

## Evolutionism: scientific dogma or theosophic thesis?

210-267 Minuten

---

### Evolutionism: scientific dogma or theosophic thesis?

Fedeli, Vanini, Oliveira

Orlando Fedeli

Fábio Vanini, Biologist

Marina Marques Vanini, doctoring in Biology

Dr. Daniel Almeida de Oliveira, Physician

*"Quant à la réalité de l'évolution organique, ma croyance est inébranlable... Il n'en est pas moins vrai que les explications classiques de la genèse des espèces sont loin de contenter tous les esprits. **Pour ma part, je les tiens toutes pour des contes de fées à l'usage des adultes...** Il faut avoir le courage de reconnaître que nous ignorons tout de ce mécanisme"*  
(Jean Rostand, **Ce Que Je Crois**, Grasset, Paris, 1953).

["About the reality of organic evolution, my belief is unshakable. It is actually true that the classical explanations about the genesis of the species are far from pleasing all spirits. **From my part, I consider them all fairy tales to adults' use...** one must have courage to recognize that we ignore everything about this mechanism"]

(Jean Rostand, **What I believe**, Grasset, Paris, 1953)

(Jean Rostand was Nobel-Prize winner as physician and

defender of Evolutionism)

## I - EVOLUTIONISM AND RELIGION

### 1 – EVOLUTIONISM AND RELATIVISM

The Evolutionism is one of the "dogmas" of modern mind.

It goes beyond the purely biological field, and is applied to everything: nothing more is considered to be stable, for it is believed that everything evolves. In this sense, the belief in Evolutionism can be pointed as one of the causes of the triumphant relativism in our days. There would not be any absolute value. No truth, neither moral, neither beauty, neither religion, nor dogmas, nothing would be stable, because all would be under the law of evolution, this one, indeed, is taken as absolute.

So, the actual Evolutionism is more than a biological theory: It is an absolute principle – a religious dogma – of a relativist metaphysics. And there we see it is a symptomatic and revealing contradiction: relativism founds its bases in an absolute principle!

The scope attributed to the Evolutionism is so metaphysic that – obviously – reaches the religious sphere: God Himself is considered an eternal becoming, and not as the Immutable Being, ***"That one that is"*** (Ex III, 12).

Father Teilhard de Chardin – who Stephan Jay Gould judges to be the main responsible for the famous fraud of the man of Piltdown (Cfr. JAY GOULD, Stephen, *A Conjuração de Piltdown*, in *A Galinha e seus Dentes*, ed. Paz e Terra, São Paulo, 1992, pp.

201 a 226, and, from the same author, *O Polegar do Panda*, Martins Fontes, S. Paulo, pp. 95 a 109) – has declared:

*"Evolution, is it a theory, a system, or a hypothesis?"*

*It is much more than that. It is the general condition to which all theories, all hypothesis, all systems should kneel; a condition to which they must refer to, from now on, in order for them to be taken in account and to be right".* (TEILHARD de CHARDIN, *The human phenomenon*, p. 245).

Julian Huxley, by his turn, shows how the dogma of evolution imposes itself as the foundation of the modern relativist religion:

*"In the evolutionist way of thinking, there is no place for supernatural (spiritual) beings capable of affecting the course of human events, nor there is necessity of them. Earth was not created. It was formed by evolution. The human body, the mind, the soul, and everything that was produced, including laws, moral, religions, gods, etc., are entirely result of evolution, by means of the natural selection".* (Cfr. HUXLEY, J. *Evolution after Darwin*, p. 246, apud OSSANDÒN VALDÈS, Juan Carlos, *En torno al concepto de evolución*, article in the *Philosophica* magazine, of Santiago, Chile, doctrinary Supplement of the *Jesus Christus* magazine, number 50, of Buenos Aires).

We believe that these statements by Teilhard de Chardin and Huxley are enough – beyond the exam of what happens today – to confirm what we said above: Evolutionism is the fundamental dogma of modern relativism.

Today, this dogma is impinged by continuous repetition and accepted by everybody, since all society breathes it continuously.

In professor Ossandón Valdés' article, one finds a quotation from J.C. Mansfield in which he *proposes*:

*"Let high-school students be soaked up with the thinking of evolution so that they get used to think all in terms of process, and not in terms of a static situation".*

Clearly, this is what has been put in practice, in worldwide scale, to create in the youth a relativist mentality.

## **2 – EVOLUTIONISM: THE CONCEPT AND ITS ORIGEN**

"To evolve" is a term that comes from the Latin *evolvere* that means to develop something that was involved. Evolving stands for making develop that which potentially existed previously in something.

Evolutionism is understood as the doctrine that affirms that life beings would come from the inorganic matter, and that from plants were originated animals, and, at the end, from animals it would have become men. Always, then, from the less it would come the more, from the inferior, by development, the superior would come.

According to the scientists present in the Congress of Chicago, in 1959, in order to celebrate the centenary of Darwin's work, evolution would have the following definition:

*"Evolution can be defined, in general terms, as an unidirectional and irreversible process that, in the course of time, generates novelty, diversity and higher levels of organizations". (Apud OSSANDÒN VALDÈS, art. cit. p. 7).*

This definition is much different from the one Darwin had, it does not make any reference to natural selection. We will come

back to this topic, later on.

Currently, different definitions are considered, as “genetic frequency change”, “harmonic change”, “modified descendants, etc. They avoid treating the evolution as a development in a genealogical line, what would, soon, give the idea of progress. As scientists do not consider evolution, at least in the Academy, as “progress” of the beings, they use the idea of the philo-genetic tree, with branches that are derived from a common ancestral. However, in principle, it falls, exactly, on the same foundation.

Even though the term evolution is, today, intimately linked to Darwin, he was not its inventor.

In the Antiquity, the philosophy of Heraclit – typically Gnostic -- already denied the existence of a subject of the changes, affirming that the unique reality was the change, the becoming.

In Stoa, Zenon and his disciples defended, they too, the illusion of the reality present in the material and visible world.

All Gnostic sects of all times have believed that divinity would be an eternal becoming, and, because of that, all reality would be mutable. To the Gnostics, that who God introduced Himself to Moses – the God that said He was immutable – that was the demiurge, creator of the material world and of evil. This evil Demiurge would be the defender of false immutable values.

In the XVII and XVIII centuries, with the reduction of the Gnosticism that feed in the Gnostic cabalism of Jacob Boehme, it spread in the mystic and esoteric environments the idea of universal evolution. For these cabalistic and Gnostic sects, the process of God’s self-manifestation would include

not only the universe but also the History.

*"Today, when there is a passionate discussion about the soteriological Evolutionism of Father Teilhard de Chardin, we need to remember that the term evolution was not initially introduced by the wise men of the natural sciences of the XIX century around Charles Darwin, but the term was used as a theological and soteriological term by the Theosophists of the XVIII century. So, it was adopted by the philosophers of the German Idealism: Hegel, Schelling, Baader, as a soteriological term, to describe the teogonical process in which God manifests Himself in the universe as in the soteriology, "so that God may be all in all" (I Cor. XV, 28). This verse from Saint Paul, so many times quoted by Teilhard de Chardin, is the favorite verse of Schelling, Baader and, before them, of Oetinger. It was Baader who published a book about "The Evolutionism and the rEvolutionism, or, about the positive and negative evolution of life in general and of social life in particular", In the Anais of Bevier, 1834, n°. 28, p. 219-224 e n°. 62, p. 483-490". (BENZ, Ernst, Les sources mystiques de la philosophie romantique allemande, Vrin, Paris, 1968, p. 58).*

Curiously, today, the dogma of evolution is accepted by almost everybody without any deep examination. Among students, it is generally accepted that man has had origin in the monkeys, or in a common ancestral from monkey and man. However, nobody asks what animal should be generated by man in the future. Because, if evolution is the general and fundamental law of nature, it will make man evolve to a stage that will be to man, just like man is to monkey.

In other words, there should come the super-men.

This question, for considering the possibility of the existence of a superior race, puts in evidence the relation between

Evolutionism and Nazism and, because of that, almost nobody takes it into account. How come is that it is never shown that Evolutionism was one of the ideological roots of the Nazi murderer system?

### **3 – Evolutionism – Pantheism and Gnosis**

Also does one avoid recognizing that the alleged simian origin of man does not answer the basic question stated by the theory of Evolution: where is the Universe from?

The denial that man was created by God brings in the denial of the creation of the Universe. If man has animal origin, where would life come from, and where would Universe raw material come from?

Has Universe always existed? Will it exist forever? Is matter eternal? Is matter infinite? Is matter omnipotent? Is matter God?

A coherent Evolutionism necessarily leads to Pantheism because it must admit that matter has always existed and is, therefore, eternal, infinite, and omnipotent. This means giving matter qualities proper to God. As for Atheism – including Darwin's – it just hides a subjacent Pantheism.

If Evolutionism denies the divinity of universal matter it has, necessarily, to fall into Gnosis, that is, if it does not accept that matter is divine it will have to admit that, in its interior resides, or better saying, is imprisoned a spirit which by means of Evolution, intends to get free from matter's prison, which is the very substance of Gnostic thinking.

Evolutionists have oscillated between Pantheism and Gnosis but, in both cases, Evolutionism always ends up in a religious

problem.

Anyway, even if many superficial evolutionists do not account for the problem, it exists: the biological Evolutionism acts only as tactical room divider, to a system beyond Metaphysics, to a religious system.

From this deep religious question, hidden in the heart of evolutionist theories, is where the “fever” of adhesion to the evolutionist thesis comes, and sometimes, the fury with which the evolutionists are affected when one questions the taboo-dogma of Darwinism.

And it is this unconditional adhesion to a not demonstrated “dogma” that explains why the theory of evolution is the one that, in its story, accounts for largest number of frauds and scandals in Science History. We will see, further on, some of the frauds perpetrated by famous scientists in order to “arrange” the proof of Evolution they did not found in Nature. Now, the simple acknowledgement that a theory had tried to be fraudulently proved would be enough for arising suspicion around it. But this rule is not applied concerning Evolutionism. Even though this theory has more frauds than proofs, it keeps on being presented as true, on the brink of the Pope John Paul II, recently, defend its ideas as verisimilar and even right (John Paul II, speech to Pontifical Academy of Sciences, 1997).

It's also very interesting to observe how common are religious expressions in the texts of evolution defenders. See, for instance, how the famous evolutionist Stephan Jay Gould speaks about “orthodoxy”, “apostasy”, “heresy”, “dogma”, “devotion”, and so on, when treating about adhesion, deviation or abjuration of Evolution Theory (cfr. Stephen Jay Gould, “The Panda’s Thumb” ed. Ref. pp. 167 to 169).

Paul Lemoine wrote:

*“Evolution is a sort of dogma in which its clergymen no longer believe, although they uphold it to the people: it is necessary to have courage to say this so that the men of the future generation guide their researches in a different way”* (Encyclopédie Française, Tome V, ps. 5-82-3, 5-82-8, apud P. TROADEC, op. cit.p. 37).

Jean Rostand has the same religious position towards Evolution, when he asseverates:

*“I believe resolutely...that mammals proceed from lizards and lizards from fishes, but I prefer to lay vague the origin of this scandalous metamorphosis instead of adding to its unlikelihood an illusory interpretation”* (Apud Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 15).

For Rostand, Evolutionism is more religious than scientific because:

*“...deliberately it maintains without response the fantastic question about origin of life and...just propose illusory solutions to the problem – not less fantastic – of evolutionary transformations”... “We are still waiting for a sufficient suggestion in respect to the cause of species’ transformations”... “When we talk about Evolution we suppose the existence of an imaginary nature, endowed with powers radically different from everything that is scientifically known”* (Jean Rostand, apud G. Salet, referred by Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 15).

Errol White, an expert in aquatic biology, has written:

*"We still ignore the evolution mechanism despite the confidence flaunted in some sectors and probably we will not make ulterior progress in this point, by means of the classic methods of the Paleontology and Biology; and certainly we will not advance in the subject on jumping up and down and screaming: "Darwin is God and I am his prophet" (cfr. Duane T. Gish. "Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record, Creation-Life Publishers, El Cajon, 7a. ed. 1.992, p. 68).*

Lynn Margulis, emeritus professor of Biology at Massachusets University thinks that History will end up considering the neo-Darwinism as "a little religious sect of the XX Century, inside the general religious faith of Anglo-Saxon biology" (C. Mann, "Lynn Margulis: Science's Unruly Earth Mother", In Science, 1.991, . 252. pp 378-381, apud Michael Behe, "A Caixa Preta de Darwin" Jorge Zahar Editor, Rio de Janeiro, 1.996, p.35).

Other authors known as defenders of Evolutionism admit that Darwinism is not scientific, and yet, it is more faith than science.

For this reason N. Macbeth says textually: "Darwinism is not science" (in American Biology Teacher, November of 1976, p. 496, apud Duane T. Gish, op. cit., p. 14).

L. Harrison Matthews, evolutionist geologist confesses:

*"The fact of Evolution being the backbone of Biology and that Biology is therefore in the particular position of a science founded upon a not-confirmed theory – is it then science or faith? Believing in Evolution is, thus, the exact parallel of believing in a special creation – both are concepts that believers take as true, but neither one nor the other was capable, so far, of proving anything" (L. H. Matthews, Introduction for the "Origin*

of Species”, of Charles Darwin, Dent and Sons, London, 1.971, p. XI, apud Duane T. Gish, op. cit. p. 15).

Evolutionism is therefore the central dogma of a sect with Gnostic character, and alike all sects, it is intolerant.

Richard Dawkins, scientist and ardent defender of Evolution wrote that those who deny Evolution are “ignorant, stupid or insane (or mean – but I would prefer not to take this possibility into consideration)” (Apud M. Behe, op.cit. p. 251).

John Madox, *Nature* magazine’s editor declared in his magazine: “Maybe it will not take long for the practice of religion to be considered as anti-science. (Apud M. Behe, op. cit. P. 252) and “Daniel Dennet compares the believers (90 % of population) to wild animals, who need to be caged and says that they must be hindered (by means of coercion, it is presumed) to notify their sons the truth about the Evolution, which is so evident to him.

#### **4 – EVOLUTIONISM AND PHILOSOPHY**

The geometric naivety of some "scientists" comes to the absurdity of imagining that Darwinian Evolutionism is a purely scientific position, without any relation to history, philosophy or religion. They imagine that Evolutionism emerged solely from the scientific studies of Darwin and his followers, all of them hermetically isolated in their laboratories, just as in a prophylaxis, preserved from whatever metaphysical or theological contagious.

Putting apart, this way, Darwinism from its historical and cultural context, they are hindered from having the true understanding of the problem as well as of its historical meaning.

In truth, Evolutionism is a chapter included in the Western History of Philosophy and Religion. It only can be truly understood inside its cultural context.

*"(...) Darwin's evolutionist thinking was not a simple scientific hypothesis that occurred in order to fight some religious ideas admitted in certain questions in fact. It was, above all, the product and an essential part of a Weltanschauung – a vision of the world – closely linked to the production of the industrial Revolution and political revolutions, mainly the French Revolution, these great historical facts which took place between 1776 and 1848". (Howard E. Gruber, op. cit. p. 47).*

So, Darwinism can only be understood as part of a "vision on the world" – of a *Weltanschauung* – and of a revolutionary *Weltanschauung*.

Darwin, himself, in his Autobiography confesses that it was after reading a work from Malthus on population that he had the idea of natural selection, through the struggle for survival, which would always make the weaker to be eliminated.

Stephan Jay Gould, defender of a reformed Evolutionism, quoting the last studies of Howard E. Gruber and Silvan S. Schweber about Darwin's life, shows how the founder of modern Evolutionism has not based himself in Biology to set up his theory.

*"Reading the detailed report of Schweber of the moments that preceded the formulation of the natural selection theory by Darwin, I was particularly touched by the absence of decisive influences from its own field, Biology. The immediate precursors were a social scientist [Comte], an economist [Adam Smith] and*

*a statistician [Adolph Quetelet]" (S. Jay Gould, The Panda's thumb, p.55).*

Jay Gould says that Schweber's work demonstrates that the "final parts [of evolution theory of Darwin] did not emerged from new facts from natural history, but from intellectual incursions of Darwin in distant fields. When he read a large revision of "*Cours de Philosophie positive* – the most famous work of the philosopher [Sic!] and natural scientist [Sic!] August Comte – Darwin was particularly impressed by the insistence of the author that an adequate theory must be prophetic [Sic!] and, at least, potentially quantitative" (S. Jay Gould, The panda's thumb, p. 55)

*"In fact, I believe that the natural selection theory should be seen as an enlarged analogy – conscious or unconscious of Darwin, I do not know – with the economy of laissez-faire, from Adam Smith" (Jay Gould, op. cit. p. 55).*

And more:

*"The natural selection's theory constitutes a creative transference, to biology, of the key argument of Adam Smith in favor of a rational economy: the balance and the order of nature do not emerge from a more elevated and external control (divine) or from the existence of laws operating directly over all, but from the fight between individuals for their own benefits (in modern terms, by the transmission of their genes to future generations through the differential success in reproduction)". (Jay Gould, op. cit. p. 56).*

Jay Gould makes every effort to minimize the surprise – or the scare generated by his statement – that the theory of evolution was not based, initially, in Biologic discoveries, saying:

*"A lot of people feel uneasy hearing such an argument: it does not compromise the integrity of science the fact that some of its primary conclusions were born, by analogies, from modern politics and culture, instead of being based on facts of the discipline itself" (Jay Gould, op. cit. p. 56).*

These facts shed new lights over the matter, indeed, because Evolutionism has been systematically presented as a purely scientific and biologic theory, when, in truth, it is not.

