

12. Evolution History and Current Status

There have been three broad stages in the doctrine of evolution.

The first was popularised by Charles Darwin in the mid 19th century when knowledge of biology was primitive and the fields of biochemistry and genetics were unknown. It is referred to as **Darwinism**. Simply put, the observable similarities in animals indicate that all living species arose through *descent with modification* from a *common ancestor* with the fittest—those having superior hereditary traits leading to better reproduction and survival rates—passing on their fitness traits to subsequent generations. No biological mechanism was proposed by Darwin. He simply speculated that small variations over long periods of time filtered by *natural selection* produced new species. Racists, eugenicists, naturalists and atheists found intellectual benefit in this idea and developed it further. In his book “Descent of Man” Darwin argued the need for “superior races”, meaning the white race, to replace “inferior races”. In the early 20th century, European and American nations had state-sanctioned eugenics programs. Most of Darwin’s prominent followers until the mid-20th century were eugenicists. However, after World War II, discussions of eugenics were no longer public. Darwinism “undeniably comforted racists, sanctioned imperialism and actively promoted eugenics.”¹⁴³

The limitation with the earliest form of Darwinism was that it did not touch the actual process of speciation itself. No mechanisms were outlined at this stage.

The second stage began to enter the scene during the 1930s in which Mendelian genetics and probability statistics were combined with the concept of natural selection—or survival of the fittest—to produce what is known as **neo-Darwinism** or more accurately, the **modern synthesis**. Staunch atheists and eugenicists with racist

¹⁴³ Depew, D.J. & Weber, B.H. *The Fate of Darwinism: Evolution after the Modern Synthesis*. Biological Theory 6 :89. (2011).

tendencies—like Julian Huxley (d. 1975)¹⁴⁴—saw in Darwinism a justification for their ideological beliefs. In 1959, a Chicago conference commemorating the hundred year anniversary of Darwin's *Origins*, was used to propel the Modern Synthesis—in the absence of any substantial challenge—to popularity.¹⁴⁵ This modern synthesis asserts that novelty in biological design and speciation occurred through **random mutations** in genes which confer advantages to biological organisms in their phenotypical expressions. These organism reproduce and outlive other organisms because they are better adapted to the environment. This is referred to as **natural selection**. As a result, the particular mutation is carried on through generations—becoming fixed within a population—and the process continues. The biological diversity in life is claimed to have arisen through this mechanism in a gradual, incremental fashion, over very long geological timescales.

In this stage, Darwinism was purged of eugenics, imperialism and racism—despite the presence of some racist, eugenicist advocates—and mathematised with probability theory to make it appear a legitimate science. It was because of receiving a new synthesis that Darwinism did not suffer the fate of other pseudo-sciences such as Marxism and Freudianism.

Very quickly however, the untenability of this theory became evident to certain researchers when they realised that selection must operate upon the **whole organism** at the **reproductive level** and is therefore completely blind to individual mutations. This is what led to the invention of **population genetics** as a means of overcoming

¹⁴⁴ In 1942 Julian Huxley published, "Evolution: The Modern Synthesis". In the book "The Retreat of Scientific Racism" (Cambridge University Press, 1992), the author, Elazar Barkan, writes in a section titled, "A Racist Liberal: Julian Huxley's Early Years", that Huxley wrote for the *Spectator* magazine in which he stated that "the negro mind is as different from the white mind as the negro from the white body." p. 178.

¹⁴⁵ Vassiliki Betty Smocovitis. *The 1959 Darwin Centennial Celebration in America*. Osiris. Vol. 14, Commemorative Practices in Science: Historical Perspectives on the Politics of Collective Memory (1999), pp. 274-323.

this problem through sleight of hand. This is discussed in more detail in a later chapter. Later population geneticists started investigating mutation rates and *the cost of selection* which led to the discovery of fatal problems for the theory.¹⁴⁶

The essence of the problem is that the rate of deleterious mutations in humans is verifiably so high that human existence could not have been maintained by the relatively low reproduction rates and at the same time natural selection is not powerful enough and operating on a large enough scale to prevent human extinction by selecting for the miniscule amounts of beneficial mutations. Humans should have become extinct millions of years ago. Further, the large deleterious mutation rate shows that *devolution* is taking place, not *evolution*. A human must have *devolved* from its closest ancestor, rather than evolved giving the high deleterious mutation rate. Further, the vast majority of mutations are below the detection threshold for natural selection. As a result most bad mutations accumulate unhindered by the selection process. This results in a downward decline in fitness from generation to generation. Because bad mutations outnumber favourable ones by such a large factor, their cumulative effect utterly overwhelms and renders of no significance the effect of the few favorable mutations that may arise. These realities are well-known to certain population geneticists but not to all evolutionary biologists. For that reason, the vast majority of evolutionists operate on the presumption that neo-Darwinism has solid foundations when it is in fact built upon a dream and a fantasy. This reason alongside many others is why evolutionary theory is currently in a crisis and conferences have been held to redevelop—as was done in the 1930s and 1940s—a *new synthesis*.

