be; subordination of women was not only natural but, in his view, desirable."

This earlier teaching of evolution has led to some unfair treatment of females and to the advocacy of immoral activities of males against females. Burton (1976, p. 156) has stated:

The double moral standard which punishes an adulteress severely while often condoning the man can be defended on biological grounds. It increases a man's reproductive potential and it might be added that those who indulge in extra-marital activities are those who are the 'fittest' and most deserving to be biological fathers as they must possess a high degree of cunning and initiative, and often physical agility.

Creation: The Divine Order of the Sexes

In certain senses men and women are equal. The Creator created both the first man and the first woman in His image (Genesis 1:26, 27). The Creator loves both men and women. Men and women should be treated with equal justice under the civil law and should receive equal pay for work of equal value.

What is wrong is the feminist principle that men and women have equal potential in all areas, and therefore it is desirable to interchange their roles. Their rule is identical treatment in all aspects of life. The Creator created men and women with certain different abilities and designed them for different roles within the family structure (husband/father; wife/mother). In spite of the bizarre attempt by medical technology to enable men to give birth, no man can be a natural mother. No woman can be a natural father.

What is true and good for the family is also true and good for the church and society. Unfortunately in our modern American culture the individual has been deified as the basic unit in our secular society. But the Creator desires that the basic unit should be the family. The church, according to Scripture, must always work to strengthen the family, never to weaken it (Ephesians 5:21-33; I Timothy 5:3-16; I Peter 3:1-7).

The difference in size, strength, attitudes and hormone levels equip men and women for different roles in the family, church and society. The Creator's intention is that these differences between the sexes should serve to benefit men, women and children as they adjust to the responsibilities and pressures in life.

Men are not better than women; women are not better than men. But they are uniquely different in certain essential responsibilities and functions. Men are better equipped for certain roles while women are better equipped for other roles. The differences in these role functions should not be used in any harmful way against the other sex. Selfish domination, competition, jealousy and usurpation of another's authority are all wrongful misuses of these differences.

It should be pointed out that the responsibility of the headship of the family and the governing of the church belongs to the men. There is some indication that many have been irresponsible and abused women on occasion. Since men are bigger, stronger and faster than women, they should use these differences to protect women. Machoism has no place in the divine order of the sexes or creationist philosophy. It is antimasculine

for a man to use physical force in any way against women or children unless in self defense. Likewise, it is wrong and immoral for men to attempt to sexually seduce women. According to creationist tenets, the sexual act between men and women is restricted to the marriage framework with one's spouse.

Conclusion

Feminism is an ideological corollary of the doctrine of humanism. The doctrine of evolution tries to scientifically support feminism. Feminism is anticreation and anti-Christian. There can be no such thing as Christian feminism. They are conceptual contradictions like capitalistic communism and evangelical lesbianism. The divine order of the sexes is a corollary doctrine of the order of creation. It establishes the family as the natural unit within society and the church. Men and women are similar in some abilities but are designed to have certain different positions and functions within the family and church. The husband/father is given the headship in the family and the church with the wife/mother as an assistant and chief educator of the children. The husband/father is not always right or should not always get his way, but in the last analysis he is always responsible in family/church decisions.

Feminism claims women are equal to men in every way. It claims order, position, responsibility and function in life are determined by one's abilities which should be developed to one's highest potential. The individual is supreme and order in society, family and church should be determined by the "survival of the fittest" with equal opportunity for either sex to survive. Feminism, instead of solving the conflict between the genders, really makes the situation worse as it not only

"fans the flames" of abuse and harm, but it destroys the order in the family and church that the Creator commands (Genesis 2 and 3, I Corinthians 11 and 14, Ephesians 5 and I Timothy 2). Evolution, operating from naturalistic presuppositions controlled by random probabilities, supports the anti-feminine philosophy of feminism. In contrast, creationism is pro-feminine. Feminine means emphasizing the womanly attributes that allow women to be delightfully different from men. The feminine and creationist woman enjoys being a woman uniquely different from men. She has a positive view of herself and a benevolent outlook on life. She knows she is a person with her own identity in God's order of creation.

