

The Linacre Quarterly

Volume 71 | Number 1

Article 7

February 2004

Why Evolutionary Theories Are Unbelievable

Samuel A. Nigro

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Nigro, Samuel A. (2004) "Why Evolutionary Theories Are Unbelievable," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 71: No. 1, Article 7.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol71/iss1/7>

Why Evolutionary Theories Are Unbelievable

by

Samuel A. Nigro, M.D.

The author is a 1961 graduate of St. Louis University School of Medicine. He spent three years as medical officer for the USS George Washington, the first nuclear missile submarine. Since 1969, he has been a private practitioner of child, adolescent, adult and family psychiatry.

Graffito:

I am God. — Kant
God is dead — Nietzsche
Kant and Nietzsche are dead. — God

Belief in evolution was possible for me during medical school to the degree that I was rapidly losing my Catholic faith. Then I read a book review in *Scientific American* (around 1956?) on *The Phenomenon of Man*, Teilhard de Chardin's seminal work. The reviewer, one of the Huxleys, I think, wrote a startling review in that he acknowledged the profundity of Teilhard's ideas but was still hopeful that someone someday would refute Teilhard because such was beyond Huxley's ability.

I immediately bought and read *The Phenomenon of Man* and have been a Teilhardian ever since. He literally saved my soul. I have all of his translated works. Teilhard gave evolution a religious understanding for me. My interpretation of his work, simply put, is that evolution demonstrated the appearance of a level of animal awareness followed by a level of consciousness of consciousness (C²) confined to humans; and that the next level of evolution would be a *personal* transition back to God.

That interpretation of Teilhard still stands from my perspective, although I know many disagree. Still, with Teilhard's theories, as I have interpreted them, I was able to maintain complete and absolute unflinching faith in Jesus, His Church and evolution. Until now.

During the past several decades, I have become more and more aware that theories of evolution leave much to be desired, so much so that I offer this article to provide three major reasons why evolution cannot be believed any longer. Teilhardian ideas may serve well for those believing in evolution, but evolution itself no longer needs to be believed because of:

- (I) Examples of extreme improbabilities in the universe which absolutely render evolution untenable.
- (II) Critiques which incontrovertibly undermine evolutionary theories.
- and
- (III) The biases of scientists

I. Four Examples of Why Evolution is Improbable

(1) Gödel's Theorems are totally unpredictable and improbable! Gödel's first theorem is that in a system of complexity, questions exist that are neither provable nor disprovable on the basis of the axioms in the system; that is, true statements are **undecidable** even if known to be true because they cannot be decided as true on the basis of the system as known. Gödel's second theorem is that the system is always **incomplete** because new undecidable elements will always be present such that contradictions occur when the system claims it has decided all; that is, the system will generate more undecidability.

Gödel's Theorems apply to the most spiritual formalities of the human mind's mathematical spirit, i.e., formal mathematics. If **undecidability** and **incompleteness** are present in such an extreme mathematical formality, how much more so are they present in everything else man does. Basically, Gödel's Theorems prove the Doctrine of Original Sin, the need for the sacrament of penance, and that there is a future eternity. Gödel's Theorems mean that, in the human complex, things will go wrong and there will always be a "defect" of sorts about which forgiveness and corrective action will be needed.

Furthermore, this human complex continues to become increasingly complex and it will never end as long as the system continues. Gödel's Theorems prove that man is on a treadmill of physical and mental entropy (sin), perpetually needing the sacrament of penance. From science to bombs, from the Bible to pornography, from Walt Disney to Michael Eisner, from birth to abortion, from marital bliss to gratuitous sex, from the Summa to the New York Times, from the Church to solipsism, from

universal magisterium to power, from Isaac Newton to Peter Singer, man will be sinful at worst and undecidable/incomplete at best.

Never more evident than by Gödel's Theorems is proven the need for sacramental grace to mitigate and overcome the omnipresent potential for incompleteness and undecidability leading to anti-transcendental outcomes (entropy and sin). The only way to overcome Gödel's Theorems is by confession followed by the other sacraments. We are undecidable, incomplete and sinful. We need reparation and all other sacraments in all that we do. In fact, we need God to complete ourselves! Science cannot account for these Divine Reminders of our defects, which includes the arrogance of scientists. Gödel's Theorems prove that.

(2) The great British scientist Bernard Lovel has stated:

That the moment one second after its expansion started, had the rate of expansion been reduced by only one part in a thousand billion, then the universe would have collapsed after a few million years... the only universe that can exist in the sense that it can be known, is simply the one which satisfied the narrow conditions necessary for the development of intelligent life.

This scientist also said:

Assembling a small protein molecule of 100 amino acid residues would require some 10 to the 130th power trial assemblies to obtain the correct sequence. The probability of achieving this within a billion years is effectively zero.

