

Mark Mushakian

Professor Chao

English 1B

10 March 2008

The Non-Theory of Evolution

“Billions and billions of years ago...” is a phrase that simply cannot be avoided when attending a science class in a public school. Evolution has become a “fact” that is taught, instead of just being the possible concept that it is. Even worse, however, is the perversion of the word evolution itself, relegating it's definition to just this belief. Over time, the word evolution has come to stand for many things, most of which are exaggerations or oversimplifications of it's original meaning. The idea of evolution needs to be clarified between what it really means – and what people have come to think it means.

As described in the dictionary, evolution means “to develop by gradual changes; unfold” (Neufeldt 472). Evolution is a very simple term to understand. It is nothing more than growth. Any well educated person can use this word correctly in a sentence, so that is not the issue. As a writer creates a screenplay, the story can evolve from a mindless action movie to a deep, though-provoking character piece. The key to that analogy, however, is that the screenplay is still a screenplay. Charles Darwin had a number of biological ideas on how humans and animals have come to be, one of them being natural selection. Natural selection, or survival of the fittest, is something that can be seen in day to day life – the strongest, and most environmentally apt wolf of a pack will be the leader. Darwin's idea of natural selection, however, is slightly different. It proposed that if a wolf was born with a slight deformity that somehow gave it an advantage over the other wolves, by random chance that trait could continue on through the wolf's lineage, until eventually an entirely new version of wolf was created – say, one with an extra eye (Smith 1). That is an extreme example, one of my own

invention, but it explains the ideas of Darwinian evolution. Where Darwin took his leap of faith, however, was going from this idea to a concept of macro-evolution. When most people mention evolution, they are usually speaking of macro-evolution, which is the idea of “evolutionary change at or above the level of species” (Wilkins). The idea of macro-evolution has changed from Darwin's time, to a point now where many scientists believe that instead of a species simply spawning a new species, it involves many species variants mating with other species variants, to create a new species (Wilkins). Aren't all of these ideas called theories, though? No.

This is where opinion enters the fray. A scientific theory has many definitions from various sources, but in general it is a hypothesis (guess or idea) that has been proven to be mostly true through experimentation and is accepted by the scientific community on the whole. By this definition, the idea that the Earth is flat was once a theory, and yet besides a few conspiracy theorists, most people now believe that this is false. This is a key with scientific theory; it must also be falsifiable – or able to be proven wrong. Therefore the idea of macro-evolution, I feel, should not be called a theory. I am a Christian, and it should be said that I do not believe in macro-evolution, but I will never say that it is impossible, simply because it can never be disproved by scientific or practical observation. What the scientific community often says, however, is that macro-evolution, again the idea that one species can change to another, is a well documented occurrence. The idea that gravity exists is a fact, it can be observed daily. There is, however, a separate “theory of gravity”, which seeks to explain the fact of gravity's existence. Macro-evolution, however, is not a proper scientific theory because what it seeks to explain is a belief. It is horribly embarrassing that the entire idea of macro-evolution is arrogantly based off an assumption that there is no God, or intelligent design, and therefore species variety must be explained by other reasons.

There are always possible alternative explanations for anything, but for a statement to be considered fact, it cannot have opposing statements that are just as valid. For example, it is a fact that an apple tree will produce apples, not puppies. It is possible to believe that the tree may produce puppies, but scientific evidence and prior events point to the fact that it will produce apples instead. Evolution, however, is not fact. One of many arguments scientists use to define evolution as factual, is the idea that the genetic makeup of different species can be near identical (Smith 129), but this does not overshadow and exclude other possible explanations, such as the idea that they were designed to be that way by God. By calling evolution a fact, the implication is that there is no other equally logical explanation, but that is, again, an arrogant assumption. Even if God is not the alternative, which is valid in a purely scientific environment, scientists should not be so foolish as to state that evolution is fact, because it is not the only viable solution (Masci).

Scientists are ideally supposed to be unbiased, but macro-evolution is taught daily in classrooms not only as theory but as fact. To use a personal example, on my first day of Biology in my sophomore year of high school, my teacher stood in front of the class and stated that this was a class of science, and that creationist discussions weren't allowed. I was fine with this, because he was right, creationism is a belief, and that is a philosophical topic. He then continued on to say, though, that evolution was a scientific fact, and that is how we would be studying it. This is not what children should be learning from a man who calls himself a scientist. A scientific theory must be based on current, observable events. *Current, observable* events. The study of what may have happened billions of years ago is an afterthought, simply a hypothesis of a possibility. Forensic science studies past events, but it is based on previous knowledge of testable facts and situations. If a man with a black eye walks into a crowded room, every person in that room can have their own hypothesis on why he has it. There can also be a scientific theory based on who he is, where he came from, what

lifestyle he leads, known causes of black eyes, etc. The hypothesis can be tested, though, by a test - simply asking the man. There is no way to test the supposed theory of evolution, because it is not a visibly ongoing event with a foreseeable outcome, and there are just too many possible variables and unknowns. Therefore, all the scientific community is left with is a hypothesis, not a theory. Children in today's classrooms are beleaguered daily with enough useless, time-wasting knowledge without being force fed the misinformation that evolution is a theory, let alone a fact.

What I say here is not a theological tactic or a desire to push my own faith and beliefs. I am an equal opportunist and believe that everyone has the right to express their thoughts as I do mine. All I ask is that children, and indeed the general public, be given the respect and common courtesy of knowing the truth about evolutionist concepts. Teach the true science of what we, as a people, know, and leave the endless propaganda of inter-species evolution to a small area of study on faiths and beliefs – where it belongs.

Works Cited

Masci, David. "Evolution vs. Creationism." CQ Researcher 7.2 (22 August 1997).

Neufeldt, Victoria. "Evolution." Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. 3rd College ed. New York: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Smith, John Maynard, and Eors Szathmary. The Origins of Life. New York: Oxford, 1999.

Wilkins, John. "Macroevolution: Its Definition, Philosophy and History." TalkOrigins. 2006. 1 March 2008. <<http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/macroevolution.html>>