Twelve Scientific Arguments Against Darwinism

by S.R. Weber

Free PDF available at yoga6d.org/beyonddarwin.pdf
Written November 24th 2017. Acknowledgements in particular to conversations with the physicist David Bohm in his office at Birkbeck College, 1986, 1987 and 1989, and to his book, Wholeness and the Implicate Order, London, Routledge, 1980.

While there is somewhat more support for darwinism than for flat-earth theory, it doesn't mean that alternative theories--of a rational, scientific kind--are impossible.

1. Science proceeds chiefly by means of observation of experiments in which something is varied and something other is observed to vary in correlation with this and alternative theories are made to account for these observations.

There can be no experiment that proves that randomness has played a chief factor in the emergence of, say, human beings, in the distant past--because it is about the distant past.

2. The fact that mutations are observed in elementary micro-organisms in the digestive tracts--and other such places--are neither proof that these mutations are, (1),

random, or (2) the same type of thing that have shaped all life over the time periods imagined by darwinists and neo-darwinists of various kinds.

3. The notion of 'survival of the fittest' (gene or organism) is talked of as if it were a proven principle operating on life. But there is in the theory of Darwinism no room whatsover for any holistic, over-arching principle that overrule dumb local cause and effect and chance. So, rather than using the concept of 'survival of the fittest' to show that darwinistic theory supposedly is right, it is one of the things that must itself be shown to be right--unless it is merely a trivial truth by virtue of the definition of the words (ie, if one define 'fittest' to be 'that which survives').

So this is a postulated effect of random fluctuations in interaction with dumb casual forces. Since it is an effect, it cannot be used in a scientific theory of how life originated as if it was a causal factor. Rather, there is no causal factor: there is only dumb causes and effects and fluctuations that are postulated to be random, in the essence of the theory. The theory cannot therefore be defended by referring to how 'survival of the fittest' seems to explain things; and this is an argument against several parts of the defense of the theory of darwinism.

4. Notions of 'many millions of years' and such rely heavily on a bit of physics that associates certain changes in certain substancies on Earth with other

assumptions as to how common radioactive changes are. There is obviously no scientific evidence that actually proves that such time periods indeed have proceeded the present state of life on Earth. The findings are very indicative but there is no proof. These findings are completely compatible with a wide variety of other views of how the universe manifested, such as from an implicate order, in which the imagined axis of time can be seen as coming, in a way, 'sideways' out of a deeper order--such descriptions are more rather than less meaningful given the developments in physics after Charles Darwin.

5. Computer simulations that uses some kind of relatively free fluctuation generation in combination with something much like 'dumb cause and effect patterns' can give a sense of how little randomness--in contrast to what dawrinists seem to think--can actually create of interesting structures. Even trillions of years would seem way too little given all the chance fluctuations that would be necessary to create even a sliver of life. Darwinists seem to put away logical thinking in favour of a fanciful idea of statistics with little foundation in rationality. (While fractal equations can give something vaguely similar in superficial appearance to leaves of trees and such, these equations feed into themselves recursively and the meagre results that come from these fractal equations all depend on a holistic pattern-forming process that is excluded by the reliance of darwinists on dumb local cause-and-effect patterns.)

6. Science proceeds by consciously erecting alternative theories over the same set of data, given a knowing, amongst well-educated scientists, that any set of data is compatible with countless theories. The claim that the theory of evolution of life according to Charles Darwin and his successors is the only true theory of the origin of life is unscientific even before we begin to look into its content. (Theories aren't true--they are more or less confirmed, and not to the exclusion of other theories.)

7. Since the time of Charles Darwin, the understanding of the complexity of the structure and physiology of the human being has expanded to a point where scientists generally are in a state of awe about the majestic subtlety and vastness of the structure. This scientific progress comes not as a result of darwinism, but rather as a result of better measuring equipment of a technological kind being employed by biologists, and is an argument against the simplistic view of life taken by the early darwinists. It is an argument in favour of something far more efficient and precise and coherent than randomness over some millions of years to be necessary as foundation to begin to understand how this miracle can arise.

8. When concepts such as 'chance' or 'random' gets into a scientific theory, it may mean that the theory hasn't been advanced beyond a preliminary stage. Reliance on a concept of the unknown--which is what 'chance factors' is all

about--isn't a good sign for a scientific theory.

9. Darwinism chiefly makes sense given a worldview that isn't upset by modern physics; it makes most sense given a cozy newtonian mechanistic universe of the kind that physicists have known for more than a century doesn't exist. It isn't a theory that has any understanding built into it of the concept of such whole fields as characterise not just subatomic findings, but indeed also macroscopic phenomena of the kind summarized under the heading of 'quantum biology'.

