

Summary Evoskepsis Association Criticism of the Theory of Evolution

By: dr. Wim de Jong, February 2009

1. The theory of evolution can only be discussed adequately if a distinction is made *between micro-evolution* in which the size of the DNA of an organism does not increase, and *macro-evolution* in which the size of the DNA of an organism does increase.
2. Micro-evolution is brought about by the recombination of gene-variants (alleles) from the gene pool of a population and selection of advantageous combinations. This mechanism is fundamental for animal and plant breeding, and is responsible for the continuous adaptation of living nature to changing circumstances by natural selection. An example of micro-evolution is the change in the beaks of Darwin finches.
3. Macro-evolution would be brought about by code-expanding, inheritable mutations of the DNA that provide a selective advantage. Mutations, however, are opposed by various mutation-repair systems in the cell kernel. An example of such a mutation-repair system is the deletion of code-expanding mutations when producing sex cells. In this process, the genes inherited from the father of the organism are mixed with those inherited from the mother. If the length of the DNA partitions that are exchanged are not exactly equal, the process will break down resulting in the deletion of the code expanding mutation. In addition, macro-evolution requires a dysfunctioning mutation-repair system, which is a severe selective disadvantage for an organism in the struggle for survival since it causes cancer and hereditary diseases. A structural process of (1) code-expanding (2) immediately advantageous (3) non-repairable (4) inheritable DNA-mutations, made possible by (5) a dysfunctioning mutation-repair system, can only exist in a mythical story, but not in reality. Moreover, what to think of the logical impossibility that mutation-repair systems are produced by the processes they antagonize?
4. As micro-evolution is produced by a process completely different from the process that would produce macro-evolution, 'a huge amount of micro-evolution', in which the size of the DNA does not increase, cannot add up to macro-evolution. Micro-evolution can produce very large differences in the appearance of organisms (for instance it can produce very big, aggressive fight dogs, or kind, palmtop dogies) and new species, without an increase in the size of the DNA of these organisms. Evidently, the numerous examples of micro-evolution cannot be used to prove the existence of macro-evolution.
5. Only in mythical stories, molecules possess an intrinsic desire to clot into ever more complex substances, into organic soup, RNA, DNA, a primitive gene, cells, an ever more complex organisms. In the real world, the natural cause of events is exactly the opposite. Random processes are aimless, but they have a direction ('arrow of time'): sooner or later they will equalize any difference, for instance in energy, temperature, potential, energy density, information or complexity. No serious scholar will deny this basic property of reality. The macro-evolutionary theory is in flat contradiction with this basic property of reality, and therefore with physical science. In addition, the macro-evolutionary theory is in contradiction with Darwin's principle of 'survival of the fittest'. As a consequence, the theory of macro-evolution is an invalid scientific theory.
6. An important rule of science, frequently applied by reviewers, is that invalid theory is put into the garbage can, even when no alternative scientific theory is available. Then, a gap in scientific knowledge remains, because the theory "god, or an intelligent designer, or a pink elephant created the DNA" is not a scientific theory as it is intestable and therefore infalsifiable. The theory "god, or an intelligent designer, or a pink elephant created the DNA" is therefore a belief that belongs to the domain of religion.
7. The theory of macro-evolution is invalid and has to be rejected according to the rules of science. An excellent scientific alternative however is available: "We don't know (yet)". Such a position is completely normal and legitimate in any branch of science, and should be normal and legitimate as well in scientific discussions of how all genes and all other DNA present in living nature have originated.