

## How Gradual Evolution Is Disproved In the Textbooks

Randall Hedtke\*

### Abstract

Jevons' Rule states that a single absolute conflict between fact and a hypothesis is fatal to that hypothesis. Darwin's theory of gradual evolution cannot logically be sustained because it is a theory which is in direct conflict with paleontological facts and is thus falsified by Jevons' Rule. This conflict between Darwin's theory and paleontology was known from the time Darwin's book was published, but reliable investigative procedures were not allowed to stand in the way of the materialists' determination to establish an explanation for the origin of life. Thus began a policy of suppression, calculated ignorance, and deliberate closed-mindedness regarding unfavorable evi-

dence on the part of macroevolutionists in science education. Today the teaching of evolution is doctrinal rather than genuinely theoretical; it is a curriculum deliberately tailored to indoctrinate rather than educate and a curriculum whose palpable intellectual duplicity must be exposed.

When the gradualists' theory of macroevolution is analyzed in the context of paleontological facts, it is disproved by the obvious lack of intermediate fossil forms. Darwin foresaw this problem as did the theistic evolutionist, St. George Mivart, whose ideas are explored here. Mivart formulated an early version of the punctuated equilibrium model, a version predicated on Divine miracles.

### Introduction

Darwin believed that all life forms are related and have descended from a common ancestry by a gradual natural process which came to be called evolution. Today, however, it is a common practice to distinguish between two types of evolutionary change. The first is sometimes labeled microevolution and involves minor changes, which can be observed or easily inferred from scientific evidence. The second usage, macroevolution, designates the belief that the major adaptive forms such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, etc. are all related. The word "evolution" as used in this paper, is referring to the concept of macroevolution. Like all other theories, macroevolution exists to be overthrown if possible and no amount of belief in it, as a doctrine, should prevent declaring it disproved. All of the pertinent evidence necessary to disprove evolution is in place. Although all explanations for the origin of life incorporate a religious element, the validity or invalidity of evolution is first and foremost an issue of good science versus bad science.

### The Untestable and Inconclusive Evidence for Evolution

Humanism is a materialistic belief which requires a materialistic explanation for origins. Darwin's religious orientation also provided the motivation for presenting his theory in a dogmatic rather than scientifically objective way. He tailored his theory to make it more convincing in terms of his personal belief system. The legacy of Darwin is that today religious humanism stands in the way of objectively looking at evolution theory.

Evolution by means of gradual change has dual roles as both scientific theory and religious doctrine. In his autobiography, Charles Darwin described his humanistic religious belief:

A man who has no assured and no present belief in the existence of a personal God or a future existence with retribution and rewards, can have for his rule of life, as far as I can see, only to follow those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seem to him the best ones. A dog acts in this manner, but he does so blindly. A man on the other hand, looks forwards and backwards, and compares his various feelings, desires, and recollections. He then finds, in accordance with the verdict of the wisest men, that the highest satisfaction is derived from following certain impulses, namely the social instincts. If he acts for the good of others he will re-

---

\*Randall Hedtke, Route 1, Box 138, Barrett, MN 56311.  
Received 13 February 1999; Revised 25 July 1999.

ceive the approbation of his fellow men and gain the love of those with whom he lives; and this latter gain undoubtedly is the highest pleasure on this earth. By degrees it will be more intolerable to him to obey his sensuous passions rather than his highest impulses, which when rendered habitual may be almost called instincts. His reason may occasionally tell him to act in opposition to the opinion of others, whose approbation he will then not receive; but he will still have the solid satisfaction of knowing that he has followed his innermost judge or conscience (Himmelfarb, 1959, pp. 318–319).

Darwin's belief seems to be the forerunner of the humanistic doctrine expounded in the *Humanist Manifesto*:

Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created. Humanism believes that man is part of nature and that he emerged as the result of a continuous process (Kurtz, 1984, p. 8).

We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural; it is either meaningless or irrelevant to the question of the survival and fulfillment of the human race. As non-theists we begin with humans not God, nature not deity (Kurtz, 1984, p. 16).

