

Any fact can be fit into the theory of evolution: Claim CA211:

Any fact can be fit into the theory of evolution. Therefore, evolution is not falsifiable and is not a proper scientific theory.

Source: Morris, Henry M. 1985. *Scientific Creationism*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, pp. 6-7.

Response:

There are many conceivable lines of evidence that could falsify evolution. For example:

- A static fossil record;
 - True chimeras, that is, organisms that combined parts from several different and diverse lineages (such as mermaids and centaurs) and which are not explained by lateral gene transfer, which transfers relatively small amounts of DNA between lineages, or symbiosis, where two whole organisms come together;
 - A mechanism that would prevent mutations from accumulating;
 - Observations of organisms being created.
2. This claim, coming from creationists, is absurd, since almost all creationism is nothing more than (unsubstantiated) claims that evolution has been falsified.

Further Reading:

Bowler, Peter J. 1983. *The Eclipse of Darwinism: Anti-Darwinian evolution theories in the decades around 1900*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

SWORD & SHIELD REBUTTAL:

Based on the list given here by Talk Origins there is NO question as to the fact evolutionary theory of decent has been completely falsified. Lets address each of their claims one at a time. They claim there are many conceivable lines of evidence that could falsify evolution. **EXAMPLES:**

A static fossil record; meaning a fossil record at rest with little to no evidence of graduations in form; A record lacking viable transitional forms. The reality of the fossil record is as has been predicted by Intelligent Design, that is, the fossil record tends to produce creatures, which appear suddenly and without any precursors. This fact is fully admitted to by an eminent evolutionist and inventor of the evolutionary theory of Punctuated Equilibrium, Dr. Gould, and PhD. “The absence of the fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution.” Gould wrote this statement 120 after Darwin’s origin of Species. In a time when the fossil record is now far better understood. Darwin himself wrote: “The number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed on earth, (must) be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection, which can be urged against my theory.” And more than 140 years later the fossil record is still just as static as in Darwin’s time. For specific examples of the fact evolution is NOT falsifiable and therefore not genuine science see the following link: <http://www.ideacenter.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/846>

Point Number Two of Talk Origins: The True chimeras. Well it just so happens that apparent true chimeras actually exist! “One of the examples is the giant sea bass found in the oceans. From the time they hatch till they reach about 300 pounds, they’re males. Then they start to undergo a transformation. By the time they reach about 400 pounds, they become females and remain that way till they die. Other fish do this as well.

This presents an *impossible* challenge for the evolutionists to explain. Were all of the first ones that evolved males? What made them change gender? If there were no females at first till they all reached a certain size, how did they reproduce? These are just some of the questions about the giant sea bass that the evolutionists *can’t* answer. When we turn to the Bible, we read that God created all of the fish—and things that swim in the seas—on Day 5 of creation. Therefore, we’d say that they were wonderfully designed to undergo this unusual change *right from* their first appearance on the earth.” Ken Hamm giving an answer to a question regarding this very subject. Again the existence of these bass refutes evolutionary theory. <http://www.answersingenesis.org/email/archive/answersupdate/2005/0430.asp>

Point THREE of Talk Origins state another disconfirming evidence would be a mechanism which keeps mutations from accumulating, this then, could falsify evolution. Well it just so happens the cell has just such a

mechanism. This mechanism is basically the “Proof Reading” system of the DNA/RNA complex, and its job is to maintain high fidelity in the replication of the DNA/RNA code. It does not obviously catch every mutation that occurs, but none-the-less it is very effective. Basically its purpose is to correct reconstruction errors in the DNA/RNA sequences and to remove mutations. This mechanism in the cell is a superb example of a biological mechanism that largely prevents mutations from accumulating. In addition, even if no such mechanism existed, the accumulation of mutations would not be enough to prove evolution. We would need to see a mutation add entirely new information into the genome. Mutations do no such thing. A mutation does only one of three things; in very rare instances it may seem on the surface to be beneficial, but when looked at closely it is always with a trade off. Antibiotic resistant bacteria become immune to one group of antibiotics, only to become more vulnerable to other groups they were not susceptible to before, Cycle Cell gene protects the carrier from contracting malaria, will increasing by up to 50% the likelihood their offspring or off-spring’s off-spring will inherit the full blown disease of cycle cell anemia. Most mutations are harmful and actually will cause disease and death. And then there are others that do not do anything. The one’s which produce disease, and those which do nothing, certainly, will not advance evolution, and the beneficial ones are again with a trade-off, so that in reality what benefit that seems to be gained is lost in future generations; a one step forward two steps back scenario.

Talk Origins point four is not even realistic, since if we did witness a new life form spontaneously being created, no doubt they would argue this proves evolution on the basis that nonliving matter seems to have spontaneously generated into life. What about the lack of observable evidence for graduation in life forms, which do exist? We have never witnessed one kind of animal becoming another kind. We have witnessed diversification and speciation, but this is not the same as one kind becoming a totally different kind of creature. For example, within the dog lineage we have great variety with dogs of many sizes and appearances, but none-the-less they are all still the same kind of animal, DOGS. Never has it been observed that a Dog has become a cat, or a monkey, a human, but this is precisely the kind of changes that must be witnessed to verify the evolutionary paradigm.

The Evolutionary predictions from abiogenesis to vestigial organs, to the graduation in fossil record, to junk genetics are all being shown to be erroneous in light of the actual observed evidence. Therefore, evolution has been falsified by the weight of the actual, observable and testable data. But do evolutionists permit their theory to be falsified, NO! Rather they invent ad hoc explanations to explain away the observable data, even though these ad hoc explanations are highly improbable and cannot be tested by empirical science. This then places evolutionary theory as it currently exists

into a state where it cannot be falsified by testing and observation, making it outside of the realm of science. Therefore, evolution is not science, but rather is mere philosophy. For more evidence of this fact, and to see specific failings of evolutionary predictions go to the following link: <http://www.ideacenter.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/846>

SOURCES:

Morris, Henry M. 1985. *Scientific Creationism*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, pp. 6-7.

<http://www.ideacenter.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/846>

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/email/archive/answersupdate/2005/0430.asp>