

THE CASE FOR A SCIENTIFICALLY OBJECTIVE EVOLUTION CURRICULUM

By Randall Hedtke

Introduction

A great deal has been written and discussed about the origins issue in public education. The controversy centers on evolution versus special creation or intelligent design, which translates into science versus religion, at least that is the popular notion.

It is difficult to find a resolution for a conflict of ideas involving two separate and distinct domains. Then again, perhaps a disagreement between science and religion does not even exist. Perhaps the conflict is first and foremost entirely within the domain of science, between legitimate or real science and Darwin's particular brand of science. If so, the focus of that disagreement is on two distinctly different standards of scientific investigation. That being the case, a resolution to the origins curriculum in public education is entirely feasible.

The central question is whether evolution is accountable to real science or Darwin's substandard brand of science? In other words, the opposing entities are legitimate science versus Darwin's pseudoscience. Darwin's brand of science is false science, mainly because his investigation into origins deliberately rejects the much-heralded scientific objectivity. Religion does enter in as a motivational factor. Darwin's preconceived belief in evolutionary naturalism was his motivation for departing from legitimate science. Legitimate science would not provide the credibility he needed for his argument. In fact, legitimate science is designed to challenge the validity of theories. As a consequence, the curriculum does not challenge evolution instead it is promoted and propagandized at every opportunity. It comes across as browbeating students into an acceptance of evolution. The big fraud is students think they are being taught real science but it is nothing more than Darwinian pseudoscience.

The popular notion is evolution can have no religious connection because it comes to us under the auspices of science. The fact of the matter is the question of origins is the preeminent question for nearly all religions; therefore, any answer to the question of origins, whether originating from science or theology is bound to have religious underpinnings. Given the inherently religious nature of the question of origins, it is quite likely there is no such thing as a secular explanation for origins. Evolution, for example, is a doctrine of Religious Humanism:

Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created. Humanism believes that man is part of nature and that he emerged as the result of a continuous process (Kurtz, 1984, p. 8).

Thus when evolution is taught, it becomes a medium for intrinsically evangelizing the beliefs and values of Religious Humanism. Religious humanists have a very cozy setup—they are allowed to have their explanation for origins taught to the exclusion of other religions and at the taxpayers' expense.

Darwinian Pseudoscience

When reading the *Origin*, one discovers a great deal of speculation but very little substance. One also comes across several procedures that are a departure from real

science, such as, utilizing hoped-for evidence rather than real time evidence, the use of an analogy to try to prove natural selection and, most importantly, the rejection of alternative points of view, which in science parlance is known as counterinduction. These procedures are unscientific, which means they defy common sense. Science is nothing more than the application of common sense.

No investigator in any other field of endeavor would seriously consider utilizing the pseudoscientific procedures that Darwin applied. In any other field of endeavor it would be apparent that those procedures are not designed to seek truth but indicate that the investigator believes he already knows what truth is. If evolution were any other theory, the science establishment would consider Darwin's procedures unacceptable and even ludicrous.

Darwin is on record as admitting that the fossil record, with its absence of numerous intermediate fossils, contradicts his idea of evolution. But Darwin, true to form, attempts to explain away the absence of numerous intermediate fossils:

The geological record is extremely imperfect and this fact will to a large extent explain why we do not find intermediate varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life by the finest graduated steps. He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory (Gould, 1977, p.76).

According to Darwin's way of thinking, evolution is valid while the search for numerous intermediate fossils continues. That does not make sense. Instead, it should be, the theory is invalid unless numerous intermediate fossils are discovered. That makes sense. So far the alleged numerous intermediate fossils have remained elusive. Real scientists deal with evidence in real time and not with what they hope the evidence will be at some time in the future. Nevertheless the science establishment allowed Darwin to get away with it.

One test for the validity of a theory is its ability to fulfill a prediction. Darwin's theory can not fulfill the prediction for the discovery of numerous intermediate fossils; consequently, he had to abandon real time evidence and go to hoped-for future evidence.