So try assembling a human animal. The expansion of the universe and molecular complexification are to win the lottery over and over again. The improbability is astronomical.

(3) Another internationally renowned scientist, Walter T. Brown, Jr. said:

Laboratory synthesized amino acids always form in equal amounts of mirror-image structures termed "left handed" and "right handed." Amino acids that comprise the proteins found in living things, including plants, animals, bacteria, molds and even viruses, are essentially all left handed. The mathematical probability that chance processes can produce just one tiny protein molecule with only left handed amino acids is virtually zero.

Evolution cannot account for this improbability.

(4) Freedom! As I describe it in “The Attainment of Psychological Freedom” (*Social Justice Review*, November/December 2002, pp. 176-179), personal freedom is subordinate to the transcendentals. Freedom is not “anything goes” but consists of acts of transcendental intent for truth, oneness, good and beauty.

Psychological *freedom* is an ontological natural activity of man, distinguishing him from subhumans, by which he, through intellect and will seeking perfection, achieve transcendental existence, that is, knowing, loving and serving God in this life and attaining ultimate freedom with God in the next. Psychological freedom consists not only of the chosen act itself but of its transcendental intention. By such transcendental intention, man can be free **unlike** all other creatures which remain confined to matter. It is against common sense and evolution itself to proclaim otherwise.

That man’s psychological freedom goes beyond matter is undeniable. This fact confirms a limitless future with God, i.e., the ultimate freedom from matter. No one who tries to understand the planet, the mind, and science, can deny the awesome significance of psychological freedom as we escape from matter. Only a theophobe would deny an even **more free future**. This personal “evolution” is confirmed by human psychological freedom which itself proves a fantastic transcendental freedom in our future beyond all comprehension, except by the word “eternity.” How can evolution account for this except by paradoxically denying itself?

II. Critiques Which Incontrovertibly Undermine Evolutionary Theories

(1) Dennis Bonnett’s *Origin of the Human Species* — which defines well the problems of evolutionary theory recognizing it as a philosophy of atheistic naturalism and not science.

(2) *Forbidden Archeology the Hidden History of the Human race* (by Michael A. Cremo & Richard L. Thompson) details unimpeachable findings of anatomically modern humans in Early Pleistocene and Pliocene — findings which invalidate contemporary human evolution theory totally. Besides that, this book is filled with documented archeological findings many times over debunking evolutionary theory.

(3) *The Atomic Constants, Light and Time* (by Trevor Norman and Barry Sutterfield) assert that the best speed of light readings from 1740 to 1983 show a decay rate in the speed of light from 2.79 kilometers per second per year. One can only shake one’s head at their findings. Their data is quite impressive. It needs to be confirmed. Another book proposing the same

idea is *Faster Than the Speed of Light/The Story of a Scientific Speculation* by Joao Magueijo. The results of a decrease in the speed of light are astonishing! Such is almost unbelievable, but the evidence seems to be there. Do we unscientifically discard it because it does not fit? Do we call the researchers frauds? Do we see another improbability which can only confirm God's presence because evolution is unnecessary to explain it all?

(4) The book *Intelligent Design Creationism and its Critics/Philosophical, Theological and Scientific Perspectives* deserves consideration regardless of the negative review in the New York Times book review (April 4, 2002). That reviewer's criticism emphasizes that "imperfections in the biological world" argue against God.

Odd arrangements and funny solutions are the proof of evolution — paths that a sensible God would never tread but that a natural process, constrained by history, follows perforce.

So says scientist Stephen J. Gould, who obviously does not understand or believe that God created a free world with entropy and evil, including misguided freedom. The New York Times reviewer says that the book is not "a slam-dunk for theism" and that the case for an "intellectually fulfilled creationist" is not made. On the other hand, most assuredly, the case for an intellectually fulfilled evolutionist has not been made either, but the dishonest press and reviewers are as dishonest as the evolution scientists they promote. This book may not confirm God, but nothing confirms evolution.

III. The Biases of Scientists

(1) Contrary to popular lore, the Galileo controversy proves not the misdeeds of the Church, but the untrustworthiness of scientists and anti-God promoters. Galileo was not even honest, having fraudulently presented the telescope as his own invention to the Venetian Senate. An accurate reading of the Church vs. Galileo is that Galileo was making outrageous claims that he had proven that the earth moved around the sun by his calculations from ocean tides. Galileo did not **prove** such. And he had no right to be making grandiose claims about the alleged implications of such. He was eventually proven correct in the late 19th century by stellar parallax and by Foucault's pendulum experiment, but Galileo did not prove any heliocentrism in his day. The anti-historical, anti-scientific, untrue portrayal of the Church v. Galileo is an incontrovertible proof of the gullibility of the scientific community.