In order to expose the fact that evolution by means of natural selection is disproved in the textbooks, one must not become beguiled by evolution's doctrinal aspects. Evolution must be held strictly accountable as a scientific theory. To do that, we need apply only one simple rule of logic, which is taken from W. Stanley Jevons (1958, p. 516): "A single absolute conflict between fact and hypothesis is fatal to the hypothesis". Jevons is merely stating an obvious elementary rule of logic that is applied in every walk of life. One can hardly get through the day without consciously or subconsciously using Jevons' Rule. It applies equally well to theories.

In evaluating the body of evolutionary evidence in the textbooks, we find that two categories exist, the untestable, inconclusive evidence and the testable, conclusive evidence. Within the inconclusive category we have the fossil evidence for alleged human evolution, alleged vestigial organs, comparative anatomy, comparative embryology, and geographic distribution. These are the same inconclusive evidences that Darwin employed in writing the *Origin of Species*. These cannot be interpreted conclusively because no empirical test is possible to prove the evolutionary interpretations. Such evidence is open to counterinduction or alternative points of view. The counterinductive interpretations are also inconclusive. The process of entertaining alternative interpretations has the effect of removing the entire body of inconclusive evidence from the arena of dogma and

putting it into the realm of scientific objectivity where it belongs.

Therefore, the first step in our criticism of customary concepts and customary reactions is to step outside the circle and either to invent a new conceptual system, for example, a new theory that clashes with the most carefully established observational results and confounds the most plausible theoretical principles, or to import such a system from outside science, from religion, from theology, from the ideas of incompetents, or the ramblings of mad men. This step is, again, counterinductive. Counterinduction is thus both a fact—science could not exist without it—and a legitimate and much needed move in the game of science (Feyerabend, 1975, p. 68).

Considering Darwin's underlying religiosity and the fact that evolution is a doctrine of certain religions, the dogmatic treatment of this inconclusive evidence in the public school textbooks constitutes a possible violation of the First Amendment Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution. That clause states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." We can demonstrate how an alternative explanation is possible with the evidence for alleged human evolution. In the textbooks, fossil specimens are interpreted in terms of an *a priori* belief in evolution. Regarding the origin of humans, an alternative point of view is that fossil specimens are remains of extinct races of human beings or extinct species of primates having nothing to do with evolution. Extinction we know is a fact in the natural scheme of things. In addition, many of the specimens were discovered on continents that presently host populations of primates. Experts will argue the ancestry of a fossil specimen endlessly because there is no empirical test to prove ancestry.

Counterinduction can apply to all the untestable, inconclusive evidence. With little effort it is possible and useful to formulate legitimate, nonevolutionary explanations for any of evolution's untestable evidences. Evolution theorists have not received any special dispensation in the United States Constitution allowing only their biased interpretations to be taught. Darwin knew that his evidence was vulnerable to counterinduction which is probably why, in the Introduction to the *Origin*, he begged the public's indulgence to postpone publishing "conclusions directly opposite."

For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of

each question; and this cannot possibly be here done (Darwin, 1909, p. 20).

Darwin regarded the *Origin* as a mere abstract of a complete account which he assured the public he would provide in the future. Originally he wrote that in “two or three more years” he would finish the complete account. But in the final edition of the *Origin* he changed his mind.

My work is now nearly finished; but as it will take me many more years to complete it, and as my health is far from strong, I have been urged to publish this Abstract (Peckham, 1959, p. 71).

Presumably a completely developed version of his theory would have included counterinduction, but Darwin’s postponement in presenting alternative views turned out to be permanent and persists to this day. It is still the practice of most evolutionists to ignore alternative views. Why was it “impossible” for Darwin to include counterinduction? He may have known that evolution was more of a religious doctrine than a scientific theory, and perhaps he was reticent to present any religious views except his own. It is scientifically archaic, however, to consider only certain prejudicial interpretations of data.

## The Testable or Conclusive Evidence

Evolution by means of natural selection contains a prediction that would ultimately determine its validity. The testable prediction was that abundant transitional fossils would be discovered and that the alleged transitional fossils would reveal a gradual evolutionary change from simple to complex in both the plant and animal kingdoms. But that is not what the real fossil record tells us.