An obvious alternative explanation as to why numerous intermediate fossils are not found could be that natural selection is not happening. In the *Origin* Darwin consumed many pages attempting to prove natural selection by making it analogous to the artificial selection of domesticated plant and animals. Real science places little value on analogies. Darwin's analogy has been removed from some, if not all textbooks, probably because the analogy can be turned around and artificial selection can be used to reveal the impossibility of natural selection. As the names imply, natural selection and artificial selection are not analogous, but the antithesis of one another. The analogy should be returned to the textbooks and students should be taught how to turn it around from an asset to a liability for evolution. An analysis of the natural selection/artificial selection analogy is in the *Great Evolution Curriculum Hoax*.

Who stated, "But analogy may be a deceitful guide"? Darwin did, near the end of the *Origin*, but that did not prevent him from using the natural selection/artificial selection analogy in the front of the book to deceive his readers (Darwin, 1872, p.370).

The following quote from the Introduction to the *Origin* reveals Darwin's rejection of alternative points of view or what is known as counterinduction:

For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in

this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question; and this cannot possibly be here done (Darwin, 1909, p. 20).

We see that Darwin was well aware of the vital importance of alternative points of view, yet he elected to proceed without them. Counterinduction is so vital to scientific methodology that to reject it is tantamount to classifying evolution as a doctrine rather than theory. Doctrines are articles of faith that one may voluntarily chose to question or not question, but one is required to question theories. The world fell for Darwin's audaciously, clever choice of words, "cannot possibly be here done". Certainly one cannot expect someone to do the impossible. But the reality is that what Darwin claims to be impossible is a routine necessity for science.

If we contrast Darwin's position with the high regard real scientist have for counterinduction, we see what a tremendous betrayal it is:

Therefore, the first step in our criticism of customary concepts and customary reactions is to step outside the circle and either to invent a new conceptual system, for example, a new theory that clashes with the most carefully established observational results and confounds the most plausible theoretical principles, or to import such a system from outside science, from religion, from theology, from the ideas of incompetents, or the ramblings of mad men. This first step is, again, counterinductive. Counterinduction is thus both a fact—science could not exist without it—and a legitimate and much needed move in the game of science (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 68).

The purpose of counterinduction is to reveal possible weaknesses in the theory in question and to instill open-mindedness. Darwin's rejection of counterinduction is an admission that his research does not represent real science. It can hardly stated more clearly. Of all the theories ever formulated since the advent of modern science, Darwin's theory (I use the word loosely) is probably the only one in which the science establishment allows a special dispensation to forgo counterinduction. There were objections to this turn of events within the science community, for example, Asa Gray, a contemporary of Darwin and a noted Harvard professor of botany, expressed the following objection regarding Darwin's research methods:

The mode in which illustrative facts are used indicates on the part of the author a bias which, to say the least of it, is very far from becoming in a lover of science (Gray, 1860, p. 480).

Again Gray states his objection:

In almost every page (of the *Origin*) we meet with facts which, as we shall have occasion to show, may be found as useful to an opponent as to an advocate of Mr. Darwin's views; while of many of them one cannot help standing in doubt as to their value, when considered even from the author's point of view (Gray, 1860, p. 457).

Gray was not the only critic of evolutionists, but evolutionists apparently had the momentum to shrug criticisms off. Perhaps they were aided by an illusion shared by others in the scientific community that after providing mankind with numerous new

technological developments to improve their quality of life, the crowning achievement would be to provide the masses with a scientific, even a pseudoscientific, explanation for the origin of life.

The Ramifications of Darwinian Pseudoscience

Let us now see how this all plays out. If the true concept of science does not exist without counterinduction and Darwin deliberately chose not to include counterinduction, does not that make his research unscientific and Darwin himself something less than a scientist? And, if evolution proponents granted Darwin a special dispensation not to include counterinduction, does not that make them something less than scientists or at least what Gray described as not lovers of science?