(2) The failure of scientists to acknowledge the debt owed to the Church for “science” itself is another proof of theophobic neuroses. The Parisian clerics Jean Buridan and Bishop Oresme gave birth to contemporary science. While there were several false starts of science elsewhere in the previous thousands of years, such early science efforts were stillbirths because the belief systems extant in those times were not able to sustain viable scientific processes.

Only Christianity had (and has) a linear outlook of the earth in terms of a natural beginning and natural end such that stable scientific procedures remained. The unique linearity of Christian theology impelled these Parisian clerics to believe that God gave motion to the planets and that this motion could be studied. In brief, profoundly but simply put, the idea of an interminable treadmill at birth and re-birth would no longer paralyze nascent scientific efforts to study the world. Only Christianity would give a linear existence requiring the study of linear motion. And that is how contemporary science began. (Read Stanley L. Jaki’s *A Mind’s Matter — An Intellectual Autobiography*)

(3) Scientists discredit themselves by abortion, which discredits all who are not against abortion as a “medical procedure.” Actually, anyone for abortion or who does not protest abortion has forfeited the right for moral argumentation about anything and has proven themselves gullible and susceptible to anti-life activity, discrediting them completely.

First of all, one must realize that **abortionists would be willing to kill you.** (Anyone who performs, is for, or does not protest abortion IS an abortionist!) Abortionists may not kill you **now**, but they would have **then**. Because abortionists would have killed you, they cannot be believed about anything, right or wrong.

Second, abortion is unacceptable because of the advances of science in terms of the uniqueness of each human individual. Today life is known in its uniqueness to basic material units at the level of one cell, one crystal, one bacterium, one virus, one molecule, one atom, and subatomic particles or waves as the case may be. Presently today we have molecule-sized circuitry, quantum-dot-cellular-automata and precisely patterned electron housing. Microanalytic techniques include laser pulses, micromotion, microknives, and micropipettes all with calculations in nanoseconds. There is nanotechnology! It is absurd for scientists, or anyone else for that matter, to deny the unique humanity and personhood internal to the undeniable beginning of each human being with the union of one sperm and one egg, the significance of which is awesome and undeniable (except for those who are unpersons, a status determined by the lack of commitment to the human species from natural beginning to natural end).

Abortion is microvictimization, a cruelly impersonal annihilation. Acceptance of abortion proves untrustability.

(4) Read *Moths and Men/An Evolutionary Tale: The Untold Story of Science and the Peppered Moth* by Judith Hooper. This book demonstrates fraud science run amok. It is a story of "human ambitions and self delusions shared amongst some of the most renowned evolutionary biologists of our era." The author describes the lepidopterists' studies thought to demonstrate natural selection in action as the white moth converts into a dark moth. And the whole thing was another scientific fraud. This is the story of an Oxford biologist, E.B. Ford, and an amateur lepidopterist, H.B.D. Kettleman. The Ford-Kettleman experiments were the most famous examples of evolution and one can still find textbooks showing the speckled moth showing up like a beacon while the dark moth is neatly concealed. Unfortunately, there turned out to be nothing "natural" about it. Some of Britain's most brilliant scientists promoted pure scientific fraud.

(5) Read *The Savior of Science* by Stanley Jaki and find Darwin to be a plagiarizer of ideas set down by another person some 20 years before. Find that Darwin stated "in the literal sense of the word, natural selection is a false term." In addition, "Selection in Relation to Sex" (the very subtitle of the *Descent*) has never to this day been demonstrated in wild populations and, in fact, counter-examples are abundant, i.e., the cuckoo, wherein the male is promiscuous and the female polyandrous, using other birds' nests for hatching their eggs. (Cuckoos and most other animals care little for "sex-selecting", it would appear.)

Conclusion

Until evolutionists, Darwinists, the press and media make the case for evolution by surviving the same degree of criticism inflicted upon creationists and intelligent design advocates, equal consideration, elaboration and promotion of both views is the only intellectually decent and honest way to proceed.

Teilhard's evolutionary scheme, as I project it, meant that evolution was a progressive sanctification and emancipation beginning with molecular complexification to the degree of matter folding back on itself to reflection, further leading to cerebral folding back on itself resulting in reflection on reflection free from matter by "consciousness squared" (C²), clearly adumbrating another level of freedom to spirituality by personal evolution to eternity with God.

If one believes in evolution, one has to be unscientific to assert that man is the ultimate end of evolution, if evolution. Given that, and properly understood in Teilhardian terms, evolution is no problem and demands an assent to a level of freedom at least equal to the immense difference in levels of freedom between man and subhuman creatures. Interpreted in such a way, one can almost hope that evolutionary theories were true. However, it does not mean evolution is true or necessary. Indeed, the evidence against evolution is overwhelming. The probability of evolution is about nil in terms of proof offered, the improbabilities to be explained and accounted for, the cogent intelligent criticism of evolution from many perspectives, and because of the theophobic biases of scientists themselves.
