

Finch Beaks and Bullfinches

Dr. Chuck McGowen

President Bush's recent public endorsement of the concept of Intelligent Design and the suggestion that it ought to have equal time for discussion in the science classes of our nation's public schools has raised a storm of protest and a virtual tsunami of unsubstantiated pronouncements (calling it religion) against the proposal that our young folks should know that the theory of evolution is far from a proven fact and that another scientifically consistent theory exists that should have a hearing.

The most recent test of the idea came in October of 2004 when the local school board in Dover, PA required science teachers to read a statement that informed students of the truth that evolution is still a theory and not a fact, that it has gaps for which there is no scientific evidence and that Intelligent Design (ID) is another theory which should be explored. The students were then merely encouraged to keep an open mind and referred to a reference book entitled *Of Pandas and People* if they so desired.

The result was a blanket refusal by the science teachers to read the statement and a suit against the Dover Area School Board brought by eleven parents who were claiming a violation of the constitution's prohibition against the establishment of religion. Note that only the protestors mentioned the debate in a religious context. ID can be taught without ever mentioning the name of God or referring to Scripture.

Soon in Ohio, we may hear similar outbursts of irrational complaint when Ohio Round Table begins to disseminate materials (DVD and booklet), which this author has helped produce, that will encourage a grass roots movement among interested parents and teachers, to present a mandate to the local boards of education granting equal time to the scientific (not religious) evidence which supports ID and disfavors macro evolution. The Ohio State Board of Education has already granted teachers that option in the new science curriculum and we purpose to find out which science teachers desire to do so. The Dover board erred when they required the reading of the statement. We will seek volunteers and then train them. They also erred when they cited the religious underpinnings of

the framers of the constitution. This is not, I repeat, is not, a religious issue. The only persons to bring the question into the debate are the opponents of ID who wish to throw up a smoke screen in the battle for truth.

Finch Beaks

When naturalist Charles Darwin sailed to the Galapagos Islands off of the Pacific coast of South America, aboard the *H.M.S. Beagle*, in December of 1831 he would discover some variations in the beaks of several birds (particularly finches) that would move him to further develop the ancient theory of natural, spontaneous, random, biological, macro evolution. When he returned from his five year voyage, he was in ill health and would never completely recover for the remainder of his life. His death eventually came at age 73 in 1882. Prior to his death, however, he would complete a literary work that would over time, totally revolutionize the thinking of 19th century scientists, theologians, philosophers and tyrants; I.e Adolf Hitler who cherished the work at used it to justify his "Final Solution" for eliminating Jews from Germany's gene pool. The book which Darwin wrote was *The Origin of the Species* and it was published in 1859. Later, in 1871, he also published another pivotal work, *The Descent of Man*.

It is worthy of note that this entire system of thought, and the literary works that it spawned, began with the simple observation that finches on one island differed from finches on another island, and the remarkable differences were in the shapes of their beaks. Some had large beaks which enabled them to crack seeds while others had slender beaks more suited to catching insects. Some had beaks that worked well when probing into flowers and still others had the capacity to grab cactus spines and use them to search inside trees for food.

Instead of assuming that the beaks had all been designed for specific purposes, through a highly intellectual plan, which is the explicit premise of the proponents of ID, he conjectured on the possibility of a common ancestor and the gradual development of the micro evolutionary changes because of the need to adapt. He theorized that the differing beaks were the result of a chance occurrence of spontaneous, random, genetic mutations and natural selection (I.e the survival of the fittest). From that misconception of what he had observed came the giant leap to what has become known as the theory of biological evolution. That is a leap of

major proportions ,a hurdle which has not yet been negotiated by the scientific evidence. Why did he simply not conclude that the finches set up shop in the islands that were best suited to their differing beaks?

Darwin knew full well that his theory of macro evolution would ultimately require further evidence than the differences which the finch beaks had provided. In fact, on his death bed he surmised that a failure to discover transitional life forms in the fossil record would ring out a death knell to his theory. To this date those fossilized, transitional life forms are most conspicuous by their absence and his caveat has been all but ignored by the evolutionary minded thinkers.