One class of facts, however, namely, the sudden appearance of new and distinct forms of life in our geological formations supports at first sight the belief in abrupt development. But the value of this evidence depends entirely on the perfection of the geological record in relation to periods remote in the history of the world. If the record is as fragmentary as many geologists strenuously assert, there is nothing strange in new forms appearing as if suddenly developed (Darwin, 1909, p. 249).

In the following statement Darwin substantiated his position on the lack of intermediate links:

Why then are not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record (Darwin, 1909, p. 320).

In other words, Darwin’s theory was founded, not on the real fossil record that he and the scientific establishment recognized, but on a mythical, or idealized fossil record with abundant transitional fossils that he believed would be forthcoming. Since Darwin formulated his theory, testing of the prediction has been going on for about 150 years. In all of this time, only one or two questionable transitional fossils have been discovered, e.g. *Archaeopteryx* as a transition between reptile and bird. It is now an embarrassment for proponents of evolution to insist, as Darwin did, that numerous intermediate fossils will be forthcoming. The time has arrived when it must be declared that the test is finished and it has negated the gradual evolutionary theory. Many contemporary evolutionists have spoken of the overthrow of gradualism; two sample quotes are given here.

The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution (Gould, 1980, p. 127).

We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn’t changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition that we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information—what appeared to be a nice simple progression when relatively few data were available now appears to be much more complex and much less gradualistic (Raup, 1979, p. 25).

Consequently, gradualistic evolution by means of natural selection is disproved. Even Darwin hinted at such paleontological disproof:

The abrupt manner in which whole groups of species suddenly appear in certain formations, has been urged by several paleontologists—for instance, by Agassiz, Pictet, and Sedgwick—as a fatal objection to the belief in the transmutation of species (Darwin, 1909, p. 348).

Regarding these paleontological problems, Gould used a quote from Darwin:

The geological record is extremely imperfect and this fact will to a large extent explain why we do not find interminable varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life by the finest graduated steps. He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory (Gould, 1977, p. 14).

He would rightly reject it because a single absolute conflict between fact and hypothesis is fatal to the hypothesis (Jevons' Rule). Darwin well understood that ultimately his theory would be accountable to such logic. The following epitomizes the relationship between the fossil record and Darwinism:

The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils. Yet Darwin was so wedded to gradualism that he wagered his entire theory on a denial of this literal record (Gould, 1977, p. 14).

Darwin wagered a prediction and lost. The mythical fossil record that he and generations of evolutionists after him have believed in has not become a reality. The consensus opinion against Darwin's prediction, however, is currently being censored from school textbooks. Despite such censorship, one can say that gradual evolution is disproved in these same textbooks and that there is in them that which confirms the consensus rejection of gradualism.

In textbooks there is a brief statement about the punctuated equilibrium theory which has become an accepted part of the evolutionary apologetic:

Evidence from the fossil record has led some scientists to propose that speciation need not occur gradually but can occur in spurts. According to the theory of punctuated equilibrium, all populations of a species may exist for a relatively long time at or close to genetic equilibrium. Then the equilibrium may be interrupted by a brief period of rapid genetic change in which speciation occurs (Towle, 1993, p. 249).

This statement seems innocuous at first until one realizes that it was formulated to take into account the absence of numerous intermediate fossils predicted by gradual evolution. Its significance becomes striking because it means that we have two opposing theories in the textbooks: one gradual and one abrupt. Both rely on the same fossil record which, of course, cannot support two opposing interpretations! The punctuated equilibrium theory is not a formal declaration by the evolutionists that gradual evolution is disproved, but it is nevertheless an indirect statement to that effect.

Now that the mythical fossil record had been openly rejected by the realists, the gradualists must prove that the mythical fossil record upon which evolution is founded is real. It is not the skeptics' responsibility to try to prove that abundant transitional fossils do not exist.

Instead, it is the gradualists' responsibility to prove that they do. This is the way matters should have played out from the very beginning.

## A Mechanic's Obedience to Jevons' Rule

An auto mechanic must abide unquestioningly by Jevons' Rule; it would be both impractical and ludicrous not to. Let us say the mechanic has been hired to start an automobile engine. He initially hypothesizes that the problem is with the battery or its electrical connections. When those potential problems are eliminated, the mechanic unhesitatingly abandons his hypothesis and formulates a new one.

