

-- Darwinism --

A Fallacy of Logical Argument

©2004 William Brookfield

Introduction:

In the new book “Darwinism, Design and the Public Education”¹ Massimo Pigliucci, Micheal Ruse (and various other scholars) claim that only Darwinism should be taught in schools because, according to these folks, “only Darwinism is science.” Unfortunately, they have it backwards. Darwinism is a fallacy of logical argument and logical fallacies are not science. Thus, Darwinism is not science² and Darwinism (illogic) has no place in schools.³

The fallacy in question is known as the “red herring” or “non-sequitur.” Arguments of this nature fail to address the problem at hand, serving only as distractions or “red herrings.” The compound word “non-sequitur” is Latin for “It does not (logically) follow (from A to B).” Both Darwinism and Neo-Darwinism risk going beyond mere irrelevance to actual nonsense by positing the very opposite of the effect, as the cause of the effect. (I.E., Darwinism posits, “randomness” {the opposite of order} and natural selective death {the opposite of life} as the cause of new orderly life {new species}.)

I here argue that Darwin’s “new” species “do not logically follow” from randomness or death, nor any combination of the two. I also maintain that *Random Variation(Rvar)* & *Natural Selection(NS)* and *Random Mutation(RM)* & *Natural Selection(NS)* are textbook examples of the “red herring” or “non-sequitur” fallacies. Darwin’s functions, *Randomness* and *Natural Selection* do not and cannot explain the origin(+) of the species because both of these functions are negative(-) with regard to living order.

I further argue against the positing of secondary statistical fluctuations (Rvar&RM) of a pre-existing structure (super-structure or sub-structure, etc.) as a valid origination process. I also question the positing of secondary distillations (NS) of an order adulterated solution space, as a valid origination process. Given that this is Darwinian “logic” in its entirety, I conclude that all forms of Darwinism are unsound due to their inadequate logical-theoretical structure.

I also examine another possible “red herring” in the promotion of materialism.

Clarification of Terms

In the following discussion I have decided to use the proverbial “typing monkey” analogy due to the combination of both, its simplicity (for explanatory clarity) and its ability to elucidate questions of meaning and form. The “random typing monkey” example, is often used to claim that, “Given enough time, a randomly typing monkey (randomness/chance) could type Shakespeare (order).”

This is false. The works of Shakespeare are works of English literature and all the letters in question are subsequently imbued with English meaning, purpose and intentionality. These agreed upon, syntactical weightings cause a re-construction of “Shakespeare” to appear in the mind of the suitably literate reader. A mindless typing monkey (without a degree in English literature) can neither produce nor reproduce real Shakespeare. At best, a mindless monkey can only type meaningless shakespearean letter patterns -- I.E., shakespeare (small “s”) and not Shakespeare (big “S”).

Materialist Ideology

-- The Darwinian foundation--

When children think about themselves, about humans or about other species, their ideas -- their mental reconstruction's of organisms and themselves -- are naturally imbued with meaning, intentionality and teleology. Legs are not pointless, they are for running and playing. Hands are not pointless, they are for grasping, heads are not pointless they are for thinking, etc. Thus the average person sees himself/herself as a “Shakespearean” biological construct and not a pointless “monkey shakespearean” “construct.” When the average person inquires as to the “origin of the species” therefore, he/she is inquiring as to the origin of a biological “sonnet” or “symphony,” not a pointless conglomeration of carbon molecules, nor a meaningless sequence of DNA code.

Due to its underlying materialist ideology, Darwinism does not answer the common person's question -- “what originated the Species -- the Shakespeare?” By answering with a material mechanism Darwinism simply asserts that the original question is not valid. “Sorry little Johnny but there are no tooth fairies, no biological symphonies or sonnets. There are only meaningless material organisms (shakespeare {small ‘s’}) to which we erroneously attach meaning, intentionality and subsequent erroneous design inferences.”

Instead of facing the larger implications of consciousness, materialism changes the subject from mind to material mechanism -- from Shakespeare to shakespeare. An unjustified change of subject however is the very essence of the “red herring” fallacy. The act of reducing the amount of order visible, by changing one's ideological/philosophical perspective, does not constitute an explanation of order's origin. Becoming blind to order, is not the same thing as identifying order, identifying the source of order and thereby explaining the origin of order. Without any scientific justification for changing a student's ideology, “teaching” for the purpose of blinding students (indoctrination) has no place in science class.

