

How to Solve the Creation/Evolution (science curriculum) Debate -- In Five Minutes or Less

©2005 William Brookfield

Is the ID (core) hypothesis/theory/paradigm permissible in science class? Yes indeed. Is the materialist (core) hypothesis/theory/paradigm permissible in science class? Yes indeed. Is an ID gospel (Creation-ism) permissible in science class? No. Is a materialist gospel (Material-ism) permissible in science class? No.

The solution to the dispute therefore lies in making a clear and principled distinction between gospelized positions (and their attendant self righteous crusades against “the enemy”) and scientific theories and their attendant respect for freedom of inquiry. In science, a counter hypothesis (core or otherwise) is not an enemy. It is an integral part of the scientific process.

To summarize therefore; Theories and hypotheses in science class?.. Yes.
Gospels in science class?... No.

How to Solve the Darwinian Mechanism Debate -- In Five Minutes or So

©2005 William Brookfield

Confusion regarding the Darwinian mechanism stems from three separate obfuscations.

These are;

#1. Use of the deceptively positive word “selection” instead of clear and accurate wording such as “natural selective destruction” or “natural selective decimation.” Like it or not, “natural selection” only “weeds out” (destroys), it never “weeds in”(creates).

#2. Use of the deceptively positive word “evolution” in “micro-evolution” so as to conflate randomized reductive/destructive nichification (“micro-evolution”) with specified constructive speciation (“macro-evolution”). Reductive(-) Nichification is not a smaller (micro) version of Constructive(+) Speciation.

#3. The deceptive labeling of residual system-level order (“monkey Shakespeare,” etc.) as “order by chance/randomness” so as to make it appear that randomness (the absence of order) can sometimes be creative (order producing). It is deceptive to use “order by chance/randomness” instead of correct wordings such as “order from residual system constraint” or “order at the system-level.” Such deceptive analogies are typically loaded with symbols or structures, habitually used by humans to convey high meanings or values (Shakespeare, jackpots, etc.). Such

loading reinforces the illusion that randomness can create order. Randomness of course, can do no such thing. Randomness merely assures that all letter sequences, of any given length, are equally probable.

The solution to the debate therefore requires making clear definitions of all pertinent active functions;

#1. Random Reductive(-) Nichification {RR--(-)-->N} (The ongoing natural selective destruction/limiting (-) of an existing species to a narrow, survivable, quasi-stable niche)

and,

#2. Specified Constructive(+) Speciation {SC--(+)-->S} (the origination (+) of new species new structure and/or new specifications).

and,

#3. Randomization -- (a. The destruction(-) of specifications {information} and subsequent production of an unspecified uniform probability distribution. b. The destruction(-) of probability weightings and subsequent increase of probabilistic weightlessness/uniformity. c. The destruction(-) of order/structure and subsequent movement toward disorder/randomness).

With these definitions in hand we can identify the destructive/constructive polarities of Darwin's mechanisms in relation to the polarities of RN and CS -- and apply basic logic to the group to determine logical consistency or inconsistency.

Darwin's proposed mechanisms of speciation are as follows;

#1. Natural Selective Destruction (NSD)

and,

#2. Randomization -- (destruction by scrambling_)

By definition these are both destruction (-) functions. As such, they are logically consistent with R-Nichification but logically inconsistent with C-Speciation. With regard to speciation, both Random Mutation and Natural Selective Destruction are "*non-sequiturs*." New biological structure(+) "does not logically follow" from the random scrambling/destruction{-} of orderly structure or code.¹ New construction(+) likewise "does not logically follow" from natural

selective destruction(-). The production (+) of new species requires a construction(+) function. Therefore, while a Darwinian mechanism (with sufficient over unity reproduction in tow) is valid for R-nichification (“micro-evolution”) it is not valid for C-speciation (“macro-evolution”).

1. Nor can residual, system-level structure (e.g. “typing monkey-shakespeare,” slot machine outputs, evolutionary algorithm outputs) be posited as new “order by chance/randomness.” In all such cases, the structure of the output, along with its probability of its occurrence, is entirely pre-determined by the pre-existing system’s parameters. Such outputs are but manifestations of old probability weightings and old system structure, and are worthless with regard to new structure, new species, new systems and subsequent new probability weightings.

Why Simple Debates, Otherwise Solvable In Ten Minutes, Can Sometimes Last For 150 Years.

©2005 William Brookfield

The reason for the protracted nature of the Evolution vs. Creation debate is existence of entrenched emotively gospel-ized positions on both sides of the issue. Any movement toward a resolution subsequently requires the overcoming of massively entrenched psychological and sociological inertia.

-- William Brookfield -- ID scientist/pleasurian/humanist