

Unfit to Survive -- Evolution goes Extinct -- Part 2

Support from the recent past for John Wynne's "demolition of evolution" in Part 1

ADAM & EVE scientifically respectable says Professor Jerome Lejeune

PROFESSOR Jerome Lejeune, world-famous geneticist, approved my assertion about him:

Dear Rev. Father Tierney, Thank you so much for the 2nd Revised Edition of your *Catholic Family Catechism*. I have gone over many pages, all excellent. What a pity we have not the equivalent in France (and everywhere!). **Page 50 is great!** With all my best wishes for the development of your ministry.

I am, very sincerely and respectfully, Yours as always,
J. Lejeune

Page 50 [of CFC] says: "Professor Jerome Lejeune, discoverer of, and contemporary researcher into, the extra chromosome in Downes Syndrome children, has declared that, because the normal 46 chromosomes are so complex in their tightly packed spirals and so detailed in containing all the genetic information to constitute a unique human being, the best scientific explanation of mankind is that it descended from a single male and female of the human species. Moreover, each species is best explained in it molecular biology as an original male and female deriving from the same zygote. **Thus Adam and Eve are perfectly respectable scientifically.**"

In an earlier letter, he said that the only reason some molecular geneticists rejected human descent from one father and mother was **because it was in the Bible !!!**.

EVOLUTION -- the great MYTH says Dr Michael Denton, biologist

"Evolution theory now stands exposed as a mistaken hypothesis -- the biggest mistake made in science -- and as the most enduring myth of modern times. Unfortunately however, the effect of evolution theory on modern society has been profound;" said Dr Michael Denton, although an agnostic.

"The entire scientific ethos and philosophy of modern western man is based to a large extent upon the central claim of Darwinian theory that humanity was not born by the creative intentions of a deity but by a completely mindless trial and error selection of random molecular patterns. The **cultural import-ance is therefore immeasurable**, forming as it does the centre-piece, the crowning achievement, of the naturalistic view of the world, the final triumph of the secular thesis which since the end of the middle ages has displaced the old naive cosmology of Genesis from the western mind....

Ultimately the Darwinian theory of evolution is no more and no less than the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century." Quoted from *Evolution, A Theory in Crisis*, 1985 (out of print), but his *Evolution, Still a Theory in Crisis*, 2016, 345pp, is \$45.

REVIEW by Professor Maciej Giertych of *Creation Rediscovered* by G.J. Keane

- Only \$27,90 (2020 price), 302 pp A5 size, with index
- Easy to read with 13 full pages of illustrations
- Appendix: Pontifical Biblical Commission
- A Catholic version of creation, reviewed by a Catholic
- Foreword by, geneticist Giertych and just as apt for a Review of *The Fall of Darwin's Last Icon* by John M. Wynn. Passages in **bold print** or **square brackets [–]** are editorial notes by Fr Tierney for the benefit of Newsletter readers.

SOMETIME in 1955, when I was taking Honour Moderations in Science (Botany, Chemistry and Geology) at Oxford University, the O.U. Biology Club announced a lecture against the theory of evolution. The large auditorium in the Biology Labs was filled to capacity. When the speaker was introduced (I regret I do not remember his name) it turned out he was an octogenarian with a Ph.D. in biology from Cambridge obtained in the 19th century. He spoke fervently against the theory of evolution, defending what was for us an obviously indefensible position. He did not convince anybody with his antique arguments, he did not understand the questions that were fired at him, he rejected science as we knew it. We all had a good laugh hearing this dinosaur. He fought for his convictions against a sophisticated scientific environment deaf to any opinions inspired by religious beliefs. **Today his views are being vindicated by new evidence from natural sciences.** May his soul rest in peace.

In 1955, like all my generation, I was fully convinced evolution was an established biological fact. The evidence was primarily paleontological. We were taught how to identify geological strata with the help of fossils, specific for a given epoch. The rocks were dated by the fossils, the fossils by the strata. A lecturer in stratigraphy [the study of rock strata, especially of their distribution, deposition and age] when asked during a field trip how the strata were dated explained that we know the rate of current sedimentation, the depths of strata and thus the age of rocks. In any case there are new isotopic techniques that confirm all this. This sounded very scientific and convincing.

In my studies I went on to a B.A. and M.A. in forestry, a Ph.D. in plant physiology and finally a D.Sc. in genetics. For a long time I was not bothered by geology, evolution or any suspicious thoughts. I had my own field of research in population genetics of forest trees, with no immediate relevance to the controversy over evolution.