While materialism is a very popular scientific paradigm (core hypothesis) and worthy of consideration as a hypothesis, it must be scientifically and morally defensible. Under no circumstances can materialism be promoted merely because it permits scientists to weasel out of an enormous amount of order that would otherwise require a scientific explanation.

Of course, Materialists would claim that I am the one who is blind to the pointlessness of existence and that I am trying to weasel out of the harsh reality of that pointlessness. To this I would just say that I have scientifically tested the materialist hypothesis and it has been refuted..

-- See Part One -- The Cosmological Physical Incompleteness Theorem at
http://www.iscid.org/papers/Brookfield_Devolution_120502.pdf

Let us now examine these two ideologies with regard to biology and Darwinism.

Two Ways of Looking at Biology

#1. The Shakespeare sonnet: {ID}

Meaningful syntax and structure, intelligently constructed and intelligently re-constructed in the mind of the reader. Original author -- William Shakespeare -- an intelligent designer. Design inference valid.

#2. Monkey shakespeare (small “s”): {Materialism}

A meaningless letter sequence, equal to all other meaningless letter sequences of the same length. No intelligent design but only with regard to any “value added” Shakespearean order. A design inference here is in error but only regarding “value added” order.

One might assume that Darwinism can at least succeed in its material domain (#2), devoid of mind and Shakespearean order. This, however, is not the case -- as hinted above. “Monkey shakespeare” {small “s”} is still order at the system-state level. The origin of all system-state order requires an explanation of the origin of the system. This is because system-state order is but an attribute of the system.

A typing monkey system is a random letter sequence generating system (or more accurately, just a letter sequence generating system). It is not a (random) number generating system. It is not a (random) hieroglyphics generating system. Nor is it any assortment of these, along with wingdings and various scratches and unsequenced lateral accidents. The distinctive nature (orderly content) of the output (linear letter sequences) is fully determined by the system’s defining parameters and not by randomness (the absence of parameters/constraint).

Notice that the word “random” in “random letter sequence” is superfluous. Any letter sequence generator where the letter arrangements are unspecified -- undefined -- unconstrained with regard to sequential order, is a “random” letter

sequence generator. Notice also that “randomness” applies only to the timing of the system’s output, not to what the system can and cannot output.

What the system can and cannot output is fully determined by what is a member of the fixed system-set -- the large set of all available patterns or combinations for that particular system.

With the establishment (origination) of any such typing system and its parameters, all available configurations (including configurations of letters that we call “Shakespeare”) are simultaneously established in potentia with a specific probability associated with each. This gives the system a specific probability “shape” that is both fixed and finite in size (for any given sequence length). The system can only output what is contained within this shape and only in accordance with its pre-specified probabilities. Any “new species” must exist within this large system “shape” or it cannot occur as an output.

We subsequently have two distinct types of events:

#1. An origination event (or “Logically Prior Superselection”⁴) in which the system and all of the system’s structure, novelty and defining parameters are established. (The origin of the system, the origin of living DNA systems, the origin of a typing monkey system and the origin of Shakespeare {big “S”}).

and..

#2. A secondary (unoriginal) statistical fluctuation, permitted by the system but devoid of any novelty or new structure. (Monkey shakespeare and Darwin’s “new” species)

The output of the typing monkey system, being devoid of any inherent order, merely displays the order of the system.

A spontaneous occurrence of letter sequences remains unexplained until one realizes that there exists a system -- a monkey (system order) and it has a typewriter (system order), and the monkey has been forced to publish or perish :-). The nature of the output is thus explained by the nature of the origination event.

In the case of the typing monkey, we know who built the typewriter and chose our alphabet -- humans. We know the typewriter is rugged (stable) for we chose it to be so, knowing its grisly fate. We know where we got the monkey (the zoo) and what monkeys do (hammer away). We can subsequently explain the output (a variety of letter sequences -- that are utterly insensitive to fine English literature).

But what built and is maintaining the DNA system? And who or what chose DNA? Darwinism provides no answer. Darwinism does not explain where biology got the DNA code nor how it received life, stability, a “drive to survive” or conscious intentionality. It is subsequently unable to explain the system’s output

(a large variety DNA sequences -- that live and intend to go on living). The origin of all DNA life forms therefore remains unexplained.

To avoid red herring status, Darwinism must address the very question that it claims to address, the question of the origin(+) of the species. If Darwinism had explained how to get from no order to a new system, with its system level of order (monkey shakespeare {small “s”}) then it would have succeeded (at least in its own domain)-- for it would have successfully explained the physical origin{+} of the species {small “s”}. If Darwinism explained how to get from shakespeare (small “s”) to Shakespeare (big “S”) then it would also have explained something of value here. Unfortunately, Darwinism has only explained how to get from shakespeare (small “s”) to shakespeare (small “s”) -- from biological system-state order to equal biological system-state order.