The same principle applies to evolution theory regarding the fossil record except for the element of practicality. The real fossil record conflicts with the theory of gradual evolution, but because of evolution's religious and philosophical underpinning, evolution theorists are guided by metaphysical considerations rather than by scientific facts. It is nonetheless ludicrous for evolution theorists to be recalcitrant in obeying Jevons' Rule; they should reject gradualism.

The leadership of the National Association of Biology Teachers (NABT, 1996) has refused to acknowledge the obvious absence of transitional fossils. It published a directive for teachers in every public school district on how to teach evolution. Two of their tenets read as follows: "Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution," (p. 61) and "Specific textbook chapters on evolution should be included in biology curricula, and evolution should be a recurrent theme throughout biology textbooks and courses" (p. 62). Could a purely secular theory inspire that much evangelistic zeal?

In that same document the NABT actually encourages biology instructors to teach a falsehood. "The fossil record, which includes abundant transitional forms in diverse taxonomic groups, establishes extensive and comprehensive evidence for organic evolution (p. 61)." There is, in fact, an absence of transitional fossils, such that Jevons' Rule takes effect and Darwinian gradualistic evolution should be presented as a falsified hypothesis.

On p. 61 the NABT states: "The model of punctuated equilibrium provides another account of the tempo of speciation in the fossil record of many lineages; it does not refute or overturn evolutionary theory, but adds to its scientific richness." "Scientific richness" should read "confusion". The NABT's endorsement of punctuated equilibrium is tantamount to admitting that they agree with paleontology, which has exposed the fact about abundant transitional fossils as being untrue.

## How Mivart Descended Gradualism in 1872

Many people believe natural selection is the mechanism for gradualism and that gradual evolution is occurring in the environment. They reason that because the mechanism sounds reasonable, gradual evolution must be true regardless of the fossil record. This is rather like having the tail wag the dog. The correct reasoning is that the fossil record disproves gradual evolution, consequently the mechanism cannot be true. In fact the efficacy of natural selection to cause macroevolutionary changes was discredited in 1872 when Darwin conceded to the problem concerning how an organ might have even got started from rudimentary beginnings, a problem posed by St. George Mivart:

It was inevitable that a great crowd of half-educated men and shallow thinkers should accept with eagerness the theory of "Natural Selection". We refer to its remarkable simplicity, and the ready way in which phenomena the most complex appear explicable by a cause for the comprehension of which laborious and persevering efforts are not required, but which may be represented by the simple phrase "survival of the fittest". With nothing more than this, can, on the Darwinian theory, all the more intricate facts of distribution and affinity, form and color, be accounted for; as well as the most complex instincts and the most admirable adjustments, such as those of human eye and ear (Mivart, 1871, p. 23).

Mivart regarded natural selection as incapable of producing new kinds or adaptive features. His criticism of natural selection was as follows:

Natural selection utterly fails to account for the conservation and development of the minute rudimentary beginnings, the slight and infinitesimal commencement of structures, however useful those structures may afterward become (Mivart, 1871, p. 35).

In other words, natural selection cannot play a role in the minute beginnings of useful structures before they have a use. Should minute, indefinite, and fortuitous variations somehow be preserved in one direction, they would merely result in an incipient, functionless organ on which natural selection is incompetent to act, since the incipient organ could not have conferred an advantage in survival or reproduction.

That such variations should come into existence and be somehow preserved in one direction is the miraculous part of Darwinian evolution and thus not scientifically accountable. All explanations for the origin of life, whether theological or scientific, ultimately rely on miracles. Mivart continued with his opposition to Darwin's touting natural selection as a mechanism for major changes:

The author of this book can say that, although by no means disposed originally to dissent from the theory of "Natural Selection", if only its difficulties could be solved, he has found each successive year that deeper consideration and more careful examination have more and more brought home to him the inadequacy of Mr. Darwin's theory to account for the preservation and intensification of incipient, specific and generic characters. That minute, fortuitous, and indefinite variations could have brought about such special forms and modifications as have been enumerated in this chapter, seems to contradict not imagination, but reason.