Ironically, by allowing Darwin to unscientifically exclude counterinduction from his explanation for origins, evolution proponents inadvertently opened the door to all explanations for origins. If evolutionists can have their explanation for origins in the biology curriculum while being unscientific in vitally important ways, why cannot all other explanation for origins be in the curriculum even if they too are considered unscientific in some way?

On the other hand, evolution needs biology as its evangelizing medium, but biology does not need evolution or any other explanation for origins for that matter. There is a great deal to teach in biology without even addressing the question of origins.

Yet, despite the unwarranted and unusual cooperation from the science establishment, which allowed Darwin to investigate according to his own unscientific rules, a threat to Darwin's research always remained. That threat is a rule of logic, which states: A single absolute conflict between fact and hypothesis is fatal to the hypothesis, *falsa in unofalsa in omnibus*. It is a simple rule of logic that people consciously or subconsciously practice in their daily routines. This means that some unforeseen evidence or some deeper analysis could manifest itself in a way that would make evolution logically indefensible. In that case it would not matter whether evolution is being sold as religious doctrine or scientific theory the consequences would be the same and all of the other evidence in the one-sided argument would not be worth the paper they are written on. And that, as we shall see, is exactly what happened when natural selection's incipency problem was brought to Darwin's attention.

The Role of Educators

Educators are not lackeys for the science establishment. We have our own professional standards to uphold. Darwin's brand of research does not represent legitimate science. Educators do not knowingly teach bad science because a segment of the science establishment or a segment of society wants it done. Counterinduction is as vital to educators as it should be to scientists. To educators, counterinduction spells the difference between education and indoctrination.

The problem is that professors in higher education graduate teachers who are uninstructed and unaware that the typical evolution curriculum is dogma masquerading as science. I am firmly convinced that a vast majority of teachers, once aware of that

deception, would not hesitate to incorporate scientific objectivity into the curriculum. I am also firmly convinced that a vast majority of parents would back them up.

I had already decided to be critical of the evolution evidence in the classroom and, after reading Darwin's rejection of alternative points of view, I knew I had made the right decision. When it comes right down to it evolution cannot be taught any other way and still claim to be a scientific theory. Theories do not exist to be blindly defended tooth and nail; they exist to be overthrown if possible. That is the scientific status of theories. The reason for the severe treatment of theories is practical and not personal. It is to prevent investigators in related fields from wasting time and effort on what could later turn out to be a false lead. All explanations for the origin of life, if they are in a science textbook, should expect a skeptical treatment of them. The last thing science is intended to do is promote theories for the purpose of fulfilling an individual's or an organization's private agenda.

I taught a scientifically objective evolution curriculum for many years and no parent or student ever objected. Some people in the community were seriously opposed to having evolution questioned, but they could do nothing about it. One tactic was to try to equate the questioning of evolution with teaching creation, but the evolution data can be questioned quite well without having to advance any other explanation for origins. The opposition could not publicly confess what they really wanted, which is to have evolution taught as an unquestionable doctrine, just as Darwin conceived it.

The evolution curriculum presently in the textbooks must be made accountable to legitimate science for several reasons. Legitimate science is secular whereas Darwinian pseudoscience is a religiously motivated form of science. The pseudoscientific presentation of the evolution data in the textbooks is dogmatic and therefore indoctrinating rather than educating, making it professionally unacceptable to educators. Students and parents expect the evolution curriculum to be representative of legitimate science and not Darwinian pseudoscience, which is rogue science.

In fact, evolution science is so bad that it becomes the perfect subject by which to teach scientific methodology. By introducing counterinduction, the problem and other unfavorable information that is censored, students may witness the transformation of evolution from a religious doctrine that does not have to abide by the principles of scientific inquiry to a theory. That is the only way an instructor can teach the curriculum and still maintain his professional integrity and the integrity of science.