Unfortunately for Darwinists, the materialist reduction of Shakespeare to mere shakespeare just reduces any apparent positive motion to mere lateral motion. I.E. “Monkey shakespeare” (regardless of appearances to the contrary) now becomes just another random sequence, equal in order content to every other random sequence available to the system. No increase in order content occurs in movement between equals. Without any increase in order content (beyond the original system state level) Darwinism is worthless.

When a magician pulls a rabbit from a hat there is no increase in “rabbit content” (beyond the original system-state level). The rabbit was always present in the system, but initially hidden from view. Similarly, the “monkey shakespeare” was always “in the cards” and any appearance of it, consistent with its associated (very low) probability of appearance, should come as no surprise. What would be a surprise would be the emergence of something that is new -- such as real Shakespeare -- or something that was not previously a part of the system and its attendant system set. This of course is precisely what needs to be explained.

Such an event would represent an emergence -- an origin. The problem is that, while Darwin’s output is probabilistic (so that its timing sequence is not “set in stone”), the probabilities and the possibilities (of what can and cannot emerge from a Darwinian system) are indeed “set in stone.” For example, a random typing system can only produce meaningless shakespeare {small “s”} patterns. It cannot produce real Shakespeare. Real Shakespeare is not “in the cards.”

In both ideological frameworks (ID and materialism) the question of “the origin of the species” is a question of how order is produced, not how pre-existing order can be randomly shuffled around and filtered in a previously established, eternally maintained and order-adulterated, DNA sequencing system.

On “Deferrent” Probabilistic Systems in General

The model that Darwin has chosen is what I call a “Deferrent Probabilistic System.” In all such systems (regardless of size or complexity) the problem of origin is not solved but is merely deferred to deeper level. The typing monkey

system is a very simple DPS, as would be a slot machine. A computer based evolutionary algorithm is a more complex DPS with a “fitness function.” In such systems the internal “hypervolume” or “possibility space” is established with the establishment of the system’s original parameters.

Examples of Deferrent Probabilistic Systems

Typing monkeys & slot machines, etc.

These exhibit irrelevant statistical fluctuations (randomness) within a fixed internal solution space (the system-set).

Evolutionary Algorithms (EA’s)

These exhibit irrelevant statistical fluctuations (Rvar & RM) and equally irrelevant distillations(NS) in a fixed internal solution space (the system’s hypervolume).

Darwin’s Material DPS Model

Because any “new” form must be an aspect of the old system set (or it could not possibly appear), it is not a new form at all, but merely an aspect of the original ancient “mega-form” -- an aspect that has now surfaced (become visible) for its “fifteen minutes of fame.” Because all of its order content is system order no new order has emerged. What is occurring, in Darwin’s model is that (due to environmental change) certain aspects (species) of the ancient original DNA mega-form (hypervolume) are becoming temporarily visible while other aspects may be retreating to become (temporarily) invisible. Without a source of new order, Darwin’s entire model is ancient.

Darwin’s Material Mechanisms

Darwinist will claim however that they have a source of new order -- *random mutation*. This however is not true. Natural selection will remove anything that fails to make sense within a biological system. The only way for a random mutation to make sense is for it to be advantageous within the pre-existing syntactical context of a living organism -- which in turn is the context of the ancient probabilistic DNA mega-form (the set of all possible living DNA sequences {that are gradualistically accessible}). Natural Selection simply destroys whatever falls outside “the set of all possible living DNA sequences” guaranteeing that nothing new will ever happen.

Thus, the origin of new living order (new species) from Darwin’s model is logically impossible due to its logical-theoretical structure. It further follows that Darwinian mechanisms, (Rvar&NS+RM&NS) must all be red herrings that serve only to distract scientists (and the public) from seeing Darwinism’s illogical basis.

Random Variation

(Darwinian "logic")

"Reshuffle the holes and new Swiss cheese will emerge."

Random variation does not explain the emergence of species but only explains randomness in the timing of the appearance of each variant sub-form. Randomized timing is irrelevant to the question of form generation or emergence.

--Red herring--

An example;

In a slot machine, the "three lemon" jackpot (along with all other possible combinations) is pre-established. What has not been established (and is therefore random) is merely the timing sequence of the appearance of the combinations. Moreover, those combinations that are blocked from view (at any given time) are nonetheless part of the system's constant probabilistic structure. Reshuffling the blockage-of-view does precisely nothing to originate new structure.