In spite of all the resources of a fertile imagination, the Darwinian, pure and simple, is reduced to the assertion of a paradox as great as any he opposes. In the place of mere assertion of our ignorance as to the way these phenomena have been produced, he brings forward, as their explanation, a cause which it is contended in this work is demonstrably insufficient.

Of course in this matter, as elsewhere throughout Nature, we have to do with the operation of fixed and constant natural laws, and the knowledge of these may before long be obtained by human patience or human genius; but there is, it is believed, already enough evidence to show that these as yet unknown natural laws or law will never be resolved into the action of "Natural Selection", but will constitute or exemplify a mode and condition or organic action of which the Darwinian theory takes no account whatsoever (Mivart, 1871, pp. 74–75).

## Darwin's Response to Mivart

In the final edition of the *Origin* (1872), Darwin included a section for a response to Mivart in which he did not deny the validity of Mivart's incipency criticism.

I have now considered enough, perhaps more than enough of the cases selected with care by a skilful 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. A good opportunity has thus been afforded for enlarging a little on gradations of structure, often associated with changed functions—an important subject, which was not treated at sufficient length in the former editions of this work (Darwin, 1909, pp. 243–244).

Darwin surrendered further with this admission: "Even if the fitting variation did arise, it does not follow that natural selection would be able to act on them, and produce a structure which apparently would be beneficial



to the species" (Darwin, 1909, p. 222). The significance of Darwin's concession to the validity of the incipency problem is profound. It means, since natural selection cannot account for the beginning stages of an organ, it cannot account for the present existence of complete, functional organs and organisms. It is for this reason some people will perform mental contortions in order not to interpret Darwin literally. What was Darwin's alternative? Could he disagree with Mivart and insist that natural selection can account for incipient organs? Of course not; the superficial logic of natural selection would be shattered. The phrase "survival of the fittest" would no longer have application and it would mean that incipient organs, with no survival value in the beginning, could make an organism more fit for survival in the end. It would be illogical to the Darwinian concept to have useless organs mysteriously maintained and preserved by natural selection. Instead, Darwin's strategy was to concede to Mivart's criticism by giving natural selection only a secondary role, and advancing other methods by which evolutionary changes can be accomplished. This is seen in the latter part of the first quote in which Darwin stated: "I have shown, as I hope, that there is no great difficulty on this head." When Darwin responded thus to Mivart, he was not trying to defend his natural selection view against incipency, since it is obviously indefensible. Instead he took Mivart to task for not informing his readers of alternative methods of evolution:

When discussing special cases, Mr. Mivart passes over effects of use and disuse of parts, which I have always maintained to be highly important... He likewise often assumes that I attribute nothing to variations, independent of natural selection... (Darwin, 1909, pp. 218–219).

Darwin formulated a new version of natural selection in an attempt to circumvent the incipency problem. Other methods of evolution and this new version of natural selection together overcome (in Darwin's mind) the difficulties confronting his theory which is why he asserted that: "...there is no great difficulty on this head."

Darwin attempted to salvage evolution by natural selection by appealing to variations independent of natural selection which simply means that favorable variations will accumulate into new kinds by themselves. But there is no naturalistic mechanism for such to occur. It was a scenario that the naturalistic evolutionary establishment would not have embraced. Use and disuse of parts is Jean Lamarck's (1774–1829) theory that the mere *need* for a new organ or body part would enable an organism to acquire it out of necessity, but Lamarck's theory has been refuted by modern genetics.

Darwin's new natural selection mechanism promoted the idea that useful gradations are always added, which is to say, that every evolutionary step must be useful. Since

Darwin could not overcome the incipency problem, he simply eliminated incipency! "Gradations of structure, with each stage beneficial to changing species, will be found only under certain peculiar conditions" (Darwin, 1909, p. 223). The air bladder in fishes, for example, would have become lungs in mammals by means of natural selection acting on alleged gradations that were always useful. It was proposed that every evolutionary stage from air bladder to lungs had been beneficial to the intermediate organisms. There is one very serious drawback, as Darwin admitted: "It is therefore impossible to conjecture by what serviceable gradation the one could have been converted into the other; but it by no means follows from this that such gradations have not existed" (Darwin, 1909, p. 237). This Darwinian statement demonstrated that the "always useful gradations" are not only beyond science; they are even beyond imagination!