## **5 - DARWINISM AND MARXISM**

If the theory of Darwinist evolution had its origin in Darwin's philosophical and economical readings, its effects could only please Marxist materialism.

In effect, "Marx was a great admirer of Darwin" (Jay Gould, op. cit. p.57).

*"When the "Origin of Species" showed up, Marx and Engels, the apostles of the world as a flow, saluted it with great joy. In 1860, Marx wrote to Engels: "Although developed in crude English style, this is the book that contains the basis of our perceptions in Natural History" (Howard E. Gruber, Darwin on Man, The University Chicago Press 1981, p.71).*

Marx wrote:

*"It is amazing how Darwin recognizes, between animals and plants, his English society, with the division of work, the competition, the openness to new markets, the "invention" and the Malthusian "fight for survive". It is the bellum omnium contra omnes (the war of all against all) of Hobbes" (Marx, apud Jay Gould, op. cit. p.56-57).*

And with the elimination of the weaker ones. Therefore, he justifies the law of the survival of the fittest to human life.

There is no doubt, so, that the evolutionist doctrine is a capitalist one...appreciated, in the past, by Marx, and today, by the Marxists.

Marx also wanted to dedicate the second volume of "Das Kapital" to Darwin, so much did he admire him. It was Darwin who asked Marx not to do that (Cfr. H. E. Gruber, op. cit., p. 72 e Gérard Bonnot, O que restou do Darwinismo, interview with Jacques Ruffié, author of the book *Traité du Vivant*, in O Estado de São Paulo, 9 de maio de 1982).

Pierre Thuillier, in his book *Darwin et Cie.* discovers the ideology man hidden in the scientist:

*"He [Darwin] had decided, even before his interpretations of his famous observations, that he should formulate a global mechanist explanation". "Darwin was a militant of atheism and of materialism, who was really careful to hide his true motivations under the appearances of a rigorous scientific procedure". "I should avoid showing up to what point I believe in Materialism, he wrote".* (Article A nossa origem: uma antiga e apaixonada discussão - L'Express, in O Estado de São Paulo - Jornal da Tarde, Caderno de Leituras, February, 13, 1982).

Maybe it was in order to hide Materialist Activism and his Atheism that Darwin did not accept Marx's homage with the dedication of The Capital.

Gilles Lapouge jumps to the same conclusion about Darwin

and his work:

*"Darwin wishes to make believe he is a science's slave (...) He dissimulates that, in truth, he started from an ideology and organized his observations in the theoretical and ideological archive he had in mind ".(...)*

*(...)"We should add the following: just as all great offensives of science, the theory of evolution is doubly involved in ideology. On the one side, Darwin, himself, confesses that his Materialist vision preceded the collection of the facts. On the other side, because, for a hundred years, Darwinism has fed other theories, other ideologies that extract from Darwinism the justifications for their philosophy or Metaphysics". (G. Lapouge, Darwin e a evolução, artigo in Cultura, Suplemento de O Estado de São Paulo, ano II n°. 95, 04/04/1982).*

Richard Dawkins, stubborn evolutionist scientist, made a speech that was worth a confession. He said that Darwin makes it possible to man to be an "intellectually fulfilled atheist" (Apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 252).

Another known evolutionist, Richard Lewontin, confessed:

*"We stayed in the side of science, despite the patent absurdity of some of its constructions, despite its failure to accomplish many of its extravagant promises in relation to health and life, despite the tolerance of scientific community in favor of certainly non-proved theories, because we have a previous compromise, a compromise with Materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science, in some way, compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenon of the world, but, on the contrary, we are forced by our previous adherence to Materialist conception of universe to create a display of investigation and a set of concepts that produce Materialist explanations, it does not matter how contradictory, how deceiving and how mythological*

*they are to the non-initiated. Beyond that, to us, the Materialism is absolute; we cannot permit that the 'Divine Foot' gets in by our door" (New York Reviews of Books, 1987).*

The narrow link of Evolutionism with Marxism is proved by what tells Monsignor O'Hara, Bishop of Yuanling, in China. According to the testimony of this Prelacy, when the Communist Liberation Army of Mao Tsé Tung entered in a town, all the population was forced to participate in a course of propaganda and indoctrination, and, the first lesson was not about the doctrine of Karl Marx, but about Evolutionism, trying to convince the people that man came from the monkey. (Apud Patrick Troadec, L'Évolucionisme, French apostile, p. 2).

It is clear, then, that Evolutionism had not scientific, but ideological and religious origin.

Because of that, the evolutionist Y. Delage declared:

*"I AM ABSOLUTELY CONVINCED THAT A PERSON IS A TRANSFORMIST OR NOT, NOT IN VIRTUE OF REASONS TAKEN FROM NATURAL HISTORY, BUT FOR REASONS TAKEN FROM PHILOSOPHICAL OPINIONS" (Apud Patrick TROADEC, L'Évolucionisme, p. 2).*

Evolutionism is not born from an impartial scientific research, but from a previous atheism which intends, more than proving evolution to be right, to deny that there was a Creator. Evolutionism is the necessary fruit from atheism. This is what many of its paladins confess.

Caullery, in his book "Le point de l'évolution", states with no holds barred:

*"Yes, current species are stable, but they have not always been like that because, in this case, one would need to appeal to a Creator to explain the appearance of living beings. Now, creationism is anti-scientific. Therefore, the transformation of the species is a fact"* (Apud P. Troadec, op. cit. p.28).

## **6- EVOLUTIONISM AND NAZISM**

However it is worth showing one more thing: the connection between Darwin's Evolutionism and other criminal racist theories that have adopted it, specially the Nazi doctrine.

And it is truly shocking to verify how current Evolutionism defenders do not notice the evident racial implications of Darwin's theory, and how they refuse to admit the evidence, when it is shown to them. The behavior of certain Darwinists – denying the obvious - is very similar to that of certain sectaries when facing a contradiction of theirs with the very Biblical text, which they say to be based on. And it is a typical attitude of fanaticism: to deny the evidence of the facts, or refuse taking an obvious conclusion from a true reasoning.

The Darwinist doctrine submitted the evolution to the laws of the survival of the fittest. The species would fight among themselves, and the weaker, or the less apt, would perish. "The essence of Darwinism resides in a single phrase: the natural selection is the main creative force of the evolutive change" (Jay Gould, op. cit. p.171).

Further on we will analyze more deeply this Darwinist principle. By now, we only want to show the evident racist implications laid in it.

If it is the victory of the fittest which guarantees the continuation of the evolution, it is clear that this universal law

must be applied also into each species. The various races of some species would also be submitted to the law of survival, and the fittest race should have to eliminate the weakest, so that the specie could have more possibilities of improving and surviving.

Darwin's theory presupposes an inequality of races and a fight between them to eliminate those which would be inferior.

Somebody could allege there would be no proofs that Darwin would think like that, and that he would have repudiated the racism. What is discussed is not the possible reaction of Darwin in face of Nazism, which would happen many decades after his death. What we are proposing to do is to make see that Evolutionism brings, in its bulge, the seeds of Hitler's racist laws.

*"Darwin himself (...) talks about "inferior" human being races and believes, according the expression of Thuillier, in the "existence of an absolute hierarchy of humanity" (L'Express, artigo A nossa origem: uma antiga e apaixonada discussão, in Jornal da Tarde - Caderno de Programas e Leituras, 13 de fevereiro de 1982).*

Gilles Lapouge says:

*"Indeed, Darwin brings with him a great part of the racist theories, although he has been completely opposed to any kind of racism". "Darwinism, for a century, has served of theoretical justification to many racist and elitist thoughts" (G. Lapouge, Darwin and the evolution, Culture, nº 95, the State of São Paulo, 4 of April of 1982).*

Darwin's cousin himself – Galton, who was biologist – proposed that science should assume the role which nature

has in the evolution, selecting the most endowed elements. He wanted that society, through the application of scientific methods, made "with providence, quickness and benevolence, what nature does blindly, slowly and cruelly". (Apud G. Lapouge, art. cit.).

Galton proposed then – basing on Darwinism – the criminal Nazis methods.

*"Another case illustrates the camouflaged poisons in the heart of Darwinism. It is Konrad Lorenz's, Nobel Prize, and deservedly considered one of the greatest ethnologic men of modernity. Well, Lorenz, who constantly appeals to Darwin, was a defender of artificial selection and of Hitler's racist ideals. In 1940, still young, he published an incredible article that deals with selection, pureness of races and even of elimination of morally inferior creatures (...) He intends, thanks to Darwinism, to extend to man the laws of animal kingdom, what would make Biology the unique truthful man science, a science at the same time moral, political, etc." (G. Lapouge, art. cit. ).*

Another example of racist Darwinist, given by Lapouge, is MacFarlane Burnett, Nobel Prize winner in 1960. He defends the thesis that the medicine progress hinders nature from selecting species and its elements, allowing the survival of the weak ones. He also accuses the democratic spirit of hindering the elimination of inferiors.

Lapouge quotes the following text by MacFarlane Burnett:

*"We can calculate, he explains, that, since the evolution of primates until the end of hunter and collectors' period, almost 90% of the descendants generated died before reaching the age of reproduction. On the contrary, in the Western societies, the children no longer die. Only 5% of children, a true misery, die. This sudden retraction of the function of proper triage of natural*

*selection must lead to an accumulation of individuals which we can call inferiors according to the current principles related to wealth, intelligence and aggressiveness" (MacFarlane Buttler, apud G. Lapouge, art. cit.).*

MacFarlane Buttler coming to the point that "it is probably impossible, nowadays, to use a legal way to kill aiming the protection of a society", he concludes that "the perpetual confinement, either in a prison, or in an hospital" would be the most proper way to hinder the growth of the number of inferior individuals (Cfr. G. Lapouge, art. cit.).

It is also known that the eugenism, largely spread out in the beginning of the XX century, used to provide "scientific" support to thousands of mass sterilization, in Europe and United States, including of insane people, sick people and beggars. At all, there were 375.000 sterilizations in the Nazis German, and – believe it or not – 30,000 in the United States, between 1927 and 1972 (Razón y revolución: Filosofía marxista y ciencia moderna; A. Woods & T. Grant, fundación F. Engels, 1995). One of its greatest lawyers was the conceited Ronald Fisher, English scientist of ultimate importance to the selecting theories of the XX century.

It seems to be a nightmare! What absurd consequences does Darwinism lead to! By the fruits one gets to know the tree. By the absurd consequences, we can comprehend the error of the principles.

But why not revealing such consequences, which manifest what was hidden in the seed planted by Darwin?

## **7 –CURRENT EVOLUTIONISM AND THE DIALECTIC PHILOSOPHIES**

The natural selection – motor of Evolution – has also philosophic basis. Jay Gould shows that Darwin, accepting the philosophical presupposition of his time, adopted the principle of “*natura non fac saltun*”, which induced him to affirm that Evolution is lazy and passes, step by step, until the formation of a new species. Now, it is universally accepted, nowadays, that this is false because in fossil registers the vestiges of such a slow evolution are not found. The slower and the more time it has endured, the more intermediate fossils would be found between two species. Well, this is not verified!

This is why Jay Gould says that he needed to appeal to a new philosophic model to justify this sudden evolution from a species to another, as he presents his hypothesis named “pointed evolution”.

And to what philosophy has Jay Gould resorted? To the dialectic philosophy of Hegel and Marx!

Let us see the speech of the leader of the Evolutionism of our days:

*“The fossil registration did not offer any support to gradual change: entire faunas had been eradicated during intervals of time extremely shortened. The new species almost always appeared in fossil registration in an abrupt manner, without intermediate links with ancestors, in the oldest rocks of the same region”* (conf. Jay Gould – “The Panda’s Thumb”, p. 161).

The extreme rarity of forms of transition in fossil registration remains the “business secret” of Paleontology. The genealogic trees which adorn our handbooks have data just at points and knots of its branches. The rest is inference – however reasonable they might look – and not evidence of fossil. Darwin, in the meantime, stucked so hard at Gradualism on the

brink of compromising his entire theory (...) (Jay Gould, op. cit. p. 163).

*"If Gradualism is more a product of western thinking than a fact of Nature, we must, this way, consider alternative philosophies of changing in order to expand our universe of constraining prejudice. In USSR, for instance, scientists are trained in a changing philosophy very different, named "dialectic laws", reformulated by Engels from Hegel's philosophy. Dialectic laws are explicitly punctual. They speak, for instance, of "transformation of quantity in quality". Even though it may look like nonsense, it suggests that changing occurs by quantum leaps, which follow a slow accumulation of tensions to which a system can resist until it reaches the rupture point. Heat the water and it ends up boiling. Oppress more and more the working class and it will bring about the Revolution. Elredge and I became fascinated to learn that Russian paleontologists defend a model similar of our punctuate balance" (Jay Gould, op. cit. p. 166).*

Jay Gould's texts are a lot important because of the confessions, which evidence, besides proving how easy it is for scientists to fall into gross philosophic errors. For instance, hot water does not "evolve" to water vapor. Water vapor keeps on being water substantially, whereas evolution, on its turn, supposes a changing of species, that is to say, of substantial form.

It is also not true that crescent oppression will necessarily produce revolution: labors were awfully oppressed by Nazism and Stalinism and never revolted. On the contrary, a lot of them carried on supporting Hitler and Stalin from the beginning to the end. Crowd loves tyrant... Nero, Mao and Pol Pot were adored...

As we can see Jay Gould confesses his adoption of Marxist dialectics as a useful tool in order to confirm his evolutionist thesis.

## **8 – EVOLUTIONISM AND GNOSTIC MISTICISM**

The confession of Jay Gould (that Evolutionism save itself by the adoption of a Hegelian and Marxist philosophic model – with the adoption of a dialectic thinking) cast, even more, the evolutionist doctrine into the Gnosis sphere.

In effect, Gnosis is essentially dialectic. Its first law refers to equality of contraries. For the Gnosis the being evolves constantly because it would be constituted of contrary and equal principles.

As a matter of fact, Engel's dialectics proceeds from Hegel's. He, on his turn, confesses to have inherited it from Jacob Boehme, who was inspired in Cabala, which, according to Gerschom Scholem, is the Judaic Gnosis (Cft. Gerscom Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism – Perspectiva, S. Paulo. 1972.)

There are two sources of Hegel's dialectic philosophy, both of Gnostic character: Meister Eckhart's and Jacob Boehme's.

*“Hegel was Boehme's follower since his youth and has praised him many times in works and letters”* (Ernst Benz, op. cit. p. 20).

*“Hegel discovered the support of his idealistic interpretation of the reality in the speculations of Meister Eckhart, in which his friend (the theosophist) Baader had initiated him”* (E. Benz, op. cit. p. 14).

Baader tells us:

*"In Berlin I use to be accompanied by Hegel frequently. One day, in 1824, I was reading to him texts from Meister Eckhart who he knew only by name. He became so enthusiastic that gave me the next day an entire conference about Meister Eckhart, which he finished with the words:*

*"Da haben wir es ja, was wir wollen"*

("This is exactly what we want. Here is the joint of our ideas, of our intentions") (E. Benz, op. cit. p.12).

*"Hegel personally introduced in the ideas of Meister Eckhart by means of his friend Baader found in him the verification and confirmation of his own philosophy of spirit (...) he found in Meister Eckhart the anticipated and even perfected form of the new metaphysical speculation of his time" (E. Benz. Op. cit. p. 12).*

Meister Eckhart and Jacob Boehme had a dialectic metaphysics that was adopted by Hegel and was followed by Marxism. Jay Gould informs us that the theory of Evolutionism can only be saved by means of Hegel and Marx's dialectics. This way he confirms that Evolutionism can just be acceptable and possible with a dialectic and Gnostic view of universe.