Bullfinches

If one were to look in the dictionary for a definition of a bullfinch, this is one of two which one would read (the other defines a particular species of birds): "A hedge too high for a horse to jump in hunting." Those of us who adhere to the philosophy of Intelligent Design find the hedge (biological macro evolution) too high for the horse (the evolutionary scientist) to jump in his hunting expedition.(I.e. Seeking a first cause of all things seen in the universe). It is ironic to say the least, and possibly even providential, that Darwin, the naturalist, who was hunting for an answer for the existence of all living things would have sailed around the globe in a ship named for a popular hunting dog; the *H.M.S. Beagle*. He mistakenly thought that his hunt had been successful, his "fox" in the hunt was his proposed theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest in the process of biological macro evolution, but unknown to Darwin at the time, the hedge, the bullfinch, was too great a leap to hurdle.

Note that I said macro evolution was too great a leap. Micro evolution is an observable fact of nature; it is all around us. That process is responsible for the countless species of spiders, the numerous species of dogs, cats, horses and cattle and the marked differences that we see in people over time. I used to be the tallest person in my family at 6 feet 5 inches. I now have two grown grandsons who are 6 feet 11 inches and 6 feet 9 inches respectively. After only two generations those McGowen men have gained several inches in height. Micro evolution is also the reason for the change one may observe in the gradual adaptation of the peppered moth to its hostile environment in the British Isles. That creature, originally adorned with black and white speckled wings, has been

growing blacker with the passage of time. The reason for the change is micro evolution and natural selection; a Darwinian observation to be sure, and one that is quite scientific. The bark on a tree is a natural habitat for that moth. As pollution has increased in Great Britain's atmosphere, the bark on the trees has grown darker. As a result, the lighter, the less black speckled moths stood out on the surface of the tree and became an easier prey for their natural enemy, the swallows. Over time the lighter colored moths were eliminated from the gene pool, having been swallowed up by the swallows. The change was micro evolution, not macro evolution; the creature remained a moth. So it was with the finch beaks, but Darwin took the leap, and ran head long into the bullfinch. Macro evolution remains an unproven theory because it requires events that have never been observed or proven to have occurred, either randomly in nature or following intricately designed experiments in the laboratory.

First Cause of Life

The alleged first cause of the biological evolution was the sudden appearance, 3.5 million years ago, of a single celled life form in a primordial soup of organic and inorganic chemicals; life had come from non-living things. The inciting event was supposedly some natural phenomenon such as a bolt of lightening or a cosmic ray. In the first place, it is axiomatic to the highest degree that life has never been observed to have developed from non living things and true science requires observation. At one time the idea of "spontaneous generation of life" from dead carcasses was proposed when some untrained eye observed that maggots were crawling around in a dead animal and that those maggots ultimately underwent a metamorphosis and eventually flew away as flies. What the observer had failed to take into account was the fact that a fly (a living fly) had laid the eggs which spawned the growth and development of the maggots. To this date, after thousands of hours of experimentation, designed by highly intelligent persons, life has never been produced in the laboratory. The bullfinch is still too high for the horse to jump, but even if an intelligent scientist is ever able to create life through the perfect design of the perfect experiment, what has he proven? Only that life does not occur randomly but strictly by way of a perfect, intelligent design.

Climbing the Evolutionary Tree

After that single cellular organism, of the highest order of complexity, had supposedly come into existence spontaneously, it then replicated itself and over time two kingdoms arose; one animal and one vegetable. That too has never been observed; animal always begets animal and vegetable always begets vegetable. An animal cell is devoid of the capacity to trap the sun's ultraviolet light energy; it has no chlorophyll. Thus the animal cell is utterly dependent upon vegetation for its supply of energy. Vegetation captures carbon dioxide through its leaves and water through its roots. In the chloroplast the water and gas combine to produce sugar; photosynthesis. The energy is trapped inside the sugar. When an animal consumes the plant the sugar is burned in the presence of inspired oxygen, energy is released to run the animal's internal organs and the carbon dioxide and water are once again released (through kidney and lung respectively) and made available to the plant.

Over millions of years single celled organisms allegedly underwent spontaneous mutations and natural selection and ultimately became multicellular organisms; I.e jellyfish. Some then spontaneously developed exoskeletons (through random mutations over millions of years) and eventually some of those evolved internal skeleton and back bones; fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals and mankind are included in the latter. When the sea became overwhelmed with population growth some fish spontaneously mutated and evolved into amphibians which spent some of their life on land. Their gills became lungs and their fins legs. They in turn spontaneously evolved insidiously over hundreds of thousands of years into reptiles and the reptiles evolved in two directions, one toward birds and the other toward mammals. Man is allegedly the highest evolved form of mammal. That is macro evolution in a nutshell.