Gradually as my children got to the state of learning biology in school and discussing their problems with dad, I realized that the evidence for evolution shifted from palaeontology and embryology to population genetics. But population genetics is my subject! I knew it was used to explain how evolution progressed but was not aware it is used to prove it. Without my noticing it my special field became the supplier of the most pertinent evidence supporting the theory. If evolution was proven in some field I was not familiar with, I understood the need to accommodate my field to this fact, to suggest explanations how it occurred in terms of genetics. But to claim that these attempted explanations are the primary evidence for the theory was quite unacceptable to me. I started reading up the current literature on the topic of evolution. Until then I was not aware how shaky the evidence for evolution was, how much of what was "evidence" had to be discarded, how little new evidence was accumulated over the years and how very much **ideas dom nate facts**. These ideas have become dogma, yet they have **no footing in natural sciences**. They **stem from materialistic philosophies**.

My primary objection as a geneticist was to the claim that the formation of races, or micro-evolution as it is often referred to, is a small scale example of macro-evolution -- the origin of species. Race formation is of course well

documented. All it requires is isolation of a part of a population. After a few generations due to natural selection and genetic drift the isolated population will irreversibly lose some genes, and thus, as long as the isolation continues, in some features it will be different from the population it arose from. In fact we do this ourselves all the time when breeding, substituting natural with artificial selection and creating artificial barriers to generative mixing outside the domesticated conditions. The important thing to remember here is that **a race is genetically impoverished relative to the whole population**. It has fewer alleles (forms of genes) [allele = any of a group of possible mutational forms of a gene, short for German *allelomorph*: *allel*, short; *morph*, a shape or form]. Some of them are arranged into special, interesting, rare combinations. This is particularly achieved by guided recombinations of selected forms in breeding work. But these selected forms are less variable (less polymorphic). Thus what is referred to as **micro-evolution represents natural or artificial reduction of the gene pool**. You will not get evolution that way. **Evolution means construction of new genes**. It means **increase in the amount of genetic information and not reduction of it**.

The evolutionary value of new races or selected forms should be demonstrable by natural selection. However if allowed to mix with the general breeding population new races will disappear. The select genes they have will disperse again, the domesticated forms will go wild. Thus there is **no evidence for evolution here**.

Mutations figure prominently in the evolution story. When in the early sixties I was starting breeding work on forest trees everyone was very excited about the potential of artificial mutations. In many places around the world special "cobalt bomb" centres were established to stimulate rates of mutations. What wonderful things we were expecting from increased variability by induced mutations. All of this work has long since been abandoned. It led nowhere. All we got were deformed freaks, absolutely useless in forestry. Maybe occasionally some oddity could be of ornamental value, but never able to live on its own in natural conditions. A glance through literature on mutations outside forestry quickly convinced me that the pattern is similar everywhere. **Mutations are either neutral or detrimental**. Positive ones if they occur are too rare to be noticeable. **Stability in nature is the rule**. We have no proofs for evolution from mutation research.

With the genome of a species [genome = a complete haploid set of chromosomes; *haploid* = having the number of chromosomes present in a normal germ cell, equal to half the number in the normal somatic cell: *hap*, one or single, *plos*, fold; compare diploid], that is in the molecular structure of its DNA we find many recurrent specific nucleotide sequences [nucleotide = any of various organic compounds consisting of a nucleoside combined with phosphoric acid; nucleoside = any compound made of a sugar and a purine or pyrimidine base] known as "repeats". Different ones occur in different species. If this variation (neutral as far as we know) arose from random mutations it should be random. How then did the repeats come to be? If mutations are the answer they could not have been random. In this context "genetic drive" is postulated, as distinct from "genetic drift". But Who or what does the driving? The empirical science of genetics knows only random mutations.

Currently there are new suggestions that molecular genetics provides evidence for evolution. Analyses of DNA sequences in various species should show similarities between related ones and big differences between systematically far removed species. They do exactly that. Molecular genetics

generally **confirms the accuracy of taxonomy** [taxonomy = the science, laws or principles of classification; *taxo*, arrangement or order; *nomy*, law]. But at the same time it does not confirm postulated evolutionary sequences. There are no progressive changes say from fishes to amphibians to reptiles to mammals. Molecular genetics confirms systematics not phylogeny [systematics = the classification of organisms in an ordered system designed to indicate certain relationships; *phylogeny* = the evolutionary development of any species of plant or animal; compare ontogeny].