## **II - EVOLUTION AND METAPHYSICS**

### **1 - THE PROBLEM OF THE ORIGIN OF LIFE**

What is life and what is its origin are two problems that, beyond the pure biological field, extend to Metaphysics and Theology. It is not to surprise, thus, that the discussions about Evolutionism always slip to the religious field.

In the world, the great distinction is between rational beings and purely material beings.

It happens, however, that even between purely material beings life springs and that man, although being endowed with rational and spiritual soul, has also an animal body. From that some important problems arise. Here are some of them:

1- What is vegetal life and animal life?

2 - Would they have purely material origin?

3 - Would there be in the vegetal and the animal a vital principle that would not be strictly material?

4 - The solution to these questions, what problems would it bring to explain what man is?

With the decadence of Scholastic philosophy, in the end of the Middle Ages, two tendencies became relevant:

1<sup>st</sup> – Materialistic - Having its roots in the Nominalist Philosophy of Ockham, Materialism acquired, later on, multiple forms. In all of them, the strive is to give to all metaphysical problems a solution with rationalist, scientificist, mechanistic and materialist character. It is not in vain that Ronaldo Fisher, in his book *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, defends the Nominalist philosopher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930; New York: Dover Publications, 1958).

2<sup>nd</sup> - Gnostic Stream - In direct opposition to materialism, it was developed a stream whose origin remounts to Eckhart and the mysticism of the medieval sects, and which, totally or partially rejecting matter, affirms a dualism that gives value and reality only to the spirit. With platonic and Gnostic core, these esoteric secret sects have multiplied after the loss of reliability in Scholastic, of submission to the Church and of primacy of Faith. These sects, in general, were anti-rational, anti-scientific, magical, and against matter, which they considered to be a prison for the spirit and the outcome of an evil God.

With relation to the problem of origin of life, the materialistic stream used to say that the cause of life was totally material. The simple ordering of matter would have the power of generating life. All in all, the evolutionist streams are affiliated with materialism.

In opposition, the spiritualist and Gnostic tendency states that life is the manifestation of a divine spirit immerse into matter and that searches for its freedom. The alchemical sects are in this last group.

Teilhard de Chardin's position attempts to conciliate these two streams, although his thinking is typically gnostic.

Both the mechanist explanation of life, adopted by the materialistic stream, and the vitalist and spiritualist one, of Gnostic tendency, go up against Catholic and Scholastic conception.

In reaction against materialist mechanicism, some neo-scholastics ended up – by mistake – giving a vitalist-like solution to the problem of vegetal and animal lives.

According to Saint Thomas, vegetal and animal lives

correspond to the substantial and material form of the plant and the animal. The hilemorfist doctrine of Aristotle and Saint Thomas states that in every material being there is a composition of matter and substantial form. In vegetals and animals, matter is ordained potentially to have vegetal or animal lives, which is given to them by its material substantial form. So, the life of a plant or of an animal corresponds to their substantial form. The death of the animal or the plant is the loss of its animal or vegetal form, just that. In plant and in animal there is not, thus, any vital principle extrinsic to matter.

The problem is how the constitution of vegetal and animal beings, by the actualization of the potentiality of matter to have life, takes place. In other words, how the potency of matter to have life is actualized by its form, without which it is neither vegetal nor animal. It is clear that pure potency does not exist, and thus, there is no pure matter as only potency. The matter of the vegetal and the animal is the same mineral matter, it is, is a matter that has already matter and mineral form.

How, then, the mineral turns to be vegetal?

For the mechanicians, mineral matter, simply by its ordination, transforms itself into vegetal, that is, becomes alive matter.

For the vitalists, the vegetal only becomes itself by the inclusion in it, from the exterior, of a "spirit" or a vital principle.

For the scholastic philosophy, neither the mechanism nor the vitalism are true. Mineral matter becomes vegetal by the acquisition of a new form. So, as wood is what it is by its substantial form, and turns to ashes, changing its substantial form by the action of fire, so purely mineral matter would become vegetal, and then alive, by changing its substantial form.

However, we have to answer a crucial question: what makes mineral matter change to vegetal substantial form?

For the Aristotelic-Thomist theory, nothing can go from potency to act by itself. All movement requires that the being in potency to a certain quality receives this same quality from another being which already possesses it in act.

Mineral matter, which has the potency of becoming alive by the assumption of a new substantial form, needs that this form be given – at least initially – by another being that is not pure mineral matter which, being in potency to life, cannot have life in act.

In fact, in Genesis we can read that, in the beginning God said: “Let the earth bring forth green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, which may have seed in itself upon the earth” (Gen, I, 11). And yet: “Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven. And God created the great whales, and every living and moving creature, which the waters brought forth, according to their kinds, and every winged fowl according to its kind” (Gen I, 20-21).

In this excerpt from the Genesis it is said that God used the earth and the waters as matter, and His order founded in matter the vegetal or animal form. *En passant*, it is convenient to note that the text from the Genesis states that every plant and animal were created capable of giving fruit “according to its kind”, and that this expression is ten times repeated in the first chapter of the Genesis.

In conclusion, vegetal and animal lives are neither the result of a mechanic ordination, nor the insertion of we-do-not-know-well-what vital spirit in them, but simply the (purely material)

substantial vegetal form of the plant, and the (purely material) substantial animal form of the animal.

## 2 – EVOLUTION AND PRINCIPLES OF THE BEING

Both common sense and Metaphysics teach that:

1 – The being is identical to itself (principle of identity). Bread is bread, stone is stone.

2 - That a thing cannot be and not to be at the same time and under the same aspect (principle of non-contradiction).

This two principles are a result of the very notion of an Absolute Being, God.

In effect, as demonstrated Aristotle and St. Thomas, the possibility of changing is repugnant to the perfection of the absolute Being. The perfect Being cannot become more perfect nor decay from its degree of perfection. God, being pure Act, without any potency, is incapable of any changing.

Changing means passing from potency of a quality to the realization or possession of this quality. God does not have passive potency. Therefore, God cannot change.

It is impressive to find out that, what Aristotle concluded by his thinking, God had already said in the Sacred Scriptures: when Moses asked God what was His name, God answered: **“EGO SUM QUI SUM” [I am who am]** (Ex III, 14). God is That who does not change.

This was confirmed by God in other passages:

***“Ego enim Dominus et non mutor” [For I am the Lord, and I change not]*** (Mal. III, 6).

“Non est Deus quasi homo, ut mentiatur: Nec ut filius homini, ut muetur” [God is not a man, that he should lie, nor is the son of man, that he should be changed] (Num. XXIII, 19).

Thus, the Being by excellence is immutable.

Face to the absolute Being, there are only two possible views:

1<sup>st</sup> – either to admit what He is, how He is;

2<sup>nd</sup> – or to deny – affirming that he does not exist (atheism) and that there is only the changing (gnosis)

All created beings are beings by analogy in relation to absolute Being. Every created being has qualities in act and qualities that they can come to have, that are in potency.

Changing or movement is the passage from potency to a quality to the possession of that same quality. Changing is to pass from potency to act in relation to a defined quality.

Every created being changes.

If one denies that the contingent beings change, so one makes

them equal to God, thus, falling into pantheism. This was Parmenides' error when he did not distinguish beings by principle of analogy and stated that there is only the absolute and unchangeable Being. Falling in such error, he leveled the being stone to the divine Being, and had denied, therefore, the evidence of changes.

Heraclites fell into the opposite error when he stated that there is only the changing, and that there would not be the subject of the changing. By doing so, Heraclites would deny the being and fall into Gnosis.

All created beings are analogical, that is, they are similar with the absolute Being. For beings by analogy, some things change and others do not.

Every analogical being is what it is, due to its substantial form.

Also the substantial form is capable of changing: burned wood becomes ash. But it cannot be wood and ash at the same time, nor is it capable of changing by itself. In order to change, it has to receive the quality, for which it is in potency, from another being, which has that quality in act.

For Evolutionism such fact does not happen.

The being would have in itself an immanent force that would necessarily make it flourish what already existed inside of it in latent state.

The first and unique being would be like a seed from which bloomed up the entire universe.

Just like states Hegelian dialectic: the being is what it is not and is not what it is.

It is the negation, *per diametrum*, of the “Ego sum qui sum” of the Sacred Scriptures.

### **3 – EVOLUTIONISM AND ANALOGY OF BEING**

We see that there is a close relationship between Evolutionism and a monist-pantheistic conception of being or a Gnostic-dialectical view of the universe. Anyway, Evolutionism affirms a metaphysical equalitarianism: deep inside all things would be transformations of a unique being, material or spiritual. For in both alternatives – pantheist or Gnostic – it is denied that the universe would have been created by a transcendental God.

By the other side, the statement that everything is, at the bottom, a unique reality would lead to a denial of the analogy of being.

Yet we see a metaphysical hierarchy in the universe.

Everything that exists is being, but not in the same way. The conception of being is neither univocal nor equivocal, it is analogical.

Thus, the foot of a chair and the foot of an animal and the human foot have something in common: they all support something. But the foot of the chair can only be “foot” while supports the chair, just like the foot supports the human body. The foot of the chair has neither life nor the several qualities of a true foot. The “foot” of the chair is only “foot” by comparison,

by analogy with the human one.

The animal “foot” looks more like human one because it has life and other similar functions when compared to the human foot. By reason of its differences from the human foot, the animal one is called paw and not foot. True foot is only man’s. The foot of chair and animal are foot only by analogy or similarity to the human foot.

Likewise, everything that exists is being. But the things we find in the universe just have the being. They are not the Being.

Being, in proper and absolute sense, is what exists by itself, that is immutable, eternal and infinite. In strict sense, only God is Being. The things that God has created are similar to Him in different degrees. Whereas a thing has qualities in act, in this precise measure it is similar to the Being and is being.

Then, purely material things have less analogy to the absolute Being and, so, they are in the minor degree possible. Yet vegetals, besides existing, have life. In man the rational form turns him a God’s image and, by this reason, the human being is much more similar to the Creator. The angels, at last, being pure spirits, have much more similarity to God than man. There is, thus, a metaphysical scale in the universe, each kingdom transcending from the inferior in the same way – but not in the same degree – that God transcends the created universe.

For Evolutionism, there would not be, in fact, a metaphysical hierarchy because what is today a stone, as time goes by and thanks to Evolution, will change into an alive being, to a rational being, and – not all of them puts it as straightforward as Teilhard de Chardin – at last it will turn into God.

Evolutionism presumes – and sometimes preaches – that there is a true metaphysical monism. And it is this monist and equalitarian conception of the being that reveals its religious inner. When the evolutionist considers that there is just matter perpetually and infinitely changing, he sticks to pantheist monism. When Evolutionism considers that the last reality of things is not matter but a spirit jailed in it, and tries to escape from it through Evolution, it is an expression of Gnosis under “scientific” clothing. Anyway, Evolutionism is the expression of an equalitarian conception of being, denying the analogy of the being in the same way that any transcendence.

#### **4 – EVOLUTIONISM AND FINAL CAUSE**

Evolutionism opposes the principle of finality. All existing things have a purpose. Now, rational beings have intentionally a purpose. Unlike man, who knows his purposes and seeks them with his will, the irrational beings act blindly. Each one of them seeks their goal without knowing it. Hence, an arrow, by itself, is unable to seek the target. To seek it, it needs to be directed. The balls of a pool game only hit one another, seeking the pocketing of one of them, because some intelligent person gives them direction and force. They need an intentional agent.

Therefore, one cannot explain the huge order of the non-rational world seeking a purpose, if there were not an intelligent agent that directed the whole universal order, seeking an ultimate goal.

This teleologic argument – which is Saint Thomas’ fifth way of proving the existence of God, was developed by many thinkers, with some variation in the examples, along the course of History.

If an interplanetary ship were to descend in another planet and, there, find a simple arrow, all the evolutionists would claim –

with good reason – that this arrow would prove the existence of intelligent life outside earth. With good reason, indeed, because it would be impossible for an arrow to be made without the action of an intelligent being.

Well, in this case, evolutionists would be applying the well-known argument of the watch and the watchmaker. If there is the watch, then there has to be a watchmaker who has built it.

Along with this same line of thought, if there is an order in the universe, it is because there is a very wise Orderer who establishes this order.

Michael Behe, in his very good book, called “Darwin's Black Box” which we have already quoted, makes countless uses of this same principle of finality.

According to this author, no irreducible system would be able to evolve. He names irreducible system all those which are composed of multiple parts, all of them absolutely necessary for the system to achieve its goal.

He exposes didactically this principle with a very simple example of a mousetrap, whose components are all absolutely necessary in order to make it achieve its goal. A mousetrap would never be able to evolve, because, if all of its parts were not being fully present or lacking any of them, the mousetrap would end up being absolutely useless.

In the same way, explains Michael Behe, the human eye, a cell, a simple cell cilium, are extremely complex irreducible systems, in which the lack of any constituent element, or the incomplete development of one of the constituent parts, would render the system useless and unable to exist and, therefore,

unable to reach the goal for which it exists. Hence, concludes Behe, the macroevolution is impossible and never happened (Cfr. Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box, Zahar, Rio, 1996).

## **5 – THE PROBLEM OF THE SPECIES AND THE UNIVERSALS**

Darwin has given to his most important work the title “The Origin of the species”. He intended to explain what the “origin” of the species was, that is, what was the efficient cause of the spring of the species. He did not do that. Because saying that mankind becomes from the monkey, by evolution, it does not answer, but only shifts the problem, in time. What about the monkey, where did it come from? What about the first being?

Darwin wanted to deny God and, logically, could only transfer to brute matter the eternity, the active almightiness and infinity, proper of God. He could only substitute God by matter, falling into Pantheism, if he was to state that matter itself had the qualities of God; or into Gnosis, if he was to state that the divine spirit was imprisoned within matter.

The same way as Darwin did not answer what was, actually, the origin, that is, the efficient cause of the universe, he also did not define what species were.

The word “species”, in Latin, stands for look, vision, figure, and it corresponded to the platonic idea of a being.

For Aristotle, “species” was the substantial form, that is, that which makes the being be what it is. The species assembles in its concept all the beings which have the same substantial form.

In the bottom line, then, the term specie is a universal.

Since the end of the Middle Ages, it has been forcefully discussed whether the universal would exist or not.

Gnostic Meister Eckhart, renewing the platonic conception, denied all value of the individual being, and stated that there would be only the universal. For him, there would be only the species.

Ockham, on the other hand, denied the existence of the universal, defending that there was only the individual being. For Ockham, there would be no species, the universal being would be a pure name. Hence his doctrine was called Nominalism.

Darwin is going to repeat the materialist and nominalist Ockham's thesis when he says:

*"The term species ends up being, hence, nothing more than an useless mental abstraction that implies and requires a distinct act of creation"* (Darwin, apud Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 9).

Moreover:

*"I consider that the term species was arbitrarily given, by convenient reasons, to assemble in a group, individuals that are very similar among themselves."*(Darwin, apud Crowson, Darwin y la clasificación, cited by Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p.11).

This way Darwin has written his book – The Origin of the Species – not explaining what was the origin of that – the species – which, according to him, would not exist.

The scientists, nowadays, have identified more than a 1,000,000 different species, being 850,000 of them insects. However, they have not come to an agreement about what species are. Usually, they are considered as “reproduction communities”, i.e., the members of a species can only reproduce themselves with others of the same species.

This modern concept is very faulty because, when taking into account only the reproductive issue, and leaving aside the formal aspects, it becomes impossible to talk about species where there is no reproduction, what renders impossible the classification of all the unicellular, animal and vegetal universe.

There are those who state that species is a group of beings which have the same origin. But, if evolution were a fact, this concept would be false, because, to the evolutionists, all living beings would have one single origin, and all of them would form one single species, what is absurd.

T. Dobhansky states that the only right thing is that species do exist and that these are the ones which the common sense has always identified them as such. Dobhansky still admits that the species are separated by insurmountable gaps among themselves, to the point of not existing any intermediate beings among them. If there were to be intermediate beings, among the species, they would not have the possibility to live (T. Dobhansky, "La idea de especie después de Darwin, en Barnett et alii, Un siglo después de Darwin, Buenos Aires, 1982, p. 39, apus Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 10).

Dobhansky himself proposes a problem to the theory: how can a continuous process, that is Evolution, generate discontinuous products? (*Organic Diversity. In Genetics and the origin of species*, 1937).

"Species are real entities in the nature", is also what Eliot Sober states. (Philosophy of Biology, 1993).

This is exactly why no one has ever been able to see a new species arise. The current ones are the same ones in Aristotle's time, exactly as he described them. They did not evolve.