The problems discovered were kept as trade secrets researched only within certain ranks and not publicised. For this reason, almost

¹⁴⁶ From them, J.B.S. Haldane (1957), M. Kimura (1968), H.J. Muller (1950, 1964), J.V. Neel (1986), A.S. Kondrashev (1995), M.W. Nachman and S.L. Crowell (2000). A. Eyre-Walker and P. Keightley (1999), J.F. Crow (1997), L. Lowe (2006). For more details on this subject refer to J.C. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy* (2006). New York: FMS Publications.

all neo-Darwinian evolutionary biologists who are specialists, let alone those less than them and let alone the laymen, are not aware that what they believe to be factual has no empirical basis.¹⁴⁷ This doctrine is peddled today by charlatan atheists like Richard Dawkins through the device of clever science-fiction storytelling.¹⁴⁸

When the fossil record failed to validate neo-Darwinism, a revised version was suggested by Stephen J. Gould and Niles Eldredge in 1972, called **punctuated equilibrium**. Instead of speciation being completely gradual, there are occasional short bursts of rapid speciation. This proposed modification was to reconcile the theory with the fossil record which was unsupportive and non-cooperative to Darwinists. However, neo-Darwinian religious fundamentalists were not pleased and attacks were made on the new theory and its heretical promoters. The theory was eventually “retired”. The split which occurred was between a sudden “organism-level” explanation of evolution and a gradual “genetic-level” explanation of evolution. The latter came out on top because the neo-Darwinian modern synthesis promoters were able to crush the new idea.

The third stage, known as the **extended evolutionary synthesis**. This is the current stage. There is increasing awareness that gene-centric neo-Darwinism or the modern synthesis (as an all-inclusive

¹⁴⁷ Refer to the section below on *Faith in Mystery and Miracles* for further details on this matter.

¹⁴⁸ For more information on the move away from the modern synthesis refer to: Margulis L. *Symbiotic Planet: A New Look at Evolution*. New York: Basic Books; 1998; Jablonka E, Lamb M. *Evolution in Four Dimensions*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press; 2005; Noble D. *The Music of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006; Okasha S. *Evolution and the Levels of Selection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006; Beurton PJ, Falk R, Rheinberger H-J. *The Concept of the Gene in Development and Evolution: Historical and Epistemological Perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2008; Shapiro JA. A 21st century view of evolution: genome system architecture, repetitive DNA, and natural genetic engineering. *Gene*. 2005;345:91–100; Pigliucci M, Müller GB. *Elements of an extended evolutionary synthesis*. In: Pigliucci M, Muller GB, editors. *Evolution: The Extended Synthesis*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press; 2010a. pp. 3–17.

explanation) is false and many evolutionary biologists have started to develop alternative theories. Basically, the old story—neo-Darwinism, the modern synthesis with its gene-centric focus—has crumbled in the face of contrary evidence coupled with advances in molecular biology and the findings of the Human Genome Project. Hence, they are scrambling to write the next story by combining their best current theories.¹⁴⁹ Broadly speaking, they are moving back towards the **organism level** version of evolution because the gene-level version has been empirically falsified and shown to be impossible. What this means is that they have to find alternative naturalistic explanations except that it is now much more difficult for them given that the DNA-gene-cell system is being increasingly looked at from a digital cybernetic programming perspective. The modern synthesis was powerful and gave atheists, naturalists and materialists intellectual fulfilment. With that gone, they are now in a scramble and have a much weaker position than before. The balance has swayed.