10. Darwinism reliance on the concept of past time--much, much past time--allows darwinists to suggest a fairly meaningful explanation of the presence of fossils. Without denying the evidence of fossils, there can be other explanations of these fossils. In some explanations--in some alternative theories of them--they may be described in terms of a timelike process that hasn't actually unfolded step by step the way evolutionary mainstream biologists typically assume. In other explanations, the leaps rather than the continuity are emphasized, with the implicit suggestions that while many forms of life may have existed, including many more primitive forms of life, the transition to more advanced forms of life need not have occurred by means of myriad tiny steps that by chance came out right. Rather, the mutations are then asserted to be created by something which is not a chance. The lack of a much-discussed set of alternative theories isn't a sign

that these alternative theories are non-scientific, but rather a sign of there being a too-strong paradigm--a form of lameness in thought--in present-day mainstream biology. This is connected to fear that political fundamentalism will sort of explode in popularity if the mainstream biologists show any dissent in their own literalist belief in their current pet theory. The uniformity of expression of mainstream biologists is itself a sign that the scientific discourse isn't taking place on essential assumptions, only on more superficial assumptions, and this is an argument against believing in the rationality and coherence whether of darwinism or some sort of neo-darwinism.

11. In the general theory of life that darwinism outlines, the brain--including the brains of these scientists, presumably--have arisen not by means of any active holistic creation principle but rather as a result, unguided and entirely according to chance, over a long period of time. One must therefore presume that the thoughts that arise in the brains of these scientists are not there due to any active holistic principle such as 'consciousness', but they merely come forth as a result of a similar type of 'struggle for survival' as these darwinists speak about as taking place in Nature. In other words, these thoughts cannot be taken to be the result of a careful aware self-critical attentive conscious process deep within the souls of these scientists--we must rather consider them chancelike

products of thought. But science is about applying conscious awareness to reach an objective map of reality also by means of suspending likes and dislikes and rather spinning alternative views, given calm consideration of empirical data. One cannot see that mainstream darwinists are engaging in a scientific, rational process.

12. In defence of the darwinistic and neo-darwinistic theory of the evolution and origin of life, including human life--which by these people is simply called, "Evolution" (with a capital "E", and most often without reference to the word 'theory', as if the mere hint of doubt would seem to them to be a breach with their professionalism)--it is often claimed that the only alternatives are 'absurd' or worse, and they refer to the alternatives by means of the textbook versions of religions' creation stories that they learned on school. But, since the time of Aristotle and Goethe in the West, and similarly in other cultures, and all through the 20th century there have been the occasional spinning of alternative theories of the origin of human and natural life, both with and without evolution, over a short or a long period of time. The fact that this seems to be unknown to the mainstream biologists is an indication, again, that a nonscientific irrational process is characterising present-day biology and that therefore, their theory of darwinism cannot be trusted to have undergone a proper scientific confirmation/disconfirmation process.

Let us add to this point that if merely a percentage of the money going into the mainstream biologists budgets were devoted to creating non-darwinistic theories of evolution and non-darwinistic theories of the origin of the human being of a non-evolutionary kind, we would certainly have very many more such theories. And, with likelihood, literalist believers of the fundamentalist kind would perhaps become more interested in this new and unusual genuinely scientific process than in their own breed of unthinking belief. There is no reason, therefore, of an ethical kind to avoid diversifying core biology towards new theories of the origin of life and human beings.

Footnotes

(Added November 27th, 2017. Above text incl grammar is untouched)

1.

Connected to the selection process of alternative theories given a set of data. In Oslo, connected to Willard v.O. Quine, at June 25th, 1993--hosted by Donald Davidson and Dagfinn Follesdal on behalf of the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, in honor of Quine's 85th birthday--there was a seminar. In that seminar I directed a question to Dr. Davidson--which in short was, "Is it always simple to tell (eg in physics) which of the theories that is the simplest?" After Davidson's reply, Quine himself added his voice, and forcefully suggested that, in essence, "It isn't always simple!".

2.

The notion of "survival of the fittest" and the closely related concept "natural selection" are, of course, headings for a somewhat more elaborate set of concepts, but the key points indicated above hold. Associated with these phrases are other such abbreviations--commonly used in papers on biology--such as "evolutionary advantage" or "selective advantage" and many more. The underlaying set of concepts, however, are exactly as stated.