Haldane, studying the length of the bones, came to the point that in the last 10,000 years there was no evolution at all. Hudson Hoagland states that:

*"The filogenetically old parts of the brain, in opposition to the neo-cortex, changed very little in the last 50,000,000 years of evolution of the mammals"* (H. Hoagland, "Biology, brains and insight", apud Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 10).

Ossandón Valdés shows us that the problem of the hybrids creates new difficulties to the evolutionist theory, because, when the hybrids are fertile, their descendents are used to having younglets that will have the formal characteristics of the original species.

## **6 – Evolutionism and causality**

The Nominalism of Ockham had difficulty in admitting the causality principle. Darwinism, also nominalist, ends having a serious problem with causality.

Actually, every cause has to be anterior and higher than its effect.

Higher in what sense?

No effect can have, in itself, something that would not be received from its causes.

Therefore, a bursting charge of potency "X" should not be able to blow up with a potency higher than "X". If I have force 5 in my arm, I will not be able to raise, alone, a weight higher than 5.

Let us assume that in a refrigerator there are avocados, bananas and cherries. I could prepare a drink composed of avocados and bananas.

$ABC > AB$ .

This is possible and logical. Because, then, the cause is higher than the effect.

Let us assume, in a second case, that in the refrigerator I would have avocados, bananas and cherries. Would it be possible to make, in the blender, a drink containing avocados, bananas, cherries, pineapples, guavas, oranges, tangerines, string beans and grapes?

Evidently no. Because, then, the cause is less than the effect.

$ABC < ABCPGPOTSG$

This is illogical. It is nonsense. And impossible to happen, since, in this case, the effect would be more than the cause.

Well, Evolutionism states that inorganic matter caused vegetal life; from vegetal life came the animal life, which is superior than vegetal life; and from animal life came man with rational life.

Mineral < vegetal < animal < man

According to Evolutionism, the effect is always more than the cause. Evolutionism would then fit in the second analyzed case.

Evolutionism is illogical, nonsense and metaphysically impossible.

Evolutionist doctrine is against the principle of causality.

It is obvious that evolutionists run away from this absurd conception, and they consider that the first existent being, as a seed, had in itself everything what would afterwards be unclasped by the evolution process.

But, thus, Evolutionism would have to admit that this universal primitive seed was eternal, infinite and omnipotent, in other words, would have to admit Pantheism.

Evolutionism is a pretense scientific theory that occults in its bulge a religious doctrine.

### **III – EVOLUTION OF EVOLUTIONIST THEORIES**

#### **1 – INTRODUCTION: Evolutionist Schools**

Science seeks to get to know natural laws. These laws are universal and immutable. Every law discovered in nature is confirmed through new experiences. Therefore, the discovering of the oral vaccine against the virus what causes the polio, by Sabin, always allows this vaccine to hinder people from being victims of this illness.

With Evolutionism such thing did not occur and do not occur. It has never been proved by facts or experiences. Worse: It has varied its explanation as Science would progress and refute its errors. The only thing that Evolutionism proves is that it is a theory in constant evolution, which does not prove either its scientific character, or its veracity.

It does not matter what is understood by the term “species”, when one states that one species comes from another, one have to explain how it happens. Since the beginning, evolutionists had divergences in respect to that, originating many groups or schools of thought.

Along History, Evolutionism has presented the followings groups or schools:

1<sup>st</sup> – Lamarck’s school

2<sup>nd</sup> – Darwin’s school

3<sup>rd</sup> – Neo-DarwinistSchool or ModernSyntheticSchool

4<sup>th</sup> – School of Punctuated Balance

**2 – LAMARCKISM**

According to Lamarck (1744-1829), all living beings would derive one from another by the observance of two laws:

1<sup>st</sup> Law of Acquired Characters

2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Influence of the Environment and the Way of Life

Lamarck wrote two works defending his theory: "Zoological Philosophy" and "Natural History of Invertebrates".

According to Lamarck, the environment in which an animal lives and its way of life would influence it in order to adapt it more and more to new conditions. Constant changes acquired through an animal's lifetime would be transmitted to its descendants. This is the law of acquired characters.

Actually, for Lamarck, the environmental circumstances would only trigger inherent powers of an organism, in order to make it change. Because of this, Lamarckism deserves, indeed, to be called Evolutionism, for it intends to mean that the principles inherent to the living beings are the ones that cause its changing.

As a proof to his theory, Lamarck used to present the fact that, in the live beings, there are some shrunk organs "by lack of use", while other organs would be more developed due to their exaggerated use.

A typical and famous example given by the Lamarckist school of overuse would be the neck of the giraffe. According to Lamarck, the giraffe, once not finding enough food on the surface, would have started to seek it at the top of the trees. For achieving it, it was forced to stretch its neck more and

more. Therefore, its descendants began to be born with longer and longer necks. If the poor giraffe had developed its huge neck to feed from those more tender and higher tree buds more easily, the more its neck grew, the more difficult it became to drink water. The “giraffal” dilemma would have been to choose between stretching its neck to eat and shrinking it to drink more easily.

Yet Cuvier, when making his post-mortem praise to Lamarck, next to his grave, buried his theory along with him, by assigning that, if it is the continuous exercise of an organ that causes its development, how could it have been originated, since it cannot exercise itself before existing? And, if by the time it is half-developed, it would be unapt to perform its functions, what would this new organ be suitable for? It would be, at this stage, more harmful than useful.

Stephen Jay Gould, on his turn, tells us that the ostriches, yet in their eggs, already have callosities typical of adults, and these callosities has not grown because of their use. (S. Jay Gould, *O Polegar do Panda*, p. 70).

The water chicken, which lives for long time – if not for ever since – in the marsh, has not developed a palm-like membrane in its paws. It has not turned into a palmated animal, even though that would have been very useful.

It is false, therefore, that the need creates the organ or transforms it.

The discovery of the deoxyribonucleic acid and the DNA chain proved that all characters are inherited through genetics. Moreover, it was already known that a great deal of acquired characters along life would never be inherited. Thus, since the world is world, the women, in order to generate, lose their

virginity, and nevertheless, their daughters are born in virginal state.

Although completely refuted by Science and by Logic, Lamarckism heritage of acquired characters continues to be quoted in certain books and in certain cathedras, and even, occultedly, by some renowned authors.

For example, according to the transformists, the articulation bone and the square bone of the reptile maxilla would be have been transformed into the mammal ear bones.

Now, this change is absurd and impossible because, during the evolution from one situation to the other, the reptile would not be able to eat, once the maxilla would not be firmly tied to anything. And, until the end of the transformation, the animal would be deaf.

Yet on animal adaptation to the environment, there is a very curious case that makes it hard to the evolutionist theory to explain: the very fact that the water expands when it freezes.

Normally, all heated body expands, and, when cooled, it shrinks.

Well, something very curious happens with water. When it is cooled, it shrinks up to 4° Celsius. As you keep cooling it, between 4° and 0° Celsius it starts to expand.

As a consequence of this fact, when the water of a lake freezes, happens the dilatation of its volume, and this allows the floating of the ice above the water. However, the lake deeper layers cannot freeze, because they have no space to expand. Because of this, in a frozen lake, the deeper layers

always remain at the temperature of 4° Celsius and never freeze, which allows the life in the lake to survive.

In this case, then, animals and vegetals did not adapt themselves to the environment. It was the environment that somehow “adapted” itself so that living beings could survive!

Now, that can only be explained by the existence of a superior Wisdom that ordered the entire universe and not by Evolutionism. Unless one would admit that matter is intelligent and that water would understand that it could not freeze, otherwise it would kill all fish.

### **3 - DARWINISM**

According to Darwin, evolution would happen through natural selection, by means of the struggle for survival.

Contrary to what was affirmed by Lamarck, for Darwin the cause of the transformation of a given species into another would be completely foreign to its organism. The struggle for life would be the real motor of evolution, allowing just the most apt. Malthus, Adam Smith and the artificial cattle selection practiced by English breeders would have inspired Darwin.

Darwin considered Lamarck’s explanation way too simplistic, although he never really went deep into this subject.

S. A. Barnett expressly recognizes that in his volume of homage to Darwin: "Darwin himself has never formulated (his own natural selection theory) in a logically valid way" (Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 12).

What Darwin used to say over the natural selection was mere tautology: natural selection just allows the most apt to survive because only the most apt can survive.

For Darwin, the species would suffer little accidental variations that would little by little accumulate, and would be transmitted from generations to go.

All selection implies on the adoption of a criterion, and all criteria suppose an intelligent mind that chooses and imposes it.

Nature by itself does not cause a natural selection. Indeed many species have disappeared due to bare natural accidents. Thus, by chance of the great orogenies, many species have disappeared along the submersion of entire continents and others have disappeared because of the elevation of the oceanic soil. Today, it is imagined that the sudden extinguishing of dinosaurs are owned to some cataclysmic event, and not to constant selection.

On the other hand, if there was selection of the most apt only, in a long-term, we would have a diminishing in the number of species, and, finally, only one would remain, which does not happen.

If men came from the monkeys through the surviving of the most apt, how would monkeys keep on living? Being less apt, all of whom that did not turn into men should have disappeared.

There are monkeys, still, and Evolutionism, in spite of all its theoretical evolutions, ensures, until now, what has not been proved since Darwin.

By the way, today it is known that species just survive in a balanced ecosystem, and that the disappearance of one species tends to make disappear other species that would depend on it.

Moreover, there should also be a selection inside the species, allowing the survival of the most apt race only. Along evolution, then, we would end with just one species and just one race, which is nonsense.

Decougis, in his work *Le vieillissement des êtres vivants* [The aging of the living beings] states:

*"Paleontology shows us that the extinguished fossil species are, usually, gigantic species, or, sometimes, dwarf but always preserving very accentuated traces of acromegalic degeneration"* (Apud Patrick Troadec, op. cit. p. 24).

Galton found out that the characteristics selected by breeders get back to their primitive state as soon the selection end.

Hugo de Vries concluded that the selection would only be possible by leaps and not by slow and constant changes, as Darwin said. And De Vries reached the conclusion that "selection does not lead to the origin of new species" (Apud Ossandón Valdés, op. cit. p. 13).

This same Ossandón Valdés asserts in his study that "interesting experiences have showed the [artificial] selection has boundaries that are impossible to cross, no matter how much effort the breeder would make. Roughly speaking, animals would rather die than keep changing" (Ossandón

Valdés, op. cit. p. 12).

The well-known biologists Kimura e Ohno criticized evolution so much, based on the natural selection. These two scientists insist that there is a conservation of the species, and, as De Vries and Jay Gould, they affirm that evolution would happen in leaps.

If there has been a slow evolution transforming one species into another, so there should exist intermediary fossils between the species. Well, these fossils were never found. We will see ahead, by studying fossils, that never any lost link between two species was found.

Darwin himself used to awe with the stability of the species that make them so well defined:

*“Why are the species so well defined? Where are, then, the infinite gradations which my theory demand?”*

Darwin was sincere enough to write this. The high school teachers today – and also many college professors – ensure to their students and to the world that these intermediaries were found elsewhere. They swear they were.

If evolution – as defended by Darwin – was true, one would find, even nowadays, a few species in phase of evolution. And this does not happen.

The Darwinists rule out this difficulty by saying:

1 – Evolution demands a long time span to work

2 – Today's environmental conditions, different from the past, do not allow evolution

What we can state in paleontology research is exactly the opposite of what was expected by Darwin and of what was said by his first followers. Not only were not found intermediary fossils between any two species, but they also found species that have never evolved during the long time they lived. The so-called "alive fossils" belong to this case.

"Living fossils" is the name given to certain beings which were known, in the past, only due to fossil samples, and that, later on, were found living samples totally identical to those millions-years-old fossil exemplars.

A classical example of living fossil is the coelacanth, a fish from which just a fossil sample from 300,000,000 years was known. Recently, it has been found out a great amount of coelacanth alive exactly identical to the fossils. The coelacanth went through 300,000,000 years without evolution, although it has lived under the environmental conditions in which evolution seemed to be possible.

There are many other cases of animals that crossed practically all the Earth's geological history and did not evolve. The cockroach is placed in this case. The old cockroach was just as disgusting as today's cockroach.

Concerning the allegation that evolution demands long time periods to accomplish, such is against Darwinism. If this was true, the longer a species takes to become another, greater the number of intermediary samples that should be found. Nothing of the kind was found fossilized in the geological column.

In order to explain the sudden and surprising appearance of new species in the geological layers, evolutionists turned to the idea of the accelerated evolution. At the cataclysmic era, when it was very likely that some species would disappear, due to an unknown and inexplicable instinct, the species, in order to survive, would evolve quickly into another shape or into a different species, capable of surviving in the new environment that would have been formed. This means to attribute not only changing capability to the menaced species, but also the power of foreseeing the cataclysm and what would be the future conditions. Truly Chiromancy!

This ridiculous attempt of explaining easily falls to the ground, because, if it was true, there should be uncountable samples of intermediary fossils between two species, succeeding one another in a short period of time. Well, this has never been seen.

Sieged, the evolutionists jumped to another branch of explanation: the onto-mutation.

By onto-mutation they understood that, at dangerous times, a couple of a species would directly generate a sample of another species. This attempt of explanation was so absurd and so ridiculous that logic, good sense, and new scientific discoveries – DNA's – made it quickly fall into oblivion.

#### **4 – NEO-DARWINISM OR Synthetic Evolutionism**

The so-called Neo-Darwinism was founded by Hugo de Vries (1848-1935). His thesis was that in a given pure race there would appear mutants that would transmit to their descendents their new characters, hence arising new species.

Taking the discoveries of genetics into consideration, it has

become impossible to support the acquired characters heritage theory. All of that which appears in a species is already determined in its genetic information.

It happens, though, that some spontaneous genetic mutations may happen, whose causes are still not very clear to us. Therefore, evolutionists resorted to the hypothesis in which the accumulation of accidental mutations would cause evolution.

This is also impossible.

Mutations are rare. Their rate corresponds to 1 by 100,000. The odds of only two mutations affecting two distinct characters is in the proportion of 1 to 10,000,000,000. One possibility in 10 billions! Such mutations cannot be guided and, besides, they are usually harmful. A rate of 12 mutations is, normally, lethal to an organism.

The low rate of spontaneous mutation is the result of the highly efficient DNA repairing system with which the organisms are gifted. Such repair mechanisms are a proof that the mutations are undesired to the species that seeks stability, demonstrating, on the other hand, a very big order, even at the molecular level.

When DNA shows itself damaged by a mutation, the activation of an elaborated repairing system occurs, composed by a series of enzymes and mechanisms. Such system is present in a simple bacterium Gram Negativa, like *Escherichia coli*, and also in superior mammals like man. In this mentioned bacterium, there are at least five different mechanisms to repair a mutated DNA: the repair that depends on the light or photoreactivation, the excision repair, the bad-pairing repair, the post-replication repair and error-free repair system (Cf. Simmons. Fundamentos da Genética, Rio de Janeiro:

Guanabara Koogan, 2001, pp. 332-336).

In men, except for photoreactivation (the majority of the human cells are not exposed to the light), all these mechanisms were verified and there were other mechanisms proper of the species (Cf. Simmons, 2001; Lewontin. *Genética Moderna*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara Koogan, 2001, pg. 192-197; Bottino. *Genética*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara Koogan, 1991, pg. 216-219).

The non-lethal mutations discovered affect only accessory points or, then, they produce degenerations, and, most of the times, cause sterility in the mutated individual, preventing the transmission of the mutated character.

In spite of all this, and only to argue, were the mutations the originators of the evolution of a species to another, this would have happened:

- a) by chance or
- b) by genetic error or
- c) by trial, seeking a vital progress or
- d) by intelligent calculation.

Was evolution to have happened only by chance, it would have been unexplainable and absurd that the millions of needed chances to make the first molecule evolve to a man would have produced such a perfectly and wisely ordered sequence to the better. It is against intelligence to state that millions of

chances would have as a result such excellent order and sequence.

It is also inadmissible to imagine that millions of genetic errors would have produced effects each time more complex, and, at the same time, but each time more ordered, even more if we have in mind the DNA system.

Was evolution to be produced by trials in order to find the best solutions of adaptations to new environments, Mathematics demonstrated that there would not be time neither material in the universe to make possible the accomplishment of evolution by trials.

Émile Borel calculated mathematically what he named as the impossibility limit related to the possibility of an event. Hence, he demonstrated that the cosmic impossibility limit is in the order of 10 to the power of 200. This makes one possibility for 1 followed by 200 zeros. Therefore, “notable events of sufficiently low odds do not occur”. And this mathematician, in the conclusion of his work said:

*“A very unlikely event cannot happen”.*

Applying these conclusions of Borel in the field of Biology, Georges Salet calculated that in order to make the mutations produce a tiny organ, the age of the Earth would have to be multiplied by a number indicated by 1 followed by several hundred or millions of zeros. That is, the time needed to make the evolution occur through mutations would be greater than the age of the universe!