Darwin's Capitulation and a New Origins Curriculum Code

Right around 1870 and shortly before the last edition of the *Origin* St. George Mivart pointed out the fatal flaw in the idea of natural selection as a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism. The fatal flaw has to do with incipient or rudimentary organs. According to the evolution scenario, organs would have to initially appear as useless, rudimentary structures, which over eons of time would eventually evolve into functional organs, at which time they would contribute to the organism's survival. But, during the incipient stages, even going back to the first conglomeration of cells, the organ would provide no survival advantage to the species.

The crux of the issue being that if natural selection cannot account for the incipient stages of development, when organs have no use, it cannot account for the existence of

fully developed organs and organisms. Mivart's conclusion is that the idea of natural selection as a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism is pure fantasy. Take a look at the imaginary examples of natural selection that textbook authors provide and one will note they pertain to fully developed organs and not the creation of those organs. For example, how giraffes evolved longer necks is an example of natural selection that textbook authors frequently use. But it is a false example natural selection because it fails to explain the origin of necks themselves, as they allegedly evolved through incipient stages, before they could contribute to the survival of the species.

The beauty of the incipency problem is one need not defer to so-called experts on the subject. Anybody with a modicum of common sense can recognize the impossibility of natural selection to create new species when incipency is taken into consideration.

Mivart reported his doubts about Darwinian evolution to T.H. Huxley. Mivart was probably blissfully unaware as to how dedicated Huxley was to Darwinian evolution. In fact, Huxley earned the sobriquet of "Darwin's bulldog" for his zealous promotion of Darwin's theory. Huxley was not about to brook any criticisms of evolution from his former student. In short order, the entire inner circle of Darwinists were made aware of Mivart's criticisms, or more accurately, to the Darwinists' mind-set, Mivart's betrayal. To their way of thinking, by trying to advance scientific criticisms of evolution, Mivart was also refuting the materialistic world-view that evolution represented to them. The legacy from the original Darwinists is a biased, dogmatic presentation of the evolution evidence in the typical secondary school evolution curriculum, which is not an inadvertent consequence of sloppy science, but an effort on the part of those responsible for the curriculum content to defend it as an essential component of their particular world-view.

To make a long story short, the Darwinists, rather than being scientifically objective and acknowledging the legitimacy of Mivart's criticisms, took it personally, as an affront to their belief system, and initiated the old ad hominem ploy: When unable to refute the message, then attack the messenger. Over the next few years, Mivart was ostracized as a turncoat; "The antipathy, gradually establishing the caricature of Mivart as a dogmatic and biased opponent of Darwinism, led for all practical purposes to the negation of his more pregnant observation." (Gruber, 1960, p. 80).

Meanwhile, Mivart had published a book entitled, *On the Genesis of Species*, in which he expounded on his evolution criticisms, paramount of which is the incipency problem. This made it necessary for Darwin to respond to Mivart, which Darwin did in the last edition of the *Origin*. Instead of attempting to refute the incipency problem, Darwin acknowledges its legitimacy; He had no other choice; nobody can address the incipency problem without acknowledging its indisputable refutation of natural selection. That is why, to this day, evolution proponents do not allow incipency into the evolution curriculum.

Darwin's mental acrobatics are difficult to follow. After recognizing the legitimacy of the incipency criticism, he continues as though everything is fine and dandy, by suggesting other methods of evolution that have absolutely no credibility. In other words, he abandoned natural selection, the mechanism that had become synonymous with evolution, yet somehow this is not supposed to diminish the belief that evolution is possible.

Darwin's capitulation statement stands out as something apart in its bluntness, yet at the same time, he appears to renege:

I have now considered enough, perhaps more than enough of the cases selected with care by a skilful naturalist to prove that natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures; and I have shown, as I hope, that there is no great difficulty on this head (Darwin, 1909, p. 243).

The "skilful naturalist" is Mivart, whom he mentions by name in the preceding pages. Mivart is the person who should be given credit for recognizing the incipency problem, yet Darwin addresses the issue as though he should be given credit for disproving his own theory.