One old deity has been falsified and they are erecting others in its place, or merging all the deities into one supreme deity, the master deity, one that is devoid of knowledge, will, power—ignorant, blind and purposeless. Thus, the same wild claims are being reformulated with more cryptic language and loaded terminology: *self-organization*, *self-assembly*, *dissipative structures*, *emergence*, *complexity at the edge of chaos* and so on. All of this complex, cryptic language aims to prove the true and real doctrine: random, undirected forces representing ignorance, blindness, and purposelessness exhibit amazing creative power giving the illusion of design. Or to put it in its crudest form:

¹⁴⁹ “Alternatives to the Modern Synthesis include: symbiogenesis, the idea that major steps in evolution, such as the formation of eukaryotes and multicellular organisms, resulted from cooperation and/or fusion between different organisms; horizontal gene transfer within and between organisms, a process now known to extend beyond prokaryotes; and the inheritance of acquired characteristics, commonly but mistakenly called ‘Lamarckism’.” Denis Noble. *Neo-Darwinism, the Modern Synthesis and selfish genes: are they of use in physiology?* J Physiol. 2011 Mar 1; 589(Pt 5): 1007–1015.

creation comes about without a wilfully chosen action from a knowing purposeful agent.

Evolutionary theory is all about proving this false assertion. One should recall the central, underlying scam upon which the atheist religion is built. It is to grant nature the attributes of knowledge, will, power, purpose and then conceal this through the use of ambiguous, cryptic language and terminology. The primitives of old worshipped nature after giving it divine attributes whereas the modern sophists—the atheists, materialists and naturalists—grant nature divine attributes because they suffer from cosmic authority syndrome, a deep-rooted hatred and resentment that there should be a commanding divine authority over the universe at all.

Incidentally, the end-result, the ultimate and inevitable conclusion of the theology of *Ahl al-Kalām* (speculative theologians), such as the Jahmites, Muʿtazilites, Ashʿarites and Māturidites—who engaged in debates with the atheists and philosophers—is that creation came about without any act of creation established with Allāh’s self.¹⁵⁰ In accepting the conceptual tools and baggage of the philosophy of the naturalists and attempting to debate them, they outlined a theology the sum of which was what has just been stated. No act of creation can be ascribed to a creator because the argument employed to prove a creator would then necessitate his non-existence. This logical conclusion is hidden to those who follow this theology because of the complexity and intricacy involved in the terms and arguments employed.

In a similar, manner those Muslims who have been deceived and believe in evolution as outlined by the atheists and naturalists, **the only eventual logical outcome** is for them to deny the existence of a creator, let alone deny that any act of creation can be ascribed to a creator. Richard Dawkins stated: “Before Darwin came along, it was pretty difficult to be an atheist, at least to be an atheist free of nagging doubts. Darwin triumphantly made it easy to be an

¹⁵⁰ For more details refer to the website <http://www.asharis.com>.

intellectually fulfilled and satisfied atheist. That doesn't mean that understanding Darwin drives you inevitably to atheism. But it certainly constitutes a giant step in that direction."¹⁵¹

Today, a conflict exists between neo-Darwinian modern synthesis fundamentalists like Richard Dawkins and those calling for an extended evolutionary synthesis like Lynn Margulis, Denis Noble and others who staunchly reject the modern synthesis and want it replaced altogether. Atheists are psychologically disturbed by these developments because abolishing the modern synthesis means that atheistic "intellectual fulfilment" disappears with it, and they are left where they were, with "nagging doubts". At present there is nothing on the table because the new "extended synthesis" has not even been devised.

As stated at the beginning of this work, the evolutionists can be divided into the following groups:

a) **Neo-Darwinian religious fundamentalists** who are staunch believers in the modern synthesis.

b) **Disbelievers and apostates** who reject the modern synthesis and are working for a new synthesis.

c) **Liberalists** who are looking for a ways to reconcile between the two and work to accommodate conflicting views within an extended evolutionary synthesis.

The rug has been pulled from beneath the atheist materialist position. The edifice is crumbling. Atheists like Thomas Nagel¹⁵² reject neo-Darwinian materialism and staunch Darwinists such as Michael Ruse¹⁵³ affirm that Darwinian evolution began as a religion, always was and continues to be a religion today.

¹⁵¹ In a comment on the Guardian newspaper website on 29 December 2008 in response to an article by Madeleine Bunting.

¹⁵² Refer to Thomas Nagel's book, *"Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False"*, Oxford University Press, 2012.

¹⁵³ Refer to *How Evolution Became a Religion: Creationists Correct?* National Post, pp. B1,B3,B7 May 13, 2000. In November 2016, Oxford University Press published Ruse's book, *"Darwinism as Religion."*