References

- Burton, R. 1976. *The mating game*. Crown Publishers. New York.
 Goldenberg, N. 1979. *Changing of the gods: feminism and the end of traditional religions*. Beacon Press. Boston.
 Hrdy, S. 1981. *The woman that never evolved*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
 Kent, R. 1986. The birth of male pregnancy. *New Society*. 76 (1219):7-9.
 Kurtz, P. and E. Wilson. 1973. Humanist manifesto II. *The New Humanist*. 33(5):20-21.
 Letis, T. 1982-83. Feminine spirituality: Eve shakes an angry fist at YAHWEH, but He triumphs through His Son, *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*. 9:182-200.
 Margulis, L. and D. Sagan. 1986. *Origins of sex*. Yale University Press. New Haven, CT.
 Nowak, M. 1980. *Eve's rib*. St. Martin's Press. New York.
 Schlafly, P. 1985. Feminism vs Feminine. *Manifest Destiny*. (October 3):4.
 Schmeck, H. 1986. All men may be descendants of the same female. *Gainesville Sun*. 110(276).
 Steinem, G. 1985. Notable quotes. *The Collegiate Dispatch*. (July 17):3.
 Thorkelson, W. 1986. Feminist theologian asserts church an accomplice in sexual abuse, *Christian News*. 24(21):25.

KEYWORD INDEX TO VOLUME 24

Glen W. Wolfrom*

AGASSIZ 89
 AMPHIBIAN/REPTILE 93
 ANTHONY, H.E. 120, 165
 ANTI-CREATIONISTS 117
 ARCHAEOPTERYX 75, 80, 93, 143, 183
 see also birds, origin of
 ARISTOTLE 5
 ARKANSAS TRIAL 35
 ASTRONOMICAL FLYBY 61
 ASTRONOMY 109, 193
 ASTROPHYSICS 193
 ATOMIC MODELS 216
 AUSTRALOPITHECUS 93, 117, 156
 see also man, origin of
 BARNES, T.G., INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS 119, 216
 BIG BANG 156
 BIOASTRONOMY 33
 BIOGEOGRAPHY 120, 165
 BIRDS, ORIGIN OF 143, 183

CANOPY 129, 207
 CARBON-14 109

*Glen W. Wolfrom, Ph.D., is Membership Secretary of the Society.

CEMENT 212, 213
 CHANCE 138
 CHRONOLOGY, BIBLICAL 148
 CLIMATE 12
 COAL, FORMATION OF 23
 COELACANTH 93
 COMETS 109
 CONTINENTAL DRIFT 23, 37, 125
 CREATION EX NIHILO 197
 CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY 136, 165
 CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY
 HERBARIUM 186, 187
 CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY SPONSORED
 RESEARCH 165, 173, 187
 CREATION, BIBLIOGRAPHY 204
 CREATIONISM 87, 93
 CREATIONIST ORGANIZATIONS 88, 204
 CREATIONISTS, ANTI- 165
 CRETACEOUS/TERTIARY BOUNDARY 88
 DARWIN, CHARLES 89, 196
 DARWINISM see evolutionism
 DATING 109