Darwin's problem is how to capitulate without having a world of recrimination descend upon him? The worst scenario, but the proper one, would be to call a meeting of the top scientists and report the incipency problem. Instead, Darwin chose to write one last edition of the *Origin* and in it reveal the incipency problem. The incipency problem would be in the sixth edition for anybody to read—that is anybody who is willing to take the time to plow through the book. He certainly was not going to announce it as a new development in the Introduction. Then too, evolutionists who do read about the incipency problem, unless they are more dedicated to the principles of science than they are to the preservation of the theory, are going to be inclined, like the original Darwinists, to keep silent about it. So there the capitulation statement is, hidden in plain sight, destined to be excluded from the main body of knowledge about evolution.

In the capitulation statement, the wording after the semicolon may sound like he is immediately refuting the first part, but is meant to placate the evolution enthusiasts whom he let down with his abandonment of natural selection. To appease their disappointment and to persuade them that they may continue to believe in evolution, he goes on to suggest other methods of evolution. For example, Lamarck's now defunct theory of use and disuse, if a giraffe needs a long neck, nature will provide one by constant stretching. He also suggested a vague possibility of "variations without natural selection" and finally the possibility of every stage of evolution being useful for survival. In other words, an elimination of incipient parts altogether. The capitulation statement does it all for Darwin; it alleviates his conscience by addressing incipency and placates the evolution enthusiasts with alternative methods of evolution. Whether or not they are willing to accept those alternatives is their business. Darwin himself probably maintained a belief in evolution as an article of faith regardless of how much credibility he placed in alternative methods. It is interesting to note that Darwin published a new edition of the *Origin* approximately every two years, until the admission of the incipency problem in the 1872 edition. There is no seventh edition because Darwin did not have anything more to say, although he did live another ten years.

The withholding of pertinent evidence is the ultimate form of unscrupulous persuasion. It is illegal in a court of law and should perhaps be equally so in science and education. But, for the last one hundred and thirty some years the science establishment has not seen fit to discuss the incipency problem in the secondary school evolution curriculum. What a profound statement that is, as to the extent influential professionals in science and education are willing to go to defend the credibility of evolution theory, by taking advantage of students' youthful trust and ignorance. Scientifically oriented

crusaders are sorely needed who will advocate students' academic freedom and in this case it is their right to know both the pros and cons of evolution theory.

Students should certainly become knowledgeable as to the superficial quality of the evolution evidence. The evidence is so insubstantial that every item of evidence in support of evolution is also evidence against it from some other point of view and not necessarily a creation point of view. Without that awareness, the subliminal learner outcome in the curriculum is how not to think critically. The typical evolution curriculum is in need of freedom of thought—a scientific emancipation of thought. Long before evolution is a scientific answer to the origins question, it is first and foremost a religious answer to the origins question and that accounts for the dogmatic rather than theoretical presentation of the evidence in the typical textbook. It all began with Darwin whose methodology is faulty. He was more of an evangelist than a scientist. Everything he observed was construed to have a positive meaning for evolution to the exclusion of anything else. Any scientist will tell you that that is precisely the wrong way to research a theory because the investigator is simply trying to confirm a preconceived belief. Allowing alternative points of view into the curriculum merely corrects Darwin's faulty methodology. One might even conclude that alternatives allow science into the curriculum where pseudoscience presently prevails.

Even creation scientists have gotten into the act by failing, in the name of scientific objectivity, to publicly take issue with the suppression of the incipency problem in the evolution curriculum. That is a puzzle because the primary motivation for censoring the incipency problem has to be religious bias. Obviously, there is no scientific reason for not openly discussing the incipency problem. Students have every right to know about the incipency problem and nobody and nothing has the authority to deny them that knowledge. Who are the high and mighty, who have determined for everybody else, contrary to the fundamental principles of science and education, that students must not acquire any knowledge about evolution theory that might cast doubt upon its credibility? The battle for biology between creation scientists and evolution scientists is one that need not be fought because of the inability of science to conclusively prove any explanation for origins anyway. In the battle for biology, creation scientists should not be talking around the incipency problem. Instead, it should be the central focus because without a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism, evolution has no greater legitimacy in the biology curriculum than creation science.