In order to make a simple bacterium produce, by mutations perhaps, a metazoan, the limit of impossibility would be by far surpassed. That is, the bacterium could not have produced the

metazoan by chance.

There would still remain an evolution guided by intelligent calculation. In this case, either one admits that the brute matter itself is intelligent, and then it becomes Gnosis, as it occurred in Father Teilhard de Chardin's doctrine, or one admits an Intelligence transcendent to matter, that is God.

But, if one has to admit that God guided evolution, then all materialist Evolutionism would crumble apart. And more. If one accepts that God exists and that He guides evolution, then the discussion stops being biological, to become then, theological. In this case, one would not be able to deny the creation as it was revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

It is clear that the defeated and evading Evolutionism is going to resort itself in the moderated Evolutionism, which is the one that admits the biological evolution of the primates, after God having infused a rational soul in a monkey, to create the first man, Adam.

This mitigated or religious Evolutionism is perhaps, and in a certain sense, even more absurd and contradictory than the materialist Evolutionism. But, since its refutation demands arguments other than the biological ones, we will deal with that later.

Currently, even evolutionist scientists acknowledge that it is impossible to attribute the cause of evolution to mutations.

The atheist and evolutionist scientist Jean Rostand stated:

*"The mutations which we know and which are considered*

*responsible for the creation of the frying world are, in general, either organic deprivations, deficiencies (loss of pigment, loss of an appendage), or the doubling of the pre-existing organs. In any case, they never produce anything really new or original in the organic scheme, nothing which one might consider the basis for a new organ or the priming for a new function . I cannot persuade myself to think that the eye, the ear, the human brain have been formed in this way” ( J. Rostand, apud P. Troadec, op. cit. p. 15, [<http://evolution-facts.org/Ev-V2/2evlch14a.htm>] - [Jean Rostand, The Orion Book of Evolution (1961), p. 79.]*

## **5 – EVOLUTIONISTSCHOOL OF “PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIUM”**

Stated the lack of intermediary fossils, Stephen Jay Gould, Nils Elredge and Steven Stanley proposed the theory of the “punctuated equilibrium”.

According to Darwin, evolution occurs in a extremely slow kind of process, which requires the existence of intermediary links. This theory was named “filetic gradualism”. We have already seen that , bearing in view the failures of DarwinianSchool, the evolutionists had created the theory of “synthetic Evolutionism”. A more elaborated research of the genetic mutations has confirmed that the synthetic Evolutionism was also wrong.

For all this and taking into account the total absence of intermediary links between the several species, in fossil registers, the fore mentioned scientists, during Darwin’s centenary, in 1960, presented a new evolutionist theory: the “punctuated equilibrium”.

Such theory starts from the confirmation that in fossil registers there are no proofs of a slow evolution from one species to another. One notices that new species appear abruptly and perfectly formed and like that they remain by a long period of

time in scale of millions of years. Gold, Elredge and Stanley call this stability of species “phase of equilibrium”. This is what is verified in the fossils. Therefore, due to an unknown reason, a little number of samples of a species isolate themselves from their own species and, also due unknown reasons, rapidly evolves to a new species. The evolution would be so fast that no lay fossil proofs of its occurrence would be left. This relatively short period of accelerated evolution they call “punctuated equilibrium”.

The new evolutionist theory of “punctuated equilibrium” is entirely gratuitous: it does not explain why a group isolates itself, neither says why it evolves nor why it suddenly evolves. By this reason while the classical Evolutionism looked for lost links of evolution during a century, because only their existence would really prove the evolutionist theory, now the theory of “punctuated equilibrium” states that the very proof of veracity of evolution of species exactly the non-existence of intermediary fossils between one and another species.

Therefore, Evolutionism had to be considered right in the past, because the discovery of the lost links would be a matter of time. Now, Evolutionism has to be accepted, because the lost links have never existed. But the dogma of Evolution has to be accepted because it is a dogma!

It is therefore confirmed that in the history of the theory of evolution the only thing that really evolves is the theory itself. Like the monkeys, it leaps from branch to branch...

#### **IV – Is Evolutionism scientific?**

##### **1 – Fraudulence, contradictions and gratuitous affirmations of evolutionists**

When somebody tries to prove something by fraudulent means, this constitutes a confession that one recognizes the non-existence of real proofs on the matter in to be proved.

Well, during its history Evolutionism many times resorted to fraudulent falsifications in order to convince the scientific community and the public that man came from an inferior animal and that he would not have been created by God. There has never been, in the History of Science, a theory so infected in its history by frauds, as Evolutionism. In spite of this, it is still presented as true.

We will tackle the most famous frauds – perpetrated by famous scientists, when we analyze the human fossils.

Contradictions are also really common.

Nowadays, for instance, the evolutionist paleontologists and biologists do not reach an agreement with respect to man's age.

Paleontologists attribute to the homideous or human fossils fabulous ages that reach to 3 millions years. But biologists are much more modest in their numbers.

In 1987, American molecular biologists, comparing genetic material from the mothers' side of populations from several continents, concluded that every men descent from only one mother. So there really would have existed a "mother of all human livings", expression designed in the Sacred Scriptures by the name of Eve.

Most important is the age these biologists calculated for the appearance of this sole mother: approximately 200.000 years.

This figure caused enormous protests among paleontologists, because it meant implicitly that all awfully old fossils that have been presented as man's ancestor, or even as primitive men, were disqualified.

In what Science to trust? In Paleontology or in Biology? An anguishing dilemma to those who trust blindly in proofs of Science.

Taking into account so many variations, frauds, contradictions and anti-scientific absurdities of History of evolutionist theory, it's not to be surprised about what Marcel de Corte has said about it:

*"Evolutionism rings the bells to the funeral of intelligence. Intelligence is in danger of death".*

## **2 – SCIENTISTS' OPINIONS AGAINST THE EVOLUTIONIST THEORY**

Since the uprising of darwinist theory, it has raised objections that science has confirmed.

In 1871, St George Mivart raised arguments that remain upright against Darwinist Evolutionism.

*"What would be proper to assert (against Darwinism), could be summarized this way: that "natural selection" is unable to explain the incipient stages of useful structures. That it harmonizes not with the coexistence of very similar structures, from different*

*origins. That there is ground for thinking that specific differences can be suddenly developed, and not gradually. That it is yet sustainable the opinion that the species have defined boundaries, though quite different ones, to their variability. That some kinds of transitional fossils are absent, when one could expect that they would be present... That there are numerous noticeable phenomena in organic forms about which the "natural selection" have very little to say" (Apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 39)*

Several of these arguments are yet to be answered, and, after a century of research and massive propaganda, they remain unanswered.

Lately, many scientists have pronounced themselves against the evolutionist theory, especially against Darwinism. Michael Behe gives many citations of famous scientists who confessed to be disappointed with Darwinism. Here are some of these quotations:

Richard Goldschmidt, a famous geneticist, yet in the 40's – therefore long before the discovery of the DNA and the development of Biochemistry – revealed himself disappointed with the Darwinian evolutionist theory, at the point of proposing the theory of the so-called "hopeful monster": a reptile, for example, could lay an egg from which a bird would be born (acc. M. Behe, op. cit. p. 35).

The famous paleontologist Nils Elredge – who founded, along with Jay Gold, the evolutionist "punctuated equilibrium" theory -- has declared:

*"It is not surprising that paleontologists have ignored evolution for so long. Apparently, it never occurs. The careful gathering of material at cliffs shows zigzag oscillations, little ones, and very scarce accumulation of small changes – throughout millions of*

*years, in too slow a rate to explain all the prodigious changes that happened in evolutionary history. When we see the appearing of evolution news, this happens generally like a thunderclap and, often, without any solid proofs that the fossils did not evolve in other places too! Evolution cannot be always happening in other places. Yet, that was how fossil register came about to many desperate paleontologists who wanted to learn something about evolution". (M. Behe, op. cit., p. 36).*

Two English biologists, Mae-Wan and Peter Saunders, assert:

*"It has passed almost half century since the formulation of the neo-darwinian synthesis. A great volume of research was made under the paradigm defined by it. However, the successes of the theory are limited to trivial particulars of evolution, like the adaptive changes in the color of moths, at the same time that people have very little to say about the questions that interest us the most, like, to start, how the moths appeared." (Apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 37).*

The geneticist John McDonald shows an enigma that cannot be explained by darwinism:

*"The result of the last twenty years of research about the genetic basis of adaptation lead us to a big darwinian paradox. Those [genes] that are obviously changeable in natural populations do not seem to constitute the basis of many of the big adaptive changes, while those [genes] that seem to constitute, in fact, the foundation of many, if not of the majority, of the big adaptive changes, apparently are not variable in natural populations".*

In other words, the genes that vary do not cause changes.

And the genes that do not vary would cause adaptations.

Exactly the opposite from what Darwinism presumes!

Jerry Coyne, from the Chicago University Ecology and Evolution Department, sentenced:

*“We conclude – unexpectedly – that there are very few proofs that support the neo-darwinian theory: its foundations are weak, as are the experimental evidences that support it” (Apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 37).*

Another geneticist, John Endler, from California University, stated:

*“Although many things about mutation are known, it is still, on the whole, a “black box”, regarding evolution. New biochemical functions seem to be rare in evolution, and the basis of their origin is virtually unknown” (apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 38).*

Also most recent mathematical studies have proved themselves contrary to the evolutionist theory. Hubert Yockey, an information theoretic, says that “the information necessary to start life up could not have appeared by chance, and suggests that the life should be considered as data, like matter and energy (M. Behe, op. cit. p. 38).

In a mathematicians and biologists symposium in 1966 at Wistar Institute of Philadelphia, mathematicians showed that the time required for the necessary mutations to form an eye was absolutely insufficient to have it accomplished, and concluded:

*“There is a great hole in the neo-darwinian theory of evolution, and, we believe that it is of such a nature that cannot be conciliated with the current conception of Biology” (Apud M.*

Behe, op. cit. p. 38).

Even those who do not openly deny Darwinism places doubts about it.

Martin Kauffman, from Santa Fe Institute, wrote:

*"Darwin and the evolution dominate us, whatever the complains of creationist scientists be. But is this thesis correct? Better yet, is it adequate? I believe not. It is not that Darwin was wrong, but yes, he understood just part of the truth"* (apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 38).

It is very hard to figure out how Darwin elaborated a not "correct", nor "adequate", theory and, at the same time, that was not "wrong". Notice in this declaration the fear to contradict Evolutionism, this idol of modern world.

Klaus Dose, a well-known scientist specialized in the problem of origin of life, concluded:

*"More than thirty years of experiments about the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution led us to a clearer perception of the enormity of the problem of its appearing on Earth, instead of leading to a solution. Nowadays all discussions about the main experiments and theories in this field ended at a deadlock or in a confession of ignorance"* (apud M. Behe, op. cit. p. 172).

Michael Behe:

*"The claims on the existence of darwinian molecular evolution is simply a joke."*

Thus, Michael Behe himself, at the end of his book, concludes:

*“Molecular evolution is not based on scientific authority. There is no publication in scientific literature – prestigious magazines, specialized magazines or books – which describes how molecular evolution of any real, complex biochemical system occurred or could have occurred. There are claims that this evolution happened, but none of them based in pertinent experiment or calculation. Once nobody knows molecular evolution by direct experience, and also because there is not an authority over which one can base allegations of knowledge, we can say with conviction that – as our claim that our team will win the championship this year – the affirmation of existence of darwinian molecular evolution is simply a joke” (M. Behe, op. cit. p. 189).*

It was exactly after so many remarkable scientists declared themselves skeptical or contrary to the darwinist theory that John Paul II affirmed that evolution was no longer a hypothesis but a scientifically proved theory.

*“Today, almost half a century after the publication of the Encyclical [Humani Generis, from Pius XII], new knowledge has led to the recognition in the theory of evolution of more than a hypothesis. It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge. The convergence, neither sought nor fabricated, of the results of work that was conducted independently is in itself a significant argument in favor of this theory.” (John Paul II, Message to the Pontifical Science Academy, 22/X/1996)*

Curiously, in the same year Michael Behe published his book showing that geneticists, biochemicists, mathematicians, paleontologists, biologists, doubt or deny darwinist

Evolutionism for the sake of Science, concluding that “darwinian molecular evolution is a joke”, Pope John Paul II declares that the most recent scientific researches allow us to affirm that the Evolutionism is no longer a hypothesis but a scientifically proved theory...

### **3 – THE ORIGIN OF THE LIFE – MACHINIST TRIES TO PRODUCE LIFE**

As we saw, it is not possible to discuss the evolutionist doctrine without focusing the problem of the origin of life. For evolutionists, life is not a fact that transcends the pure mineral reign. By defending the most radical metaphysical egalitarianism and the “machinism”, evolutionists have to look for the appearing of life from mere chemical combinations.

Since the 1950s, Biochemistry has made huge progress. The electronic microscope allowed big advances in the knowledge about cellular structure and functioning. Darwin did not know at all the reasons why there would be modifications within a species, and despite of this ignorance he raised the hypothesis of evolution from one species to another. Only with sophisticate techniques discovered in this century it became possible to examine the basic level of life, and, such examination disqualified pretense darwinian explanations.

*“Event though science has really made headway in the comprehension of how the chemistry of life works, the sophistication and complexity of the biological systems at molecular level has stopped its attempts to explain their origins. There was virtually no scientific attempt to explain the origin of specific and complex bio-molecular systems, neither was there any progress in this sense. Many scientist boldly affirmed that they already have answers, or that they will have them sooner or later, but no support to such allegations can be found in the scientific literature. Yet more important, there are irresistible*

*reasons – based in the very structure of the systems – to think that a Darwinian answer about the mechanisms of life will always be deceitful” (Michael Behe, op. cit. p. 8).*

In the 1950's, at Chicago University, Stanley L. Miller, a 23-year-old youngster, seemed to succeed when reproducing in a laboratory the conditions existent on Earth, by the time when life would have appeared. He put inside a gadget, methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water. Then he produced an electrical discharge and heat. After some days, Miller found in his gadget a reddish substance. Analyzing it, he found out that they were amino acids, that is, the organic compound necessary to form proteins, the basic element of life.

Stanley L. Miller published then a little article, two pages long, in the *Science* magazine reporting his experience.

The article's repercussion was huge. It was said that it had been proved that life came from pure chemical reactions. Miller would have found the “recipe” to the origin of life and of its “primordial soup”.

Until today, in the suburban sites of culture and science, the famous “primordial soup” of Stanley Miller continues to be cited, although it has already been deleted from the most developed evolutionist scientific menu. Stanley Miller himself – who has become Professor of Chemistry at California University, in San Diego, declared:

*“The problem of the origin of life has turned out to be much more difficult than I and many other people would judge” (John Horgan, article “In the beginning... “. Scientific American Magazine. February 1991, p. 101).*

In 1953, James D. Watson and Francis H. C. Crick deciphered

the deoxyribonucleic acid structure (DNA) which supplies to the cells the information “to construct” and organize proteins.

The discovery of Watson and Crick brought problems to the “primordial soup” of life as it had been suggested by Stanley Miller.

Crick and Watson showed that proteins are made according to instructions coded in the DNA. But it happens, however, that DNA is incapable of doing that – or even of producing more DNA – without the help of catalytic proteins, or enzymes. In short, proteins cannot form proteins without DNA, but the DNA cannot be formed without proteins. So, we are trapped in the problem of the chicken and the egg: without eggs, chickens are not born, but without chickens, we cannot have eggs. Without proteins, we have no DNA, but without DNA, proteins cannot be formed. It’s deadlock.

In the 1980s, Thomas R. Cech from Colorado University and Sidney Altman from Yale University tried to solve the problem suggesting that RNA would be the first auto-reproducing molecule. But it had not been demonstrated how RNA could do that without the enzymes’ help. Cech and Altman discovered, then, that certain kinds of RNA could act as their auto-enzymes. This gave them the Nobel prize in 1989. RNA served as generator and catalyser at the same time.

New experiences seemed to prove that the RNA was in the beginning and in the explanation to the life.

However, the atheistic and evolutionist enthusiasm had not lasted long. Other problems came out.

How was the first RNA formed? If it is a substance very hardly

produced in laboratory, in ideal conditions, far harder will it be produced in Nature.

How did phosphorus – relatively rare in Nature as a substance – become such a crucial ingredient for RNA and DNA?

What's more. RNA, once synthesized, is just capable of making copies of itself with a great help from scientist. As a scientist would say, "the RNA is an inept molecule, especially if compared with proteins" (John Horgan, cit. article, page 103).

