

## *Critique of the Evolutionary Worldview*

### I. Introduction

- A. Evolution is an ancient philosophical and religious belief.
1. Confucius (25 centuries before Darwin) said: *All reality unfolded gradually from a single entity.*
  2. Bhuddist teachers believed all living things evolved from a prior unitary nature. (See Ninian Smart's *Indian Philosophy*).
  3. Anaximander and Anaximenes (6th Century B.C.) held that the sun's warmth generated all living forms by acting on moist primeval element. Anaximenes believed, moreover, that plants, animals and humans were generated in that order!
  4. Evolution again became popular in the early 19th century. Many philosophers embraced it as a philosophical position, all before Darwin.
- B. Therefore, since evolution began as a philosophy, and has become all pervasive, affecting every area of life and culture, it should be critiqued for the worldview it is.

### II. The Philosophical Problems with Evolution

- A. Darwin's hypothesis as to the mechanism of evolution arose not from empirical investigation, but was fully formulated long before he sought evidence to support his theory. The origin of Darwin's theory of natural selection was speculative rather than scientific. Darwin admits this in his autobiography. He got the idea from Malthus, and from watching animal breeders.
- B. Darwin's theory of natural selection is a tautology. That is, it is true by definition, e.g., all bachelors are unmarried men. *Those that survive are the fittest.* But how do we know who are the fittest? Only by those that survive! Darwin mistakenly assumed there were independent criteria for fitness (e.g. the speed of a wolf). Neo-darwinians tried to correct this with the empirical observation that the forms that survive are those that leave more offspring. But again circular reasoning is not avoided. *The result of natural selection is that some things leave more offspring than others; and which leave more offspring? Those that survive.*

This type of logical fallacy is also seen in historical geology where fossils are dated by the layer of sediment in which they are found, and the

sediments are dated by the fossils (key fossils).

- C. Darwin and his apologists often commit the fallacy of using improper analogies. When Darwin saw animal breeders selecting certain desired characteristics in animals to be bred, he assumed this is what nature did. Nature selected characteristics that would result in a fitter animal. Here Darwin is re-ifying nature. That is, he is attributing being to nature which is just an expression. Another example of an improper analogy we often see is: *Since human and chimpanzees (or apes) are similar in the structure of their chromosomes, therefore, it is concluded that man evolved from the chimpanzee.* A syllogism of the argument is thus:

Premise: If X is similar to y in Z,

Conclusion: Then x evolved from y or

X and y evolved from K.

This is fallacious reasoning, first, because the conclusion has no relationship to the premise; the law of the excluded middle applies in this situation. Second, the attributes of a part cannot be applied to a whole; that the organisms share similar features does not logically imply that as whole beings they had similar origins. Third, you could just as well say that y evolved from x, i.e., chimps evolved from humans.

- . Many evolutionists commit the fallacy of *ignoratio elenchi*. *Evolution is true because Special Creation is refuted.* I have heard evolutionists admit that they believe in evolution because the only alternative, creationism, is preposterous. You cannot simply say *I can explain that away*. Explanation must not be confused with refutation. You never establish one position by refuting another.
- E. Evolutionists often commit the fallacy of scientism or reductionism, i.e., *What the net does not catch ain't fish. Nothing can occur that is not in accordance with natural law. Creationism is not according to natural law, therefore, creationism cannot be true.*
- F. Evolutionists often commit the fallacy of begging the question. e.g., Since creation is a religious view there can be no evidence supporting creation, all the evidence presented is false. Since the evidence is all false, creation is not true. Hume used a similar argument against miracles. Since miracles are contrary to firm and unalterable experience, they do not exist. Yet Hume assumes that no one has ever experienced a miracle, he is asking us to accept what he has failed to prove.
- G. Evolution by its very nature is associated with naturalistic philosophies which consistently are self-refuting. For example:

1. *Only empirically verifiable or falsifiable statements have any meaning. This statement is itself incapable of verification.*
  2. *There are no absolutes. This statement is an absolute.*
  3. Everything is relative. But *this statement* is meant to be taken as an absolute.
  4. *We cannot know anything with certainty.* Yet, we are supposed to know *this statement* with certainty.
  5. *There is no truth, except of course, this statement.*
  6. *What a person believes is the result of irrational forces.* Then this statement itself is also the result of irrational forces. So why believe it?
  7. *What you believe is determined by psychological, environmental, chemical, or class conditioning.* Then this belief also is the result of such conditioning as well and is equally worthless.
  8. *The universe is self-caused.* If it caused itself it had to exist prior to the causing!
  9. *The universe came from nothing.* Even Julie Andrews knows that is not true. *Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could.*
  10. If evolution is true then it too is evolving.
- H. Evolution is guilty of amphibole (improper use of words). Chance is not a causative factor. Chance is not an entity. It is only a statistical phenomena. Evolutionists want to assign to both chance and nature as the sources of causation. They often capitalize chance and nature. The universe is sometimes seen by them as an intelligent being! (The New Age variety).
- Robert Ingersol, the known atheist, once walked into the planetarium in New York City and noticed the beautiful model of the solar system. He asked the head of the planetarium who was responsible for this beautiful model. The head of the planetarium, being a theist, replied: *Nobody; it just happened.* Ingersol reportedly laughed when he realized the absurdity of it just happening.
- I. Inconsistencies in evolutionist thinking with regards to how they live their lives.
1. By its very nature evolution cannot be teleological (purposeful) since it is a pure chance operation. Yet most evolutionists live as though life is purposeful and meaningful.

2. From my perspective, the major weakness of evolution as a worldview is the area of ethics. Huxley himself admitted that evolution leads to bad ethics. The *survival of the fittest* doctrine gives dictators the right to exterminate the weak.
- J. Evolution as a hypothesis fails to explain the major questions of life.
1. It fails to answer how evolution takes place. No mechanism.
  2. It fails to explain the taxonomic gaps in the fossil record.
  3. It contradicts known genetic principles.
  4. It fails to explain entropy (the second law of thermodynamics) in light of the eternity of matter and the simple giving rise to the complex.
  5. It fails to explain the origin of life.
  6. It fails to explain how the non-sentient became sentient.
  7. It fails to explain the uniqueness of man, i.e., his moral consciousness.
- K. Conclusion: Evolution is the embodiment of the 19th century idea of progress now under considerable attack from inside its own ranks. Change is not necessarily progress. Evolution is not quite the god its makers had hoped. In absence of a Creator, evolutionists have created their own substitutes:

Dobzhansky compared natural selection to a Composer.  
 Beer described evolution as the Master of Ceremonies.  
 Simpson likened evolution to a Poet.  
 Mayer compared selection to a Sculptor.  
 Huxley compared selection to Shakespeare.

For Further Study:

For the history and background of evolutionary thinking, we recommend:

Blackmore, Vernon, and Page, Andrew. *Evolution: The Great Debate*.  
 Morris, Henry. *The Long War Against God*.

Contemporary critiques of evolution:

Phillip E. Johnson. *Darwin on Trial*.  
 Spetner, Lee. *Not By Chance*.  
 Strobel, Lee. *The Case For The Creator*.  
 Woodward, Thomas. *Doubts About Darwin*.