Creation science cannot present its evidence in the curriculum because it advocates a supernatural method of origins, and that supposedly places it outside the domain of science. But, if life did not arise supernaturally, then there must be a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism for origins that is legitimately within the domain of science and is just waiting to be discovered — that naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism was thought, by some, to be natural selection, until 1872 when Darwin acknowledged the incipency problem. It is understandable, from an evolutionist's point of view, why incipency has to be suppressed, because without a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism, there really is no theory of evolution that sets it apart from a creation explanation for origins.

Let us face it if the incipency problem had become common knowledge after the publication of the sixth edition, Darwinian evolution would not have made it into the textbooks. What is not understandable is why, when both creation scientists and

evolution scientists claim to be champions of scientific objectivity, creation scientists particularly do not, in the name of scientific objectivity, insist that incipency be part of the evolution curriculum. It seems like the natural thing to do. Somehow the incipency problem will have to become common knowledge in spite of the science establishment's efforts to suppress it. What makes it doubly scandalous is the target of the incipency cover up are America's youth.

To summarize, two methods of teaching evolution exist, one is religious and the other is scientific. The former is evangelical the latter is analytical. They are not readily distinguishable to the layman because they both speak the language of science. But the religious method suppresses alternative points of view and censors evidence that is downright unfavorable. That describes the typical evolution curriculum. On the other hand, the scientific method of teaching evolution adheres to the principles of scientific inquiry. Because evolution is a doctrine of Religious Humanism, for example, the religious method of teaching evolution, may possibly be deemed unconstitutional.

A Scientific Solution to the Origins Issue in Public Education with a New Origins Curriculum Code

The term "biology" means the study of living things. It is a realistic definition that reflects the limited capabilities of science; consequently, it does not include the origin of living things. Historically, the origin of living things was considered supernatural to the naturalism of science. In order to bring the origin of living things into the domain of science a naturalistic, on-going creative mechanism was needed and that was Darwin's goal with his natural selection mechanism. But without a workable natural selection mechanism, we have returned to the original parameters of biology, which is limited to the study of living things and not their origins. The following curriculum code would guarantee that those parameters are not violated unless certain conditions are met:

Whereas, the question of origins is the preeminent question for nearly all religions, including Religious Humanism

Whereas, it is socially divisive and religiously discriminating to exclusively represent one particular explanation for origins as the so-called "unifying theme" in biology

Whereas, science cannot experimentally prove any particular explanation for origins by any means presently known

Whereas, Darwin's natural selection idea was prematurely accepted and has, with the passage of time and a more intense analysis, been revealed to be incompetent to create new kinds

Be it resolved, that in order to insure the scientific integrity of the biological sciences, guarantee the constitutional intent of the doctrine of the separation of church and state and eliminate religious discrimination in public education, let no explanation for origins assume the status of the so-called "unifying theme" in biology unless the creative mechanism proves itself to be unquestionably viable.

References

Darwin, Charles. 1909. *The Origin of Species*, sixth edition. P.F.Collier and Sons, New York.
Darwin P. 243.
Darwin, Charles. 1872. *The Origin of Species and the Decent of Man*. The Random House, Inc., New York.
Feyerabend, Paul. 1978. *Against method; outline of an anarchist theory of knowledge*. Humanities Press, London.
Gould, S.J. 1977. "Evolution's erratic pace." *Natural History*, 76 (May 5):14.
Gray, Asa. 1860. "A Critique of On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life." *The North British Review*, Vol. 32:465.
Gruber, Jacob. 1960. *A conscience in conflict-the life of St. George Jackson Mivart*. Columbia University Press, New York.
Kurtz, David. 1984. *Humanist Manifesto I and II*. Prometheus Books, Buffalo.

This document is condensed from information contained in *The Great Evolution Curriculum Hoax*. This book is available from:
National Book Network
P.O. Box 191
Blue Ridge Summit, PA 17214
Phone: 877-323-4550