No ! Genetics has no proofs for evolution. It has trouble explaining it. The closer one looks at the evidence for evolution the less one finds of substance. In fact the theory keeps on postulating evidence, and failing to find it, moves on to other postulates (fossil missing-links, natural selection of improved forms, positive mutations, molecular phylogenetic sequences, etc.). This is not science.

A whole age of scientific endeavour was wasted searching for a phantom. [A similar assertion was made by Professor Thompson -- that evolution had impaired the study of his own subject, biology -- in his introduction in 1956 to a new edition of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*] It is time we stopped and looked at the facts. Natural sciences failed to supply any evidence for evolution. **Christian philosophy tried to accommodate this unproven postulate of materialistic philosophies**. Much time and intellectual effort went in vain leading only to **negative moral consequences**. It is time those working in the humanities were told the truth.

Gerald J. Keane is doing exactly that. In clear and simple language he reviews the present status of the evolution-creation controversy. I am very happy to be able to recommend this book. Indeed ***Creation Rediscovered by science comes to the rescue of Christianity***.

THE CRUMBLING THEORY OF EVOLUTION

J.W.G. Johnson

Wallace Johnson, of Brisbane, 1916-1989, published several editions of *The Case Against Evolution* from 1976, then a definitive Australian edition in January, 1982, called ***The Crumbling Theory of Evolution***, which was fully revised for publication in the USA, December, 1987.

In 1985, Johnson turned over the copyright of his book to international businessman, L. Owen Traynor, who changed the title to **"Evolution?"** At Johnson's request, the original title has been retained for Australian distribution, and the Polish edition has retained this title too.

Polish Edition **Introduction by Professor Maciej Giertych**
SCIENTISTS STAY IN THEIR WAYS ?

When some new theory first appears in science, it has few supporters. Specialists in their respective fields try to disprove it, try to show its weaknesses, even try to ridicule it. No one likes to discard one's own ideas. Such a new theory gets into textbooks and becomes universally accepted teaching only after polemics among scientists and an accumulation of compelling evidence that the theory is well documented.

UNFAIR PRIVILEGES FOR EVOLUTION

The theory of evolution came through this process at a rate completely unjustified by scientific documentation. This undue haste is attributable to the fact that the theory impacts not only on science but also (and especially) on philosophy.

Now that scientific doubts about the theory are becoming ever more obvious, the process of abandoning it is also singularly slow, and for the same reason. The philosophical consequences of this abandonment are too far reaching.

Nor is it easy to abandon an accepted canon of science, to admit to an error. Nevertheless, this something the current generation of scientists must face.

BIOLOGY PROF. SAYS NO EVOLUTION

I had the opportunity to experience this first hand when I published a review of Johnson's *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution* (1st edition) in *Rycerz Niepokalanej* (Knight of the Immaculate), a monthly founded by St Maximilian Kolbe. This review was a series of articles in nn. 6/1986 through 2 /1987. Since this review I have been invited on a number of occasions to give talk on the subject to various audiences with special interests in biology.

I expected to meet with hostility or even ridicule. But these audiences accepted by views and information with interest and with a readiness for constructive discussion.

My chief antagonists came not from the scientific community, but from philosophical quarters (ranging from Marxist to Catholic). I came to realize that today the theory of evolution is being defended more by philosophers and theologians than by biologists and other scientists.

SCIENTISTS CAN SUSPEND JUDGEMENT

It appears that scientists know of the many questions surrounding this theory. They also seem to understand they can quite successfully pursue research in their respective fields regardless of what is believed about origins. They know, of course, that descriptive and experimental scientific findings are compelling so long as those descriptions and experiments are honest. Evolutionist or creationist interpretations do not affect this validity of their work.

SOME THEOLOGIES "NEED" EVOLUTION !

With philosophy it is different. If a philosophical or theological premise is based on an evolutionary assumption, that entire premise collapses when the assumption is shown to be invalid. **Unfortunately theologians & philosophers are apparently oblivious to the multitude of questions posed today by the natural sciences with respect to the theory of evolution.** Likewise, the general public knows little about this. It is only at the university level that independent thinking and critical study are encouraged [or least ways, they used to be!], and too often, these only in connection with a diploma thesis, when usually for the first time a student is asked to supplement unclarified fragmental knowledge. [Is this our Australian experience?]