In effect, Darwin was saying that in order for natural selection to work, one must always have useful gradations which natural selection will then make useful for survival. This makes natural selection redundant as a creative mechanism, because if the variations were already useful, how could natural selection make them useful later? It is no wonder that evolutionary scientists did not adopt Darwin's new natural selection mechanism. Their strategy instead has been to sweep the whole incipency problem under the rug; it is simply omitted from typical introductory biology textbooks. Darwin's belief in "serviceable gradations" again directs us back to the fossil record. These serviceable gradations must have been evident in nothing other than the elusive intermediate fossils!

## The History of Punctuated Equilibrium

Few people realize that the punctuated equilibrium scenario was originally proposed by St. George Mivart under the name of "derivative creation." Although a contemporary of Darwin, Mivart stuck with the real fossil record rather than the mythical one and, "...he utilized the gaps in the palaeontological record...to support his view that evolution occurs through saltations (jumps) independent of the operation of natural selection" (Gruber, 1960, p. 54).

In his book, *On the Genesis of Species*, Mivart described his own theory of origins, which overcomes the problems in Darwinian gradualism by means of natural selection. Mivart's theory of evolution centered on a belief in a Divine Being.

Organic Nature speaks clearly to many minds of the action of an intelligence resulting, on the whole and in the main, in order, harmony, and beauty, yet of an intelligence the ways of which are not such as ours" (Mivart 1871, p. 253).

Mivart's aim was,

...to support the doctrine that these species have been evolved by ordinary natural laws (for the most part unknown) controlled by the subordinate action of "Natural Selection," and at the same time to remind some that there is and can be absolutely nothing in physical science which forbids them to regard those natural laws as acting with the Divine concurrence and in obedience to a creative fiat originally imposed on the primeval Cosmos, "in the beginning," by its Creator, its upholder, and its Lord. (Mivart, 1871, p. 255).

Consequently,

...an internal law presides over the actions of every part of every individual, and of every organism as a unit, and of the entire organic world as a whole. That by such a force, from time to time, new species are manifested by ordinary generation... That these "jumps" are considerable in comparison with the minute variations of "Natural Selection"—are in fact sensible steps, such as discriminate species from species. That the latent tendency which exists to these sudden evolutions is determined to action by the stimulus of external conditions. (Mivart, 1871, p. 255).

Therefore, according to Mivart, natural laws that were preordained by God induced the abrupt appearance of new species derived from antecedent species. The subordinate role of natural selection is to eliminate the antecedent species. The function of natural selection is thus relegated to an eliminating and stabilizing, not a creating, mechanism.

"Natural Selection" removes the antecedent species rapidly when the new one evolved is more in harmony with surrounding conditions. By some such conception as this, the difficulties here enumerated, which beset the theory of "Natural Selection" pure and simple, are to be got over. Thus, for example, the difficulties as to the origins and first beginnings of certain structures are completely got over (Mivart, 1871, p. 255–256).

Mivart's sudden appearance explanation for origins, like the punctuated equilibrium model, overcomes unresolved difficulties facing Darwinian gradualism, particularly incipency and the obviously abrupt appearance of species in the fossil record. But Mivart's derivative creation theory had a feature that made it unacceptable to the prevailing naturalistic mindset of the Darwinists. It did not have an on-going naturalistic mechanism, being instead a teleological explanation for the origin of life. Teleology means that natural phenomena are determined not only by mechanical causes but by an overall design or purpose in nature. Mivart's theory called for a Divine Being and we know from Darwin's

humanistic belief that the religious imperative of his theory was to deny the activity of a personal God. Any kind of abrupt explanation for the origin of life immediately implies miracles and miracles imply a creator. It is for that reason Darwin was absolutely opposed to Mivart's theory:

He who believes that some ancient form was transformed suddenly through an internal force or tendency into, for instance, one furnished with wings, will be almost compelled to assume... that many individuals varied simultaneously. He will further 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 co-adaptation, he will not be able to assign a shadow of an explanation. To admit all this is, as it seems to me, to enter into the realms of miracle, and to leave those of Science (Darwin, 1909, p. 250).