- DATING, FISSION TRACK 109
 DATING, RADIOMETRIC 23, 37, 109
 DAY-AGE THEORY 87, 197
 DESIGN 89, 144
 DESIGN, HUMAN BODY 200
 DESIGN, INSECTS 209, 210
 DIAMONDS, INCLUSIONS 158
 DINOSAUR EXTINCTION 88
 DNA, MITOCHONDRIAL 156
 DOUBLE REVELATION THEORY 87
 DRIPSTONE 18, 212, 213
- EARTH, AGE OF 37, 152, 158, 209
 EARTH, EXPANDING 53, 109, 207
 EARTH, TEMPERATURE 158
 EARTH, YOUNG 109
 ENLIGHTENMENT, AGE OF 19
 EQUISETUM SP. 141
 ETHER 5, 38
 EVOLUTION 44
 EVOLUTION, CONVERGENT 82, 93
 EVOLUTION, CORRECT USE OF TERM 215
 EVOLUTION, PARALLEL 93
 EVOLUTIONISM 196, 201
 EXTINCTION 157
 EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIFE 33
 EYE 82, 144
 EYE, OCTUPUS 82
- FEATHER 93
 FIRMAMENT 38
 FISH/AMPHIBIAN 93
 FLOOD 38
 FLOOD GEOLOGY 37
 FLOOD MODEL 45
 FLOOD, NOACHIAN 23, 37, 53, 129, 154, 209
 FOSSIL, PLANTS 9
 FOSSILS 75, 80
 FOSSILS, AMPHIBIA 75
 FOSSILS; FISH 75
 FOSSILS, LIVING 23
 FOSSILS, RAPID FORMATION 14
 FOSSILS; TRACE see trace fossils
 FOSSILS, TRANSITIONAL 23
 FREUD 149
- GAP THEORY 87, 197
 GAS DEPOSITS 129
 GENE THEME 75, 143
 GENESIS 1:1-2 197
 GENESIS 1:6-8 38
 GENESIS 1:7 129
 GENESIS 10:25 129
 GEOGRAPHICAL ISOLATION 120, 165
 GEOLOGICAL COLUMN 23, 109, 129
 GEOLOGY 37
 GEOLOGY, UNCONFORMITIES 46
 GOSSE, P.H. 87
 GRAND CANYON 53, 120, 165
 GRAND CANYON, FOSSIL POLLEN 173
- HAECKEL 5
 HAKATAI SHALE 173
 HEAVENS 38
 HELIUM, ATMOSPHERIC 152
- HERBARIUM 186, 187
 HERMIT SHALE 173
 HOMO HABILIS 93, 117 see also man, origin of
 HOMOMOLOGY, MOLECULAR 93, 185
 see also molecular clock
 HORSE EVOLUTION 93
 HORSETAIL 141
- ICE AGE(S) 129
 INSECTS 210
 INSECTS, REPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOR 86
 INTERMEDIATE FORMS see transitional forms
 IRIDIUM 88
- JOB 38:25 129
 JUNG 149
- KELVIN, LORD 109
- LANGUAGE, EVOLUTION OF 157
 LIFE, ORIGIN OF 23, 36
 LITERARY FRAMEWORK HYPOTHESIS 197
 LOCKE, JOHN 19
 LUCY/AFARENSIS 93
- MACROEVOLUTION 44, 87, 89, 93
 MAGNETIC FIELD 109
 MAMMAL-LIKE REPTILES 75
 MAN, ORIGIN OF 93, 156
 MATERIAL HYPOTHESIS 208
 MEGAEVOLUTION 196
 METAPHYSICS 5, 138
 METEORITES 91
 METEOROLOGY 12
 MICROEVOLUTION 44
 MIRACLES 87, 197
 MOLECULAR CLOCK 185
 MOON 109
 MOON, DUST 152
 MOON, ORBIT 152
 MOUNTAIN BUILDING see orogeny
 MOUNTAINS, EFFECT ON CLIMATE 9, 12
 MUTATION(S) 75
- NATURE, DEIFICATION OF 150
 NEUTRINOS 23
 NEWTON, SIR ISAAC 19
- OIL DEPOSITS 129
 OIL, FORMATION OF 23
 OROGENY 9, 53, 61, 125, 129
- PALEOBOTANY see fossil, plants
 PALEOCLIMATE 154
 PARAPSYCHOLOGY 105
 PELEG 129
 PERMITTIVITY 154
 PHILOLOGY see language, evolution of
 PHILOSOPHY 185
 PHYSICS 216
 PHYSICS, BARNES INSTITUTE OF see Barnes, T.G.
 PHYSICS, SPACE-TIME 151
 PLANTS, COLLECTING see Creation
 Research Society Herbarium
 PLANTS, EVOLUTION OF 194