Nowadays, researches consider that "a single bacteria is so terribly complex that, from the chemical point of view, it is almost impossible to imagine how it happened" (Harold P. Klein, Santa Clara University, apud J. Hoargan, art. cit. p. 104).

On the other hand, it is necessary to take into account very carefully what would be the existent conditions on Earth by the time life would have appeared. It is an illusion to imagine that they would be almost like the actual conditions.

J. William Schopf, from California University, in Los Angeles, has calculated that the first signs of life – probably under the form of an alga – would have appeared about 3.500.000.000 years ago. According to Manfred Schidlowski, from Max Planck Chemical Institute of Mainz, there would be evidences of the existence of organisms capable of making photosynthesis 3.800.000.000 years ago. However, Roger Buck, an Australian paleontologist, judges that the data which estimates the existence of life 3.5 or 3.8 billion years ago are doubtful, and he calls them "doubtful-fossils". For Roger Buck the first fossils that evidence clear cellular structure date from 3.1 to 3.2 billion years.

David J. Stevenson, from the Technology Institute of California, and Norman H. Sleep, from Stanford, working independently one from the other, demonstrated that the meteorite bombing suffered by Earth at its beginning was so intense and terrible that the heat produced by the impact could vaporize oceans and would rise a huge cloud of dust, so that all incipient life would be destroyed, even more if life depended on photosynthesis. They calculated that just around 3.8 billion years ago life could have appeared.

There is even more. It looks like the earth atmosphere composition by the time “would not favor the synthesis of organic compounds as much as we had thought” (J. Hoargan, art. cit. p. 105).

Laboratory computerized reconstitution of the atmosphere of those times, performed by James C. G. Walter from Michigan University, in Ann Arbor, suggests that ultra-violet radiation coming from the Sun, which are nowadays blocked by the ozone layer, would have destroyed all hydrogen-based molecules, and the free hydrogen would have escaped into deep space. The atmosphere at those times would have carbon and nitrogen dioxide, expelled by the volcanoes, as its major components. Such atmosphere would not favor the synthesis of amino acids and other forerunners of life.

The difficulties to explain the origin of life, from a purely naturalist point of view, are so big that some started to rise the hypothesis of seeds of life coming from extra-terrestrial sources. Well, this would transfer the problem to other worlds, – it would be a new science “from another world” – but it does not explain how life could have appeared over there. Besides, the migration of living elements to earth brought by meteorites does not take into account that the heat produced by the impact would be enough to destroy all seeds of life that would eventually be on them. What’s more, many scientists contradict

this hypothesis by asserting that microbes have never been found in the space, and that the space environment is very adverse to life.

Orgel and Crick, recently, came up with the “idea” – as a kind of joke, if we consider the difficulties that Science faces to explain the origin of life – that life arrived on Earth through spaceships from another planet.

*“As Crick has once written: “The origin of the life seems almost like a miracle, so many are the conditions needed for it to happen” (J. Hoargan, cit. art, p. 108).*

Miracle... modern scientists admit it, as long as it be a nature’s miracle and not God’s.

Such are the difficulties found by Science to explain the origin of life, and such have been the rationalist scientificism failures in this field that Klaus Dose expressed all the prevailing pessimism with these words:

*“More than thirty years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemistry and molecular evolution have led us to a clearer perception of the enormity of the problem of its appearing on Earth, instead of leading us to its solution. Nowadays all discussions over the main experiments and theories in this field end up in a deadlock or in a confession of ignorance” (Apud M. Behe, cited work, p. 172).*

*“There has never been a symposium, book or article about the details of the evolution of complex biochemical systems” (...)  
“Once we just saw that biochemical literature does not have works or books that explain in details how complex systems could have appeared, why, despite of this, is Darwinism accepted*

*by many biochemists? An important part of the answer is that they were taught, as part of their biochemical education, that Darwinism is true.” (M. Behe cited work, p. 183).*

*“Biochemistry, in fact, revealed a molecular world that boldly resists to the explanation of the same theory that was for so long applied to the level of the complete organism. None of the two starting points of Darwin – the origin of life and the origin of sight – were explained by his theory. Darwin never imagined the complexity horribly deep that exists even at the most basic levels of life” (M. Behe, cited work, p. 177).*

When the major natural scientists confess being in this deadlock, where does ordinary high-school teachers and university professors take from the certainty that Science has already answered the origin of life?

Professor Dr. Klaus Dose, one of the top names in the origin of life problem claims:

*“At present all discussions in the main theories and experiences in the field finish in a tie or in a confession of ignorance” (art. “The Origin of life: more questions than answers”. Interdisciplinary Science Review,1988).* In this article, Dr. Dose shows us the non-sustainability of the theories, from the Neo-Vitalism to the most recent ones.

As noticed by Michael Behe, “privately, many scientists admit that Science does not have an answer to the origin of life” (M. Behe, cited work, p. 176). But, in public, they fear to say what they think... Why? More than ever, it is evidenced that many support, today, Evolutionism more due to a “Faith” in the evolution than due to scientific proves.

Evolution is a Pantheist or Gnostic dogma of faith. It is a religious dogma and not a scientific truth.

# V- FOSSILS

## 1 - INTRODUCTION

In order to study the primitive forms of life that appeared during earth's history, scientists appeal to fossils. In sedimentary rocks it is possible to find remaining portions, or even indications of petrified animals and vegetals: such are called fossils. It is clearly that the fossilization of a vegetal or of an animal demands special conditions. Usually organic beings decompose themselves, but, submitted to certain conditions, they can petrify. The cases of fossilization are relatively rare, and finding fossil samples is very hard.

Usually, the deeper the layer of sediments is located in the terrestrial crust, the more ancient are the fossils found in it. However there might be exceptions to the correspondence between the depth of the rock and oldness, when there is a geologic plait that produces an inversion in the position of geologic layers.

Fossil dating, or geologic layer dating involves very complex processes and their result is a lot imprecise. Evidently, the more ancient a layer or a fossil is, the more inexact is its dating. Once one knows the probable age of a certain geologic layer, one can often presume that the fossils found in this geologic layer have its age.

It is quite clear that, in the first geologic ages, Earth did not offer any favorable environmental conditions to the existence of life. Only after some billions of years, we were likely to have the necessary environmental conditions for living beings to exist. It is estimated that the Earth is around 4.5 billion years-old and that life would only had appeared around 5 to 3.5 million years ago, which is a period relatively short.

The geologic time is divided, for study reasons, in eras and periods.

Geology and Paleontology present the followings picture of geologic eras.

| ERAS                | PERIODS                        | EVALUATED DATING                     |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ARQUEAN             |                                | 1.8 billion to 1 billion years ago   |
| PROTEROZOICAN       |                                | 1 billion to 600 million years ago   |
| Paleozoic (Primary) | Cambrian                       | 600 million to 200 million years ago |
|                     | Ordovician                     |                                      |
|                     | Silurian                       |                                      |
|                     | Devonian                       |                                      |
|                     | Carboniferous    Mississippian |                                      |

|                         |            |  |
|-------------------------|------------|--|
|                         |            | Pennsylvanian                                |
|                         | Permian    |  |
| Mesozoic<br>(Secondary) | Triassic   | 200 million<br>to 70<br>million<br>years ago |
|                         | JURASSIC   |  |
|                         | Cretaceous |  |
| Cenozoic<br>(Tertiary)  | Paleocene  | 70 million<br>to 60<br>million<br>years ago  |
|                         | Eocene     | 60 million<br>to 35<br>million<br>years ago  |
|                         | Oligocene  | 35 million<br>to 25<br>million<br>years ago  |
|                         | Miocene    | 25 million<br>to 5 million<br>years ago      |

|            |             |                                      |
|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
|            | Pliocene    | 5 million to 1.8 million years ago   |
| QUATERNARY | Pleistocene | 1.8 million to 10 thousand years ago |
|            | Holocene    | 10 thousand years ago                |

## 2 – MICRO-ORGANISMS

School manuals – all of them primary evolutionists – use to present the appearing of living beings in a sequence which insinuates the likelihood of evolution. Then, they say that the first living beings from which we have information are unicellular beings, and that after them, methosoaeries would have appeared, and next, animals with soft body, animals of carapace, insets, vertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals and, finally, man. The reasons why evolution would have stopped in man, they do not explain.

This sequence causes the impression that many species came from one another, as if there would be a unique genetic source. In reality, it is way more complex.

When fossils registers are studied, what is found is a large phylogenetic multiplicity. Each species appears suddenly, never

presenting genetic predecessors, and, many times, a plurality of phylogenetic sequences abruptly disappear, which indicates that living beings do not originate one from another. Each species appears suddenly – without any known predecessor – it lives during a relatively long period never changing its essential form, and suddenly disappears, without any genetic link with posterior species.

This fact is the great slip of the theory of evolution.

If the appearing of new living species is a mystery for science, the disappearing of some of them can be explained by cataclysmic phenomenon – as the orogenies – that could have extinguished all living beings from a region or continent.

As we have seen previously, it is estimated that life, on Earth, might have begun 3.5 million years ago. It is admitted that the first living beings were unicellular micro-organisms. How this unicellular beings appeared and how they would have evolved to more complex beings remain a mystery.

Methazoaries, which are the first multi-cellular and complex living beings, appeared all of a sudden, and without obvious predecessors in fossil registers.

Canadian paleontologists discovered the most ancient fossils registered until the present moment. They are fossils about 2 meters long, enough complex as compared to the other fossils discovered so far (Narbonne, Guy M., James G. Gehling, *Geology*, vol. 31, n.1, de 2001, Life after snowball: The oldest complex Ediacaran fossils). This is evidence that fossil registers up to now are far from suggesting an increasing scale of complexity in the appearance of life. Since the theory of evolution gives room to all hypotheses, it is now supposed that life would have a complex origin.

Before this recent Canadian discovery, the registers of first indications of life, which dates from Pre Cambrian period, are rare. In 1947, Australian geologist R.C. Spring found at Edicara Hills, southern Australia, marine sedimentary deposits with rich samples of Pre Cambrian fossils. New researches, at the same place, enriched even more the fossil treasure found. Currently, around 600 different species proceeding from Edicara have been classified, dating from Pre Cambrian age. There were found marine animals of soft body (jellyfish), jelly corals, parts of worms with shielded solid heads, "marine-flocks". All these soft body beings would belong, generally, to the coelenterate file. (Cfr. Martin F. Glaessner, "Pre-Cambrian Animals", article in Science magazine).

There is a very impressing fact about Edicara fossils: it was proved that the coelenterate fossils of Edicara are not coelenterates and echinoderms of the same type than others from Cambrian. On the contrary, they are so different from them that there is not any possibility of them to be their ancestrals.

Suddenly, in Cambrian geologic layers, such a great number of fossils of so many types are found – including vertebrates – that we refer to as the "Cambrian life explosion". If Darwinian Theory was true, we should find predecessors fossils of this "Cambrian life explosion". There is nothing before this explosion that could explain the surging of such a great number of complex and diverse species. And the species found that survived during long geologic periods have never evidenced signals of evolution.

Even scientists unsuspecting of being anti-evolutionists confess that the explosive appearing of new species in the Cambrian, without any proved predecessor, is "the greatest

mystery of History of Life” (George Gaylord Simpson, apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 56). Elredge himself— one of the founders of the “Punctuated Equilibrium” Evolution Theory – recognizes that the fauna from Edicara and from the “Cambrian explosion” constitute a great challenge for Science. Better saying, for Evolutionism.

Elredge tries to solve this mystery by arguing that we did not find predecessors fossils of Cambrian life because the beings of Pre-Cambrian were of jelly body, what would had obstructed the formation of fossils. Well, if things were like that, we could not have known the existence of jelly body beings of previous geologic ages.

Gish gets surprised with Elredge’s ragged excuse, remembering that, if indications of microscopic and unicellular beings were found, evidently signals of life of jelly body animals from Pre-Cambrian era can be found, as they were, in Edicara. In spite of this, intermediate fossils between Pre Cambrian and Cambrian beings were not found, so far. Also in this point, Darwinism lacks proofs.

### **3 – THE APPEARING OF INSECTS**

The appearing of insects is as sudden as vertebrates: there are no preceding species from which they would have evolved. The first exemplars of fossilized insects appear in rocks from Devonian period, but it is in Carboniferous (especially in the Pennsylvanian sub-period) that they appeared in so great a quantity that this age is called Insects Age. There are fossils of dragonfly from that time that measure 5 to 7 centimeters of length. The cockroaches that appeared in Carboniferous had already the same disagreeable aspect they have nowadays, as Duane Gish makes sure to remind us, quoting Betty Fisher from AmericanMuseum of Natural History (P 61). The cockroach has produced the same repulsion for 200.000.000 years. It has

not evolved in all this enormous length of time.

Evolutionists believe that flying insets proceeded from insects unable to fly. But until now it has never been found an intermediary specimen between winged and non-winged insects. Only winged or non-winged insects were found. Semi-winged insects do not exist.

A recent case published in *Nature* magazine came out due to studies led by biologist Michael Whiting, among others scientists, who showed that “evolutionally”, the popularly called “wood insect” (*phibalosoma phillinum*) would have lost and restored its wings four times, at least, in 50 million of years (Whiting, M. F., Bradler, S., Maxwell, T; *Nature*, jan/2.003). Now, believing in it is to consider that these animals had a great “luck”.

#### **4 – VERTEBRATES AND INVERTEBRATES**

It is also an affirmation not based on reality that vertebrate animals evolved from the invertebrate. There is no fossil basis to such evolutionist thesis in this kingdom of Nature.

According to Ommanney there is an interval of 100,000,000 years between the first vertebrate fish and the most recent invertebrate creatures.

The first creatures similar to vertebrate fishes – the agnathous – arose in Paleozoic age, during Silurian period, that is, about 600,000,000 years ago. There is no predecessor fossil apt to be presented as direct ancestor of this kind of vertebrate. The agnathous suddenly appeared – like all other living beings – and not by consequence of a long evolution.

In the past, some evolutionists proposed that fish with cartilaginous structure would have given origin to fish provided

of osseous structure. This way, it was affirmed that chondrichthyes would have been intermediate ancestors between the cartilaginous and the osseous structured ones. But according to Romer, author of the book "Vertebrate Paleontology", the research leads to the opposite conclusion to that intended by evolutionists: sharks would have evolved from a major to a minor osseous structure. Romer himself affirms that the appearing of fish of vertebrate structure in fossil registers is dramatically abrupt, without apparent ancestors. He says: "The common ancestor of the several groups of fish of osseous structure is unknown" (apud. Duane T. Gish, op. cit. p. 68).

Todd, discussing about the origin of vertebrate fishes, notes that:

*"All three subdivisions of vertebrate fishes appeared approximately at the same time in fossil registers. They were already morphologically largely divergent from the morphologic point of view and were heavily harnessed. How were they originated? What permitted them to diverge so largely? How did they get to have so heavy harness? And why isn't there vestige of anterior intermediate species?"* (Todd, apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 69).

Excellent and embarrassing questions to defenders of the Theory of Evolution!

Duane Gish, in his excellent book in which we are basing this article, mentions another expert in aquatic life, Errol White, who in spite of being evolutionist, states:

*"But whatever are the ideas of the authorities in this matter, the pulmonary fish, like all major groups that I know, has its origin firmly founded in nothing..."* (Errol White, apud Duane T. Gish, op.

cit. p. 68).

Therefore, also for the fishes, the evolutionist theory was not proved. It's founded in *nothing*.

The greater the authority of a scientist in a certain biologic science, the more emphasis he puts when confessing the lack of ground of the Theory of Evolution.

The more we step down in level of authority, the more emphasis and conviction – not to say fanaticism – are found in defense of the Theory of Evolution.

## **5 – THE TRANSITION FROM FISH TO AMPHIBIANS**

We can see that, up to this point, Evolutionism, at every step of the study of the fossils, has found nothing but problems to their Theory. But, to them, no solution has been found. And the same has happened when researching the transition from invertebrates to vertebrates. Despite the fact that they have suggested a wide range of solutions in order to demonstrate that vertebrates came from invertebrates, none was proved at last. It is presumed that such transition occurred through animals called “chordates”, that is, animals which had a sort of “notochord”. But, such fact was never proved by means of fossils.

Also, the transition from fishes to amphibians has found the same impossibility. Although this transition would require a large lapse of time, until today, it has never been found the bond between these two kinds of animal.

Some authors have defended the hypothesis that the “crossopterygian” fish would have produced the amphibian of

“ichthyostega” sort. Between these two sorts it is required a huge lapse of time in order to permit the appearance of several transitional forms. But they do not exist. Neither in the “ichthyostega” are there fin vestiges from their supposed ancestors, nor in the “Crossopterygian” are there incipient forms of future members of “ichthyostega” amphibians. In no fish can we find elements linking the fins to the vertebrate structure. When tiny little structural bones of the fins appear, they are always very small and are just linked to the fish tissue, and they never have a link with fish dorsal spine, forming a firm structure that would permit it to walk.