Mivart's derivative creation theory is really a version of theistic evolution. Darwin's opposition to Mivart's theory tells us in no uncertain terms that any theistic evolutionist who thinks he shares common ground with orthodox, atheistic, evolutionists is sadly mistaken. Teleology is still the forbidden element in the theorizing of orthodox evolutionists.

Mivart's reward for betraying evolutionary orthodoxy was ostracism:

Until the day of his death, Mivart was haunted by the hostility, latent and overt, of the small circle which had surrounded Darwin. The continuing, if not growing antipathy toward Mivart as both a man and scientist, expressed by those who were becoming the leaders of post-Darwinian science, virtually excluded him from the mainstream of science for which Darwinism was the source. This antipathy, gradually established the caricature of Mivart as a dogmatic and biased opponent of Darwinism, led for all practical purposes to the negation of his more pregnant observations. As an apostate he was forgotten, relegated to the ash heap upon which lay the remains of all whose who, for one reason or another, selfish or unselfish, good or bad, sought to check the wholesale acceptance of all things Darwinian (Gruber, 1960, p. 80).

Where was the tolerance and the fabled scientific objectivity and open-mindedness? And that was not the full extent of Mivart's tribulation. To add insult to injury, Mivart, a prominent Catholic layman, was excommunicated by Cardinal Vaughn for trying to advance an explanation for origins other than special creation (Gruber, 1960, pp. 209–210). We must give Mivart credit for having the courage to stand up to the Darwinian juggernaut

and point out the incipency problem. We must also applaud him for having the mental fortitude to base his origins theory on the real fossil record while others were committed to gradualism based on a mythical fossil record. Mivart's analysis was, in fact, a declaration that Darwinian gradual evolution was already disproved. It was because of this declaration and his teleology that he was ostracized and his work suppressed. His one fault seems to have been that he insisted on his theory being accepted because it overcame incipency and accounted for the gaps in the fossil record. In actuality it merely proved to be a superior theory to Darwinian gradualism in agreeing with the facts, but it, like Darwinian gradualism, remained a tentative explanation and could not be empirically supported.

About 120 years passed before orthodox evolutionists have again confronted the issue of the absence of abundant intermediate fossils with the formulation of the punctuated equilibrium theory. Orthodox evolutionists finally had to admit that the mythical fossil record is indeed a figment of their imaginations and could no longer be perpetuated in the real world. So why are not the formulators of punctuated equilibrium, Eldridge and Gould, ostracized? Why was their punctuated equilibrium theory accepted when Mivart's was not? It is obvious that Darwin's objection to Mivart's theory applies as well to their punctuated equilibrium view. Both theories are based upon the abrupt appearance of organisms. The answer is that the punctuated equilibrium model of Gould and Eldridge is not teleological; its miracles are not called such and they do not demand a Miracle Maker. The punctuated equilibrium view fulfills the orthodox evolutionists' religious imperative to exclude God from the process of origins. To the evolutionist, the question of whether or not there was a Miracle Maker behind the obvious "miracles" is an issue for religion to discuss, not science.

### **The Need for Academic Honesty in School Curricula**

The general taxpayers and scientists should be in favor of an open presentation of the scientific origins data and an honest evolutionary curriculum. Such a curriculum should correct the work of Darwin who was dedicated to a form of religious indoctrination rather than to scientific open-mindedness. By his own admission he knew that his data were subject to "conclusions directly opposite".

What would constitute an enlightened and academically honest origins curriculum? First and foremost it would incorporate counterinduction (alternative expla-

nations) in keeping with scientific objectivity. It should also include all of the pertinent information unfavorable to evolution that is presently censored. It should detail the "incipency problem" and Darwin's response to it. It ought to inform students of Darwin's new concept of natural selection that required gradations that were always useful. Students should be informed that in every field of investigation the real data are the only data scientists consider reliable. They must learn how evolutionary investigators have promoted a mythical fossil record rather than the real one. When the real fossil evidence is analyzed, Jevons' Rule applies and gradual evolution stands disproved. Students should be allowed to decide for themselves whether or not to apply Jevons' Rule. In an academically honest origins curriculum, discussions of the punctuated equilibrium model ought to include Mivart's pioneering "derivative creation" theory, which, like the punctuated equilibrium view, was formulated to take into account the absence of abundant intermediate fossils. Students should learn that both theories are similar in that neither is scientifically accountable and that the fundamental difference is the teleology of Mivart's theory versus the materialism of Gould's and Eldridge's view. Mivart's derivative creation requires a Miracle Maker while the miracles of Gould's punctuated equilibrium theory supposedly occur "naturally". They should see that the difference between Gould and Mivart is in the metaphysics, not the science.