- PLATE TECTONICS 125
 PLEOCHROIC HALOS 35, 109, 158
 POLLEN, FOSSIL 173
 POLLEN, PRECAMBRIAN 173
 POPPER 19
 PROBABILITY 196
 PROGRESS, PHILOSOPHY OF 185
 PROTOAVIS 80, 143, 183
 see also birds, origin of
 PSYCHOANALYSIS 149
- QUANTUM ELECTRODYNAMICS 150
 QUANTUM THEORY 150
- RAIN, PRE-FLOOD 129
 REASON/NONREASON 19
 REDSHIFT 23
 RELATIVISM 16
 RELATIVITY 151
 REPTILE/BIRD 93
 REPTILE/MAMMAL 93
 RESEARCH, CREATIONIST 165
 RUIN RECONSTRUCTION see gap theory
- SCIENCE 5, 42, 43, 44, 128, 138
- SCIENTIFIC METHOD 43, 44
 SCRIPTURE 87
 SEEDS, SURVIVAL 144
 SELECTION, SEXUAL 86
 SEXUAL SELECTION see selection, sexual
- SEYMOURIA 93
 SHIVA TEMPLE 120, 165
 SIMILARITIES, see homology
 SOLAR SYSTEM 151
 SOUL 19
 SPECIATION 23, 120, 165
 STALACTITE-LIKE FORMATIONS 18
 STALACTITES 109, 212, 213
 STARS, EVOLUTION OF see stellar evolution
 STELLAR EVOLUTION 193
 SUN, SHRINKING 145, 152
 SUPAI FORMATION 173
- TALUS 15
 TAUTOLOGY 80
 TEXTBOOKS 71
 THEISTIC EVOLUTION 87, 147
 TRACE FOSSILS, BURROWS 154
 TRACE FOSSILS, FOOTPRINTS 154
 TRACE FOSSILS; RIPPLE MARKS 154
 TRANSITIONAL FORMS 89, 93
 TYPOLOGICAL MODEL 89
- UNIVERSE, ORIGIN OF 23, 109, 156
- VAN TILL, H.J. 87
 VARIATION, SYMMETRIC 75
- WATCHMAKER 144, 201

THE POSTULATED EVIDENCE FOR MACROEVOLUTION AND DARWINISM: DARWINIAN ARGUMENTS AND THE DISINTEGRATING NEO-DARWINIAN SYNTHESIS—PART II

W. R. BIRD*

Received 15 May 1987 Revised 2 May 1988

Abstract

Part I discussed three of the eight primary lines of evidence offered for macroevolution and Darwinian mechanisms. Part II addresses the remaining arguments for macroevolution and Darwinian mechanisms. Evolutionists are cited who suggest that (1) the "facts of comparative anatomy provide no evidence for evolution," while the "attempt to find homologous genes has been given up as hopeless"; (2) the embryological argument used to center on a biogenetic "law" that has "been demonstrated to be wrong by numerous subsequent scholars," and now stands on the problem that "[a]natomically homologous parts in different related organisms appear to have quite different origins"; (3) the comparative biochemistry argument offers a "serious . . . challenge to the whole evolutionary framework" rather than support, by widespread anomalies that require "a robust rejection of a generalized molecular clock hypothesis of DNA evolution"; (4) the population genetics argument has made "no direct contribution to what Darwin obviously saw as the fundamental problem: the origin of species," and "is merely the blind leading the blind"; and (5) the artificial selection argument overlooks that "selective breeding is not analogous to the action of 'natural selection'."

All scientists mentioned in this article are evolutionists unless otherwise identified. All emphases in the quotes is the author's.

Comparative Anatomy and Physiology Argument and Difficulties

The comparative anatomy argument for macroevolution, which focuses on comparing anatomical structure (Stansfield, 1977 p. 113) is based on the similarity of structure of various organisms. Most evolutionists

interpret some, but not all, similar structure to show common ancestry. The comparative anatomy evidence that is anomalous, in the sense of indicating the unrelatedness or distinct ancestry of organisms, is treated fully elsewhere (Bird, 1987, pp. 94-8). The comparative anatomy and physiology argument is constructed on a problematic foundation that can be viewed causally and historically.

This basic problem is that similar anatomy or physiology does not necessarily indicate common ancestry and evolutionary descent. First, nearly all evolutionist

*W. R. Bird, J. D., receives mail at 1150 Monarch Plaza, 3414 Peachtree Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30326. This article is excerpted from section 3.4 of his book, *The Origin of Species Revisited: The Theories of Evolution and of Abrupt Appearance*. Philosophical Library, New York.