YOUTH'S ACT OF FAITH IN EVOLUTION

Pupils (and often students) are asked to learn what they are told, without questioning. So they learn what they are taught, believing in this. Yes, believing, because the whole education process is based on confidence in the teacher. It is rarely based on verifiable information. Teachers do the same, though it is true they more commonly look into the documentation for information presented.

SOME TEXTBOOKS ADMIT THIS

Inspection of biology textbooks will point up a difference in the presentation mode for facts experimentally documented and for theoretical information given only to be believed in. For example, descriptions of the photosynthetic cycle and of the genetic code are presented factually on the basis of documented experiments. Presentations of evolution material, on the other hand, contain words and phrases such as "presumably," "one can suspect," "it appears," "it is probable that," ">" etc. Information accompanying "family trees" of living organisms always contain many broken lines, indicating lack of knowledge about

intermediary forms, lack of documented connections, etc.

CLADISTS

Today evolutionists are especially worried about a revolution in systematics which is proposed by those referred to as "cladists". This is a trend of thought aimed at a return to rigorism in taxonomy. [Taxonomy# is the science of classification -- the Greek *taxis* means an arrangement, the putting of things in their right place. The dictionary describes *cladistics* as :a scientific classification which places organisms in same taxonomic group if they share features thought to indicate ancestry;" (Greek *clade* means a branch or twig) but it is precisely that last part about a common ancestry that **assumes what has to be proved**, as the Polish introduction goes on to explain.]

The first instruction Adam received from God was to name all animals (Genesis 2:19-20). To this day this is being done by taxonomists, but they are at odds how to systematize *taxa*. The phylogenetic view predominates; that is, the origin of one group of organisms from another is assumed. Then an attempt is made to indicate speculated sequences of those transformations. [Greek *phylon* means a race or tribe; *phylogenetic* means the racial evolution of animal or plant types.]

Cladists, on the other hand, reject the thinking in terms of time. They **demand classification based exclusively on observed similarities**. They want to combine all organisms, living or fossil, into **groups which have some common features, but never those which lack some features**. So every animal with feathers is a bird, but it is impermissible to join all animals without feathers into a group because obviously, nothing "binds" them.

Systematics is full of *taxa* defined in this manner. In the sixties this type of systematics was criticized by W. Henning (East Germany). Today his ideas have many followers and the annual meeting of the Willi Henning Society gathers more than 250 systematicians from around the world. **For cladists, vertebrates are a good group but invertebrates are not a group at all.** Why group together a bee, an octopus and amoeba? To be consistent invertebrates should include a strawberry, as well as a sock.

ASSUMING WHAT HAS TO BE PROVED

So we see here some inconsistencies in phylogenetic systematics. If someone says vertebrates evolved from invertebrates, he is suggesting the phylogenetic course for a specific group of organisms. In fact, however, all he is saying is that vertebrates evolved from organisms which were not vertebrates themselves. This is equivalent to the proofless statement that vertebrates evolved. Nothing more. If systematics is weeded out of groups linked by the absence of some traits, nothing is left of phylogenetics. The postulated "family trees" are left with broken (speculative) connections.

Debate on such topics fascinates some groups of scientists but not much of this reaches the general public. **Such information access is prevented by evolutionists and their allies in the humanities.**

GEOLOGY WITHOUT EVOLUTION ? YES !

With geology there is a similar situation. It was once believed that all sedimentary rocks and fossils of the living organisms they contain resulted from a flood combined with major earthquakes, volcanic and orogenic activity [=mountain building], that they are evidence of **a major catastrophe** that changed the face of the earth. The appearance of the **uniformitarian theory** (the suggestion sedimentary rocks formed through slow over-position of sediments at the bottom of water reservoirs, as we observe it occurring today) would not have mattered much in geology were it not for the theory of

evolution.

Evolution needs millions (billions) of years and thus uniformitarian geology superseded flood geology. **For geologists this is an impediment, not a simplification**, because current sediments do not collect fossils of living things. The living things rot or are eaten by scavengers.

CIRCULAR ARGUMENT AGAIN

The absurd situation arose wherein fossils are dated by geological strata, but the strata are, in turn, dated by the fossils. With such circular reasoning no system of calibration exists. If anyone things dating, with the help of radioactive isotopes explains anything, they should look into current specialized literature on the subject. Many doubts and inconsistencies undermine the utility of these methods. The dates of geological eras as given in textbooks have been proposed in the 19th century and have nothing whatsoever to do with isotope dating.