An academically honest origins curriculum would enable students to have a well-rounded education on the subject of origins. In a scientifically based curriculum there should be discussion of whether or not any explanation for the origin of life can be empirically proved. Indeed, some explanations for the origin of life may be disproved but can any be empirically proved? Without exception all so-called scientific explanations for the origin of life begin with a modicum of scientific accountability and ultimately veer off into the domains of speculation, imagination, myth, miracle, and wishful thinking. It is socially divisive and reflects a lack of scientific integrity for scientists to promote one particular explanation for the origin of life under the name of "science" when no explanation can be empirically verified.

The scientific establishment should stop theorizing about origins unless it becomes socially neutral by including all other theories of origins. All explanations for origins share the common feature of relying on miracles that are scientifically unaccountable and all have religious underpinnings. There really is no scientific, social, or other basis for excluding any particular explanation for the origin of life in a science curriculum.



## Doctrine versus True Science in Teaching Evolution

Two versions of evolution exist, the doctrinal and the truly scientific. The educational world promotes only the doctrinal version. Scientific information unfavorable to evolution has been systematically omitted because doctrinal evolutionists are religiously motivated.

No one can claim to be an authority on evolution if they are unaware of information that is unfavorable to their theory. No other investigative body would consider forsaking real evidence for imaginary evidence; only doctrinal evolutionists have this distinction. They formulated a theory that was unavoidably destined to self-destruct in the face of Jevons' Rule.

Because doctrinal evolutionists are unwilling to include unfavorable information about evolution in the curriculum, they automatically forfeit their claim of authority on the subject. The open-minded and truly scientific evolutionists and others willing to deal with evolution in a truly scientific framework need to claim that authority.

The doctrinal version of evolution as presently taught in public schools should be rejected not on constitutional grounds alone but because it is also self-serving, prejudicial, and religiously dogmatic. Students are not able to make an educated judgment concerning evolution when the unfavorable information is withheld and only favorable information is presented. This is the grand strategy that has shaped the evolution curriculum and it is time for a change.

## References

- Darwin, Charles. 1909. *The origin of species*, sixth edition. P. F. Collier and Sons, New York.
- Feyerabend, Paul. 1978. *Against method: outline of an anarchist theory of knowledge*. Humanities Press, London.
- Gould, S. J. 1977. Evolution's erratic pace. *Natural History* 76(May 5):14.
- Gould, S. J. 1980. Is a new general theory of evolution emerging? *Paleobiology* 6(1):127.
- Gruber, Jacob. 1960. *A conscience in conflict—the life of St. George Jackson Mivart*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. 1959. *Darwin and the Darwinian revolution*. Chatto and Windus, London.
- Jevons, W. Stanley. 1958. *The principles of science: a treatise on logic and the scientific method*. Dover Publications, New York.
- Kurtz, David. 1984. *Humanist manifestos I and II*. Prometheus Books, Buffalo.
- Mivart, St. George. 1871. *On the genesis of species*. D. Appleton, New York.
- NABT. 1996. NABT unveils new statement on teaching evolution. *American Biology Teacher* 50(1):61–62.
- Peckham, Morse. (editor). 1959. *The origin of species by Charles Darwin*. A variorum text. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.
- Raup, David. 1979. Conflicts between Darwin and paleontology. *Field Museum of Natural History Bull.* 50(1):26.
- . 1960. The history of life in the evolution of life, Sol Tax (editor). Vol. 1. Evolution after Darwin. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Towle, Albert. 1993. *Modern biology*, eighth edition. Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Austin, TX. .

---

## On the 200th anniversary of the death of the first President of the United States

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity.

Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.

Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure—reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

George Washington, from his Farewell Address