The problem for the evolutionist in that imaginary scenario is, as my wise old grandpa used to say, "That dog won't hunt." The Beagle has chased the fox and the fox has run up and hidden himself in the evolutionary tree. The evolutionary theory has not found the proof which Darwin himself demanded, the bullfinch has won the day in the fox hunt and it is represented by the decided lack of proof of any transitional life forms. One does not find the record replete with animals that are half fish and half frog; half salamander and half turtle; half snake and half bird or half rat. Those alleged transitional forms are, as already stated above, quite conspicuous by their absence.

Thermodynamics

There are many other scientific discoveries that are counter opposed to the theory of macro evolution but I will close with one; the greatest bullfinch of them all, the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics; A.K.A. entropy. This basic scientific tenet is as sound as the law of gravity and quite readily observed in nature. The law basically states that left to themselves all systems in nature will spontaneously move for a state of order to one of chaos, from a state of complexity to one of simplicity and from a state of high energy potential to one of lesser energy potential.

The theory of evolution requires quite the opposite. Left to itself the primordial sea, composed of a chaotic mixture of chemicals, somehow spontaneously organized some of those randomly dispersed chemicals into a highly ordered and structured cell that was capable of self sustaining life and replication. That cell had a highly ordered information system in its nucleus called DNA. Outside the nucleus, in its cytoplasm were the RNA molecules which transferred vital information from the DNA to other areas of cell metabolism and reproduction upon which the cell depended for its existence. The cell had mitochondria where energy metabolism took place (I.e sugar to water and gas). It had a complex cell membrane that kept unwanted substances out and needed substances in.

The simple, organic chemicals had to become more complex chains of amino acids, nucleic acids (the stuff of DNA), fatty acids and complex carbohydrates. The less complex amino acids, fatty acids and carbohydrate then had to spontaneously organize to become more complex organelles within the cell which enabled it to function. Over time simple single celled organisms had to evolve into more complex multi celled creatures and then to higher and more complex life forms. None of this has ever been observed and the only place it has even possibly been seen is in the imaginary dreams of the macro evolutionary scientists.

Single celled creatures (I.e amoeba) have one degree of energy potential, jellyfish another, higher level, sharks still higher an energy potential and elephants a higher potential still. The 2nd Law of thermodynamics is again reversed by the theory of evolution.

In nature we observe that water spontaneously runs down hill, thus losing, not gaining, energy potential. Complex metal products oxidize into simple piles of rust. Complex dead bodies putrefy (rot) and disappear, boiling water with a potential to turn to steam and run a dynamo cools off and mainsprings unwind. We find that neatly arranged things spontaneously disarrange over time.

There are numerous other bullfinches for the macro evolutionists to hurdle before the hunt is over and those need to be seen by the students who occupy the seats in our state's science class rooms. They are there to learn the truth about origins. They need to know that there is a science based alternative theory which deserves a hearing. They have a right to hear a straight forward critique of the only theory of origins currently being purposed in their science classes. They ought to know that Darwinism is what Phillip Johnson has called "A wild extrapolation from limited data." What became "one small step" for the man Darwin in the confines of the Galapagos Islands has become "one giant leap for mankind," one insurmountable bullfinch indeed, in his fruitless hunt for meaning and purpose in life.

We who aspire to the teaching of ID in the classroom have no designs on eliminating the other theory from the discussion. We welcome the opportunity to present our side of the debate along with the other popularized notion of macro evolution. It is they who fear us, not we them. They are throwing up roadblocks to a reasoned debate by calling ID a religion while claiming that the theory of evolution is pure science. We only want to bring scientific evidence to the debate, not the Bible. We merely ask for equal time. The science class is not the place to discuss religious issues, but these two differing philosophies need to be compared in regard to the scientific evidence which either supports or refutes the diametrically opposing views.

The only way that ID will ever get into Ohio's science class rooms is for concerned parents to organize and demand that the local boards of education begin to implement what the state board has already permitted; a critical analysis of the two leading theories of origin. Ohio Round Table is ready to offer its support to those groups who wish to become adept in fostering the support of their local boards. For more information on how to proceed, contact Ohio Round Table on the web at info@ohioroundtable.org or by phone 1-800-5228683.