On the contrary, in amphibians, the osseous structure that joints the members to vertebrate spine is always very strong and well developed. It has never been found a fossil with intermediate bone structure between the fish and the amphibian.

According to evolutionist Rommer, it would have been the dry seasons – such common in Devonian period – that obligated fishes to develop lungs at same time that they kept on having gills in order to live out of water. It would be from these intermediate animals that the actual amphibians would have developed. But, in Devonian layers, we find no fossils that could to confirm Rommer’s hypothesis.

Evolutionists affirm that the transition from fish to amphibian would have occurred 70 million years ago. Now then, in 1939 it was fished, in the African coast, a latimeria that is a crossopterygian fish. It was rigorously equal to the fish of 70 million of years ago. Through all this time, instead of evolving to become an amphibian, it remained a latimeria, contradicting the theories that supposed it had evolved.

## **6 - FROM AMPHIBIANS TO REPTILES AND MAMMALS**

Both the transformation of an invertebrate into a vertebrate, the change of a fish into an amphibian, or the evolution of a reptile into a bird calls for a real structural and morphological revolution in the animal. It is evident that such revolution – if it ever happened – should have left innumerable fossil proofs.

Reptiles are distinguished from amphibians especially for the amniote egg. Mammals are distinguished from reptiles due to their anatomy and physiology, to the way they reproduce, to the hot blood, not cold, to the presence of the diaphragm, which allows a different breathing, to the capability of the nestling for sucking and to the presence of fur.

The amphibian-reptile-mammal succession presents unsolvable chronological problems to evolutionists, because the mammal ancestors existed before the reptiles.

In effect, evolutionists affirm that the reptile ancestors were the seymuria and dialectes that existed in the beginning of the Permian period. They also admit that the mammal ancestors already existed in the Carboniferous period (sub-period Pennsylvanian). Thus, the mammal ancestors have existed before the reptiles, from which mammals should have come. The succession presumed by evolution does not fit the chronological fossil succession.

On the other hand, some evolutionists admit that they did not discover the intermediate from any of the 32 existent orders of mammals.

George Gaylord Simpson affirms:

*“It is true for the thirty two orders of mammals... The first and oldest members of each order already have the basic characters*

*of their order, and it is not known in any case an approached continuous sequence from one order to another. In many cases the rupture is so sharp and the lapse is so wide that the origin of the order is speculative and very disputed”(G. G. Simpson, Tempo and Mode in Evolution, Columbia Univ. Press p. 105, apud Duane T. Gish, op. cit. p.78).*

## **7 – THE PROBLEM OF MARINE MAMMALS**

In Brazilian schools, people have been talking a lot about the terrestrial origin of whales and of other marine mammals. These creatures have suddenly appeared – as all others have – in fossil registers. There are no intermediate fossils between the whales and the others marines mammals and their supposed terrestrial progenitors. It is what asserts E. C. Olson (*The Evolution of Life*, apud Gish, op. cit. p. 78). A. S. Romer confirms that, when he talks about whales and dolphins: “We ignore their terrestrial antecessors and we cannot be sure of their place of origin” (A. S. Romer, *Vertebrate Paleontology*, apud Gish, op. cit. p.79).

Also E. H. Colbert (*Evolution of Vertebrates*) affirms about the origin of whales: “These mammals must have had an old origin because there are no intermediate forms between whales and the placentaceous animals from Cretaceous age, in fossil registers. Like the bats, the whales (...) suddenly appear in the beginning of the Tertiary age, completely adapted because of deep modifications of mammals’ basic structure into a highly specialized way of life. Actually, whales are even more isolated than bats in relation to other mammals. The whales remain absolutely isolated. (Apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. pp. 80).

## **8 – HORSE FINGERS AND EVOLUTION**

Evolutionists, if they are not asking horses to give them a hand, for helping them proving evolution, at least they are asking them for some fingers.

In effect, almost everybody have already heard about the famous evolution from the primitive horse – that would have four fingers – to the intermediate horse with three fingers, to the horse of nowadays, whose hoof is, actually, a very advanced finger's nail.

Even if it had been this way, the transformation of an accidental form – the change from four to three, and to one finger – does not mean that the horse has evolved, because in all cases the subject remains the same: the horse. If there had been evolution, they would have to admit three distinct subjects, what does not happen.

However, when the question is more seriously studied, it is verified that fossil history is a lot different from the one usually presented in schoolbooks.

This is what J.B. Birdsell and G.G. Simpson say (Cfr. D.T. Gish op. cit. p. 82).

Duane T. Gish demonstrates that the sequence of modern horses' ancestors, at least in what concerns South American fossils, contradicts horse's evolution thesis as it is usually presented.

Thus, fossils found in South America show that, in fact, there were creatures of the equideous genre with four, three and one finger. However the historical sequence is not this one. The oldest fossils of this genre in South America, *Diadiaphorus* (three-fingered) and *Thoatherium* (one-fingered), were already contemporary in the Miocene period. What happens is that, nevertheless, *Macrauchenia* (four-fingered) will only later appear, in Pliocenic period, when *Thoatherium* (one-fingered)

was already extinct. It is the inverse sequence from the one presented in the books that is true! (Cfr. Gish, op. cit. pp. 83 e 84).

One could, even so, argue that anyway there was and evolutionary sequence, albeit different from the one presented in manuals, and that the sequence of fossils found in North America, presented in the manuals is the true one: Hyracotherium (Eohippus) had four fingers; Merychippus had three; and Equus modernizem, just one.

The problem is that the unsuspecting scientists contest whether Eohippus was really a horse. H. Nilsson affirms that the Eohippus does not resemble a horse! To Nilsson the Eohippus, both morphologically and in the habitat, resembles more to the Hyrax gender (H. Nilson, *Synthetische Artbuilding*, apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 85).

C.A. Kerkut also agrees with this (Implications of Evolution):

"In the first place, it is not clear that the Hyracotherium (the Eohippus) is horse's ancestor. Because of that Simpson (1945) affirms, 'Matthew demonstrated and insisted that the Hyracotherium (including the Eohippus) is so primitive that is not much more equideous than tapirideous, rinocerontideous, etc., but it is ordinarily situated in the roots of the equideous group. (Apud D. T. Gish. op. cit. p. 86). And Kerkut concludes that "In some sense, it seems that the model of the horse's evolution can really be as chaotic as that model proposed by Osborn to the Proboscideous' evolution... " Apud Gish p. 86). Nothing proved, therefore.

## **9 - RODENTS**

Rodents mammals, being the most prolific mammals, the ones

that have the bigger number of species living in a wide range of habitats, would be more likely to provide more evidences of evolution. Also with them the "ritornello" is repeated: there is no information about transitional forms that could have given origin to rodents.

Romer says about them:

*"The rodent's origin is obscure (...) transitionals forms [related to them] are not known"* (Apud Gish op. cit. p. 87)

## **10 - MAMMALS AND WINGED BEINGS**

Despite the fact that evolutionists guarantee that reptiles would have given origin to mammals, the transition from one group to another is still a mystery. And a mystery "to stare with wide open mouth", since one of the unanswered questions regards the junction of the chin to the cranium in reptiles and in mammals.

In reptiles, the inferior maxilla is formed by six bones in each side of the head, while, in mammals, the inferior maxilla is constituted by one bone only. Besides, for reptiles, the jaw joints the cranium by means of the "square bone", which does not exist in mammals. Reptiles have a single ear bone, while mammals have three: the stirrup, the hammer and the anvil. There are, admittedly, still other differences between reptiles and mammals, but let us stick with these in sight.

Reptiles appeared together with the reptile-like mammals in the Carboniferous period. The so-called mammals arose later, in Triassic period, when the reptile-like mammals had disappeared.

It is worth seeing, *en passant*, that the existence of beings with common morphologic characteristics from two different genres or species does not mean, by itself, that the beings are intermediary between these two species. Thus, the ornitorinco (duck-bill platypus) has characteristics of a mammal, of a bird, and of a reptile. At first sight, it could be known as an intermediate animal, as a mammal predecessor that has conserved characteristics of bird and of reptile. Nothing could be less true, because it is posterior to the appearing of mammals. It exists just for 150 millions of years, while mammals, belonging to the Triassic is, at least, 200 million years old.

It is generally said that the intermediates between reptiles and mammals would have been animals like *Morganucodon* and *Kuehneotherium*. These were two small beings that date of the Triassic. From them were found just bone fragments that do not allow to know, in fact, whether they were the junction of their jaws to their respective craniums. Everything that is said about them is merely supposition. Both *Morganucodon* and *Kuehneotherio* have reptile's typical jaw with six bones at each side of the jaw. Both also have the square bone at the junction of the jaw to the cranium, typical of the reptiles.

According to evolutionists, these two animals' junction of the jaw to the cranium would be an intermediate between reptiles' and mammals', while their ear would also have an intermediate bone structure. What evolutionists do not explain is – if things happened like they say they did – how these poor animals managed to eat in the transition phase, and how they survived, becoming thus, at least temporarily, deaf.

All reptiles' fossils found until today, all of them, have just an only bone in the ear. It has never been discovered one intermediary being between reptile and mammal that had two bones in the ear.

Another big mystery to evolutionists is the "disappearance" of mammals for the long period of 120,000,000 years, period dominated by the so-called dinosaurs, by huge marine reptiles and by flying reptiles. This "disappearance" of mammals in the Triassic period remains inexplicable. For 120 million years, mammals' fossils practically disappeared, and suddenly, reappeared in enormous number, with their 32 different fully constituted and stable orders. Admittedly, they could not have arisen in Triassic then have been extinguished, and finally reappeared. They must have had a great numeric decrease, motivated by reasons that we ignore, and later, ceased this reason, multiplied again in great number. Possibly these mammals relative disappearance in Triassic was due the big saurs predators existence. When these disappeared - due to a reason as baffling as the mammals' "disappearance", the last ones began to multiply again.

Dealing about this fact G. G. Simpson says:

*"The most intriguing event in the history of life in Earth is the change from the Mesozoic, reptiles' age, to mammals' age"* (Apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. P. 95).

## **11 - THE ORIGIN OF WINGED BEINGS**

If evolution were true, the appearing of winged beings in several genders of animals – insects, reptiles, birds and mammals (bats) – would demand a massive structural revolution in non-winged beings. Because for a non-winged being to become capable of flying, it would not be enough to simply develop wings. There would have to be change in its bones, from heavy and full, to light and hollow; it should develop an entirely different muscular system, and revolutionize its nervous system.

While these changes would be occurring, it would be able to hardly walk and would not fly yet. This is what evolutionists understand as adaptation to the environment and as survival of the most apt. It is evident that this intermediary being between non-winged and winged beings would be easily captured by its predators, because neither would it walk, nor fly perfectly: it would be an easily destructible cripple. Here is the most apt to survive: a cripple and impotent.

Of course here also, evolutionists have no fossil, of an intermediary being between non-winged and winged for not a single animal gender.

E. C. Olson – who is evolutionist – says:

*“Regarding the flight, the farther we go in the past, the greater the lapses in fossil registers.”*

And regarding insects, tells the same Olson:

*“There is not almost anything to give any information concerning the flight origin history regarding the insects.”*

Regarding flying reptiles, tells Olson:

*“True flight is registered, between reptiles, by pterosaurs in the Jurassic period. However the most primitive of these animals had been less specialized to fly than the posteriors, there is absolutely no signal of intermediary stages”.*

About the winged mammals, Olson says:

*“The first evidence of flight capability in mammals exists in fully developed bats in the Eocenus.”* (Olson's citations apud Gish, op. cit. pp. 103 and 104).

The winged reptiles' case is particularly impressive.

Gish, in the well argued book that have been followed and cited, shows the enormous structural differences between *Saltoposuchus*-tecodonte reptile that Romer considers to be the predecessor of dinosaurs, birds and winged reptiles – and the *Rhamphorrhyncus*, winged pteosaur whose enormous fourth finger sustained the membrane that allowed it to fly.

The *Pteranodon* -- an animal of pteosaurious group -- had a finger of more than 15 meters in length, and a huge teethless peck.

Between the pterosaur of immense finger and the tecodonte, there is no intermediate being with finger of three, four, six, ten meters. There is no intermediate between both.

On their turn, bats are considered to have evolved from a non-winged insect-eater mammal. In the bat, four of their five fingers are extremely long so that they can support their membranes- wings. If evolutionists were correct in their hypothesis, the insect-eater mammal that gave origin to the bat had to develop – by casual genetic mistakes, remember – not only their immense fingers, but also their membranes, and, even more – and not less – their sonar system that allows them to fly in the darkness. From this evolution there should have had countless verifying fossils. As usual, there is not a single intermediate fossil between the insect-eater mammal and the bat. And Gish gives the older fossil photo of the only bat ever found. It is a 50-million-years-old fossil. And it is just like nowadays bats. Bats also did not evolved. Maybe because they lacked Darwinian light...

## **12 - ORIGIN OF THE BIRDS**

It is in this chapter that evolutionists present their great triumph: the *Archaeopteryx*. It is a species from which were found five samples of fossils and a feather, dating from the Jurassic period, thus, about 150 million years old. *Archaeopteryx* is considered the oldest bird known.

Actually, *Archaeopteryx* is a weird animal: it seems to be a bird, beak and teeth, and, if it had no feathers, it would seem a reptile. However, their feathers are different from the feathers of the birds currently known, because their feathers' peduncles run symmetrically by their axle, what would not permit them a perfect flight. The birds, to fly well, need to have feathers divided asymmetrically along their peduncles. The aerodynamic of the correct flight claims that. This weird aspect – half bird, half reptile – made the *Archaeopteryx* the classical example of the pretense gradual evolution, today rejected by evolutionists of the “punctuated equilibrium” of Jay Gould and Elredge. The fact that there is an animal with characteristics of different species does not mean that, necessarily, this is the intermediate antecessor between two different species. Otherwise we should have to admit that the platypus is antecessor of mammals and of ducks.

Romer had already affirmed that the *Archaeopteryx* could not be considered as the original antecessor of birds. But, after this statement, James Jensen discovered rests of modern birds in rocks from the primitive Jurassic!

This discovery would put down the *Archaeopteryx* as a proof of evolution. If there were modern birds in Jurassic -- contemporaneous of *Archaeopteryx* – so it was not the intermediate link of birds! This puts an end in the exhibition of this pretense Darwinist triumph.

But the search for a sensational lost link between reptiles and birds proceeds, and the despair of obtaining a proof of evolution is so big that leads to another fraud.

Recently, paleontologist Tim Rowe discovered it. A fossil found in China, divulged as cover report of National Geographic magazine, was proved to be false by the American paleontologist, Rowe. In the article "Forensic paleontology: The Archaeoraptor forgery" (Nature, 410, 29/mar/2001), the author demonstrates the crude fraud of a fossil that supposedly would be a lost-link between reptiles and birds, in a mounting of an skeleton with parts of four dinosaurs and a bird. It was the end of Archaeoraptor.

## **13 - DINOSAURS**

It had been written a lot about the dinosaurs, especially about their mysterious and inexplicable sudden disappearance. These huge animals – the Brontosaur weighted around 80 tons – constitute one more problem to Evolutionism, not their disappearance, but their appearing. If evolution were true, from where and from what animal did these giant dinosaurs come? How come we do not have any trace of their origin? And traces of their antecessors should be very respectable! Nothing at all. They enter the history of life without antecessors and leave without successors. For them too, they search the lost link. In truth, lost are the defenders of evolution.

## **VI – THE ORIGIN OF MAN**

### **1 - INTRODUCTION**

The great question behind all Evolutionism is the origin of man: was man created by God? The Darwinist thesis that man would have evolved from apes was, indeed, a more or less veiled denial of Creationism, although the evolutionary thesis did not

explain where matter came from. For the ordinary man, however, the victory of atheism and materialism would be implicit, if Darwinism was true. It is still like that today. Usually Evolutionism is taught to, between the lines – and many times on the lines – attack religion as anti-rational and anti-scientific, throwing its teachings to the sphere of legend or myth.

Since the appearance of the Darwin's thesis, what was constantly searched – and without success – was finding the lost link between apes and men, between the irrational and the rational. The impassioned – and most times deceitful -- search of intermediate fossils between the various species of animals intended only to establish a higher premise, necessary to build the syllogism whose conclusion was: “so, man comes from the animal... And the Scriptures lied”.