Random Mutation

"Given enough holes, new Swiss cheese will emerge."

Random mutation does not explain the emergence of new species. This is because the success of any mutational change is entirely dependent upon that change fixing to pre-existing (old) structure/form. Without organismal or environmental syntax there is nothing to fix to and randomness in isolation is worthless. *What is needed is a source of living form that precedes that form and produces new form.* New Swiss cheese "does not logically follow" from holes (the absence of cheese). New living form "does not logically follow" from randomness (the absence of form).

--Non-sequitur--

On Randomness and Demolition Functions in General

Randomness is not a causally adequate explanation for the emergence of its opposite -- order. Randomness can, however, serve as an explanation where the end product is not ordered, but is instead randomized...

Example: #1.

Q. "Why is the shape of my car unappealingly random?"

A. "I entered your car in a demolition derby and it lost."

In this case, a randomization function (demolition) has been applied to my car successfully explaining its randomized present state. This logic is subsequently valid.

Example #2.

Q. "How did you restore my car to an ordered state after it had been demolished?"

A. "I re-entered it into the demolition derby and it became ordered by accident."

In this case, a randomization function (demolition) has been applied to my demolished car, unsuccessfully explaining its ordered present state. This logic is not valid.

Random Mutation is a demolition function applied to genetic information.

Natural Selection

"Remove enough cheddar (apples, TV sets, etc.) and Swiss cheese will emerge."

Natural Selection does not explain the emergence of new species. This is because NS only kills (-) what does not work. It does not produce(+) what does work. The two functions (killing{-} and producing{+}) are logically and functionally distinct. The emergence of Swiss cheese "does not logically follow" from the removal of cheddar. The emergence of viable living order "does not logically follow" from the killing of non-viable living order.

-- Non-sequitur --

On Distillations and Moonshine in General

In a distillation process, alcohol is not being originated.⁵ Instead, whatever alcohol was already in the "solution space" is simply becoming more concentrated with the removal (by the de-selection/vaporization) of water. Just as with natural (de)selection -- the vaporization -- of that-which-is-not the target does not produce the target (alcohol or new species respectively). It is the irrelevance of Natural Selection to the origin of the target that make Natural Selection a "red herring." Darwin's "new species," are merely secondary internal fluctuations and distillations masquerading as novelty.

Darwinists are simply assuming that the "new species" are already "in the cards" (already in the solution space) and that mere appearance (becoming visible) constitutes a bona fide emergence and not just sleight of hand. For many this constitutes good science. For others like myself it does not. A genuine solution to

the origin of the species would shed significant light upon other problems of origin, such as the origin of life and the origin of the universe.

In conclusion, Darwinian “logic,” being loaded with assumptions and fallacies, is an impediment to critical logical and scientific thought. With use of computer models, Darwinists are simply assuming the countless teams of intelligent designers (paid for with Bill Gate’s re-invested millions) needed to originate stable⁶ computers and their stable internal platonic spaces and stable software environments. Intelligently designed computer programs (E.A.’s) running in these natural(?!) spaces serve only to further deepen the Darwinian delusion.

The Darwinian invocation of deep time is a further sleight of hand. When Darwinists claim that “given enough time it could happen” but neglect to mention the massive infusion of bio-specific order required to maintain organisms and a biosphere over that time, they are not presenting a scientifically accurate picture of the problem. Given a massive infusion of rabbits (or Bill Gate’s millions), I too can pull a rabbit from a hat. But what if you do not have any “rabbits” at all, just a black hole singularity, what then?

Notes

1. While do disagree with some of the design critics in DDPE the book itself represents a very valuable and comprehensive contribution to the Darwin versus Design debate (in my opinion).

2. With strong words like this you might think that I was “religiously motivated.” Think again. You do not want to be blind-sided.

3. I am not here questioning “evolution”-- the notion that species grow and change or “evolve” over time. Nor am I questioning that idea that many species are related. I am instead question the adequacy of the Darwinian mechanism as a source of new order as an “originator of the species” - the core Darwinian claim.

4. My thread at ARN “The Argument From the Logically Prior Superselection.” can be found at.. http://www.arn.org/boards/ubb-get_topic-f-13-t-001190.html

5. In contrast to a fermentation process in which alcohol is being originated from sugar.

6. And even with all this effort and money our computer environments are just barely stable. Has your windows program ever crashed?