EVOLUTION DOES NOT HELP SCIENCE

As in biology, it is possible to be a functional geologist regardless of the theory one may adopt for the mode of sedimentary rock formation (uniformitarian or catastrophic). Geologists will not be in the vanguard of evolution defenders. [Prof. Thompson's 1956 *Introduction to Darwin* claimed evolution hindered biological science!]

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION

The crux of the evolution debate concerns a basic 2 pronged question. Has a once-disorganised world (in chaos after the alleged "Big Bang") undergone an evolutionary sequence of changes -- first in particles, then in molecular chemistry, and finally biological with formation of man -- all moving toward perfection (to an ideal state of maximum organisation, to the omega point of Teilhard de Chardin), **or** is the world (once non-chaotic, beautiful and perfect) declining for some reason (fall of the angels and of Adam) and burning out, deteriorating, running down, toward a lower state of organisation (towards disorganisation and chaos) ?

This is primarily a philosophical/metaphysical question. Natural scientists have only an extremely brief time period available for analysis and observation. What do we observe in it? Advancement or regression? Formation of new and better forms or of poorer more defective ones and the irreversible extinction of some? Does the amount of energy in circulation increase or decrease?

WALLACE JOHNSON'S BOOK

Johnson attempts to present, in a popularises idiom, highlights of the evolution debate and current knowledge about origins. He attempts to outline doubts and weaknesses of the theory, along with falsehoods and errors on which those doubts and weaknesses rest, and along with a large number of evolutionary inconsistencies. This book is aimed at the "man in the street", at those who during their schooling learned only one side of the evolution debate.

In this book there are surely debatable topics. Some are overemphasized, others missing. It covers too many disciplines; one author cannot be expert in all. **But it is a book worth reading** because it will stimulate thinking and debate and it will help to **re-evaluate many clichés which we too often use in scientific literature without empirical data to support them.**

THE EVOLUTIONIST'S BASIC ARGUMENT

When a biology evolutionist is pressed to the wall for scientific facts supporting his theory, the response usually boils down to two:

- (1) All living organisms have parents or at least one parent.
- (2) There was a time when there were no mammals, no people, etc. From these two facts the evolutionist draws his conclusion (and presents that conclusion as factual) that mammals were born from non-mammals, that people were born from non-people, etc. This is the principle of biological evolution in a nut shell. ***Convincing evidence is non-existent.***

To reject the possibility of being-made-from-nothing leaves **no alternative but to believe in being-born-from-something, no matter how utterly lacking the scientific evidence may be for the latter. The evolutionist must remain: perplexed by the age-old question: Which came first, the chicken or the egg? Which came first, DNA, RNA or protein?**

Johnson also touches on the question of civilization's history. Of interest is his observation that the primitive state still observable here and there in the current world is not of primary origin but is the result of civilization decline, the consequence of losing contact with centres of civilization. This, however, should not imply that a development of civilization is not possible. Technological development is a permanently observable fact, but that is not the issue here. We are also observing a civilizational development in the spiritual sense.

Our Polish historian/philosopher, Professor Feliks Konieczny, who spent his lifetime studying the question of civilizations, came to some important conclusions on this question. He has shown that in the development of mankind there is such a thing as ethical development (elevation of moral standards to a higher level), as discussed in his *Moral Development (Rozwoj moralnosci*, Lublin 1938). He has also shown that in history there operate certain laws worth knowing if one wishes to understand the history of mankind (if one wishes to learn from history). These laws have nothing to do with the laws of nature, because they concern the spirit and not matter, as discussed in Konieczny's *Laws of History (Prawa dziejowe*, London 1982). They determine the relation between a civilization and its development. There is no doubt Adam did not start from zero. He received from God some civilization. He also received a soul. Biological (physical) evolution is but a postulate of evolutionists. Spiritual development, however, as well as spiritual regression, are historically observable facts. Such is the sense of a soul.

We can fall, but we can also raise ourselves by our will power. Spiritual development is under control of different sets of rules than physical development. When refuting/exposing the theory of evolution (the theory of development in nature), Johnson suggests that perhaps civilizational development is impossible. I find this out of place here.

The present work is a Polish translation from the first English edition (Brisbane, Australia, 1982). During work on this translation the now-deceased author supplied changes he introduced into his last edition (USA 1987). Thus the Polish edition is in agreement with the American edition. Both the author and the American publishers have kindly agreed to allow free copyrights to the Polish edition, for which we offer our sincere thanks.

The latest American edition of Wallace Johnson's *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution*, in 138 pages and with many illustrations, is \$22.95 -- also, ask for the cassette tapes.

Father James Tierney