At first, Darwin and his followers tried to find the link between man and ape. When it was clear that this link did not exist, they changed their argument: man and ape have had a very ancient common ancestor.

For materialism, the difference between man and animal is not essential. Man would be just a more perfect animal, but he would not distinguish himself from the animal for having a spiritual soul. Human intelligence would be the effect of chemical and electrical reactions in the human brain. Thus, animals would also have an incipient “intelligence”. Instincts and rationality would not have a substantial difference.

For Marx, what distinguishes man from the animal is not rationality, fruit of man's spiritual soul. What distinguishes man from the animal is the ability of working. Engels defined man as “the animal that works”, what is foolish, because ants and beavers work, and they are not human. For Marxism, it would have been work that would have produced, in man, the

language, and from it, rationality. Therefore, in the beginning was work, and not the Verb. In the beginning there was shouting and screaming, not the verb. In the beginning there was no Wisdom, but matter.

For Materialism, man's and ape's animal ancestors – the primates – would have quit living over trees and have begun living on the ground. Little by little, they would have abandoned walking on four members and would have started walking erectly. This would have given them the possibility of using the hands. Next, they would have started to use sticks and stones as weapons, and, afterwards, as tools. From there comes the names "Homo faber" and "Homo habilis", from whom would have been born what they call "Homo sapiens".

In reality, what distinguishes man from animal is the spiritual and rational soul. So, a man is always "sapiens", even if, in many times, he does not have any sapience (wisdom)...

Man's genealogical tree, according to evolutionists, would have been what follows:

The datings of these pretense man's ancestors are very elastic, varying from author to author, with, sometimes, gigantic differences. For evolutionists, the error of some hundreds of millions years is not very impressive...

For example, the datings of men and apes common ancestor varies from 4 to 3.5 million years. It seems little when we first look at the numbers. But it is actually a gigantic difference of half a million years, that is, 500,000 years!

According to the usually presented scheme, man's closest relative would be the chimpanzee, because they would have genetic codes with very approximate numbers.

There are others, such as Schwartz, who, taking into account certain morphological aspects, consider man closer to the orangutan than to the chimp. This approach of man to monkey wants to point out only morphological resemblance between them, letting in the darkness what really distinguishes one from the other, that is, rationality, consequence of the existence of a spiritual soul in man. They point out similar accidental aspects, not considering that, however, a small difference in the chromosomes means an enormous specific difference, or that an accidental resemblance means nothing when facing an essential difference. Reducing difference of man from the animal only to the number of chromosomes means affirming that the only difference between man and animal is matter. Now, the main difference between man and animal is spiritual not material.

On the eagerness of proving that evolution was true, some evolutionist scientists did not hesitate using lies and frauds. There have never been, in the History of Science, so many scandalous frauds as is registered in evolutionist polemics. The *Batibius Haeckeli*, the Man of Piltdown, the Man of Java, the Man of Beijing, the child jaw of Ehringsdorf, were just some of the most famous frauds used to prove that man was not created by God, but had a purely animal origin.

We will first examine evolutionist frauds in the field of human fossils, and then we will examine the fossils presented as man's ancestors, today.

## **2 – Evolutionist Fraudulences**

### **a) The “Man” of Java**

The first fraudulent human fossil presented as proof of Evolution, and till today considered authentic by several

authors, was the famous man of Java, also called Pithecanthropus Erectus (erect man-monkey).

He was discovered in 1891 by a Dutch called Eugène Dubois, in Java. Dubois joined himself to the Dutch Army and, at first, made service in Sumatra, where he began his paleontologist research as well. Finding nothing of scientific importance in Sumatra he moved to Java where he said to have found at first a monkey-like cranial calotte. In the following year, and around 15 meters from the first discovery, Dubois said to have found a human femur. Later yet he found three teeth, of which he described two, and they were monkey's. The third tooth he maintained hidden for a long time and said nothing about it.

The cranial calotte found by Dubois had slender walls and almost did not present forehead, indicating also a very acute facial angle, typical of monkeys. The Dutch scientist calculated that the cranial capacity of this fossil would have been by 900 cubic centimeters, much smaller than actual man's, around 1.500 cubic centimeters.

Uniting the monkey-like cranial calotte, the human femur and two monkeys' teeth that he found, Dubois mounted a skeleton, filling with cement other absent parts. It was born, by this means, the Man of Java, who he called Pithecanthropus Erectus. Pithé (monkey) due to the monkey-like cranial calotte and two teeth. Anthropus (man) due to the human femur. This "fossil" was, then, presented as being the intermediate link between ape and man, that for a much time evolutionists longed to find in order to prove their hypothesis, turning it into demonstrated scientific thesis; a creature with characteristics of monkey and man, at the same time.

Of course, Dubois's proceedings were unscientific, because it is not legitimate to joint fossils found separated. There was no

warranty that the human femur, found about 15 meters from the monkey-like cranial calotte, would belong to the same creature. If we cave a place and find a jaguar's cranium and around 15 meters forward, a parrot beak it's not fair to conclude that, in ancient times, jaguars had parrot beaks.

Dubois discovered yet, near Wadjak, in Java, and in the same geologic stratum of the fossils referred above – and by this way supposedly of close age – two human craniums with capacity from 1.550 to 1.650 cubic centimeters. Meantime, Dubois prevented himself of revealing this discovery. For more than 30 years he hid it, because it demonstrates the falsity of his Pithecanthropus Erectus, that, till today, remains “alive and kicking” in the evolutionists scholar handbooks.

Only in 1922, when a similar discovery occurred at Wadjak was to be announced, Dubois suddenly urged to reveal the two human craniums he found in Wadjak. In 1895, he just exhibited his assemblage of Pithecanthropus Erectus – a kind of Frankenstein fossil – in the Zoology International Congress of London.

Despite the thunderstorm's triumph of evolutionists – sound experts in organizing cheering groups and false consensus – the acceptance of Pithecanthropus Erectus was not universal. Since the beginning, it was seen with wonder and some scientists looked skeptic in relation to this assembled fossil. This weirdness was mainly due to the joint of a monkey-like cranial calotte with a human femur found 15 meters of distance from one another.

Dubois was inquired about the third tooth that he inconceivably maintained occult. At last, Dubois was obliged to reveal that this third tooth was human. In the same mouth, Pithecanthropus Erectus would have monkey's and man's

teeth. A strange conjunction for a creature in evolution, for it should have semi-simian and semi-human teeth, but not teeth from monkey and man, at the same time...It was too much ado about a single mouth.

Dubois' revelation of 1922 that, into the same geologic stratum of his first discovery, he had also found two human craniums, proved that already at that time there were human beings of the same age of the owner of the monkey-like calotte of *Pithecanthropus Erectus*. Thus, this last could not be man's ancestor. Dubois himself ended up confessing, little before dying, that the cranial calotte found in Java belonged to a giant gibbon. Therefore, the Man of Java died before his discoverer and assembler...

Von Koenigswald, famous German paleontologist, studying the teeth found by Dubois, concluded that they were two molars of orangutan, and also that the third tooth – a pre-molar – was human! Despite that, these teeth are till today joint with cement in the famous monkey-like calotte of the Man of Java, and keep on giving fraudulent evolutionist and materialist bites on creationism.

Von Koenigswald himself, doing research in Java, in a place named Sapiroan, in the years preceding World War II (1936/39), found new fossils similar to the ones found by Dubois and called them *Pithecanthropus* II, III and IV.

Marcelin Boule – one of the highest authorities in fossil morphology and adept of Evolutionism – classified Sapiroan fossils as being of the same kind of Dubois' *Pithecanthropos*: they were simians (According to Gish, op. cit. p.182).

Boule and Vallois showed that, in the fossils found by Von Koenigswald, the pre-molar and the molars were put in right

line in order to give the “U” form to the palate, a simian typical form, meanwhile in man the palate presents a horseshoe-like shape.

Therefore, the famous Pithecanthropus was truly a Pithé: that is, a monkey in fact, but it was not an anthropus, in other words, it was not man.

Regardless of Dubois’s malicious and fraudulent omissions, regardless of his demoralizing confessions, the fossil he assembled is maintained Erectus till today due to the little sincere and nothing scientific “obstinacy” of Evolutionism. Also in the History of Evolution is proved the truth proposed by Voltaire to his disciples in order to combat the Church: “Lie, lie, all the time. Something will remain...”

## **b) The “Man” of Piltdown**

The second big fraud accomplished by evolutionists in order to attempt to prove as truth that man would have animal origin, was the famous Man of Piltdown (Eanthropos Dawsoni), found by Charles Dawson in the first decade of the XX century.

In 1908, a workman found, in Piltdown, fractions of a fossilized human cranium, and talked about his discovery to physician Charles Dawson, who was an amateur paleontologist as well.

In this same year the forthcoming celebrated Jesuit, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin – at that time a simple seminarist – was sent to Seminary of Ore Place, Hastings, near Piltdown. Teilhard studied in Jesuit seminary of Lyon, where he got to know and was influenced by the thoughts of Father Rousselot, whose affinities with Modernism led him to be condemned in 1920. At this same seminary of Lyon, Teilhard met and became friends with Father Auguste Valensin, disciple of Maurice

Blondel. Father Valensin was also implicated with Modernism. Teilhard called Father Valensin the “spiritual father”, and said he instructed him to think. It was Valensin who conducted Teilhard to correspond with Blondel, one of the leaders of Modernism, even though he had never been condemned by Church.

Modernism is a heresy that has exactly the Metaphysical Evolutionism as ground of all its heretical system. Teilhard de Chardin was the theologian – if his Gnosis could be called Theology – who made connection between Gnostic Modernism and Darwinist Evolutionism.

As soon as he arrived in England, Teilhard was introduced to Dawson. They are said to be introduced in May 31 of 1909, becoming friends and collaborators in paleontologist field researches. They made the digging out together in Piltdown. Precisely while digging out together, one day in Piltdown, Dawson would have found the famous monkey-like mandible of the “Piltdown” Man. (According to Stephen Jay Gould, “Piltdown Revisited”, in “Panda’s Thumb”, p. 96). That mandible, which the discovery was attributed to Dawson, had two monkey-like molars teeth, but whose use was typically human, and as the monkey’ s teeth are never worn out. And Teilhard was already digging out with Dawson...

The mandible, very well preserved, was defaulted exactly the condyle, that is, the osseous protuberance through which mandible joins the cranium. It is by the perfect joining made between the condyle and the cranium that is proved that a maxilla belongs, in fact, to determinate cranium. But “as if it was on purpose, condyle was lacking”, Father years afterwards, Father Teilhard de Chardin would write some years later ... (According to S. Jay Gould, “The Conjunction Of Piltdown in “The Chicken and its Teeth”, p. 218).

“As if it was made on purpose”... to mandible – found by Dawson, when digged out together with Teilhard – lacked the condyle...

Dawson jointed, then, the fractions of human cranium that he found with monkey-like maxillary, in order to mount so - after all!!! – the proof that man descends from monkey and making – after all!!! – the scientific demonstration of veracity of Darwinian Theory.

Teilhard would have discovered, then, at Piltdown, some mammal fossils (a rhinoceros bone and an elephant tooth) that would help proving the dating of the discovered fossils.

Dawson brought, then, all discovered material to Smith Woodward, the Conserver of the Geology Department of the British Museum (Natural History). And in 1912 Woodward and Dawson showed the fossils in the London Geology Society.

In the following year – 1913 - Teilhard de Chardin, digging up again with Dawson at Piltdown found a canine inferior tooth. It was a monkey-like tooth, but, as the molars from maxillary founded, this canine, also, showed a way of using typically human.

In 1914 World War I begins, and Teilhard was called to enlist the French Army. During all the four years of the war, he acted the front, as stretcher-bearer.

Meanwhile, Dawson was digging out in another place (Piltdown 2) with the same geological characteristics of Piltdown 1, where the first fossils had been found. At place 2 of Piltdown Dawson found two other dispersed fractions of human cranium, and a simian tooth, also with a human attrition.

The new discoveries were so providentially complemented to first fossils found in Piltdown that H. Fairfield Osborn, the top American paleontologist of the time, pronounced:

“If there is Providence hovering over the themes of prehistoric man, it certainly have manifested itself in this case, because the three segments of second Piltdown Man found by Dawson are exactly those we would have selected in order to confirm the comparison with the original type” (S. Jay Gould, “Piltdown Revisited” in “The panda’s Thumb”, p. 97).

What a happy coincidence!... Actually too much luck for him who digs with a priest, especially if this priest is Teilhard de Chardin!...

Since this discovery of fossils till the 50s, Piltdown Man was trumpeted in the academic cathedras, in famous intellectuals’ conferences, in the media and even in the pulpits, as being THE very proof that Darwin was right: man was in fact monkey’s and not God’s son!

In 1949, Kenneth P. Oakley applied the fluorine test – used to date fossils – on several pieces found at Piltdown. And lo, what a surprise! They had a very low fluorine content, which meant they had stayed in the ground for little time.

Four years later – 1953 – Oakley himself with the cooperation of J. Weiner and W. E. Le Gros Clark, proved that Piltdown cranium, and the mandible added to it, had different ages. The mandible belonged to an orangutan and was a lot older than the cranium, which belonged to a modern man.

It was a revelation “to stare at with wide open mouth”!

Closely examining the fossils, one could easily notice that they had been “made up”... Both the cranium and the mandible had been dyed. The teeth, in their turn, had been filed and rasped in order to give the impression of typical human attrition. At last, it was proved that other mammal fossils (rhinoceros bone and elephant tooth) found by Father Teilhard de Chardin at Piltdown, had been brought from other places.

Everything was a big fraud!

The perfection and diligence to delude indicated that the falsifier was an expert and not just an amateur as Dawson...

All the blame of fraudulence was put over Dawson, in order to save Father Teilhard de Chardin. After all, a priest could not be a falsifier.

But recently Stephen Jay Gould, determined to set aside the “clericalism”, dared to make himself the question of whether Father Teilhard was innocent in this gigantic fraudulence. He makes long researches which came out on an essay named “Conjuration of Piltdown”, and edited in his book “The Chicken and its Teeth” (pp. 201 to 220). From the research and essay, Father Teilhard comes out absolutely guilty. Jay Gould concluded that Teilhard was the main responsible for the fraudulence. He was the main responsible, but not the only one, because a “conjuration” involves a lot of guilty people.

Disclosed and revealed the fraudulence, still in 1953, Oakley wrote to Father Teilhard de Chardin asking him about his work with Dawson in Piltdown.

Teilhard answered to him refusing to admit the implication of Dawson and Smith Woodward in the fraudulence. (Who was the guilty then?)

But in same letter, a little after excusing Dawson and Woodward, Teilhard committed a fatal slip that revealed who was the true guilty of the fraud. In this letter to Oakley, Teilhard says that, in 1913, Dawson conducted him to the local named Piltdown 2 where there had been found the isolated molar and the rest of cranium. Well, Dawson only made this discovery in 1915, and not in 1913. Teilhard could never have been conducted by Dawson to that place in 1913 because the discoveries had not been done yet. The fact occurred in 1915 only. And in the year of 1915 Teilhard could not have gone to Piltdown, because since 1914 he was engaged in military French front, where he remained until 1918, the end of the First World War. Teilhard lied!

Jay Gould, after having confirmed that the priest had lied, began to search all Teilhard's correspondence – the edited ones at first and then in the original manuscripts – in order to look for everything he wrote about Piltdown discovery.

A new surprise!

Jay Gould discovered that in the edition of Teilhard's work itself there had been eliminated all excerpts about Piltdown Man that existed in the original manuscripts. There had been made an acute censoring of originals, in order not to appear, in the edited works, anything that could implicate Father Teilhard in the fraud!

Stephen Jay Gould is American and imagined that Teilhard just wanted to have some fun with Dawson when they made up the fraud. It would have been, initially, just to have fun at the

expense of Dawson. But that Dawson, however, believed naively that he had really made a great discovery and convinced Woodward about it. When both authors published the discovery of Piltdown Man it would have been very difficult for Teilhard to undo the “joke”...The return was impossible and the scientific world accepted the fraud.

What seems, in truth, a joke is Jay Gould's hypothesis! If you know a little of Modernist doctrine, defended by Teilhard, if you know some of the Modernist methods and swindles you may comprehend that the cause of the fraud was a lot more serious than merely joking.

Once the fraud was revealed, one would expect not hearing about the Piltdown Man as proof of evolution from monkey to man any longer. But that was not so, and during a long time one could find handbooks that would teach students that Piltdown Man proves man's coming from the ape, and that Darwin was right.

### **c) The “Man” of Nebraska**

This is a fossil little known in Brazil, but had, in its due time, repercussion in United States, where it was found. In Nebraska, 1922, was discovered a tooth. It was examined by Henry Fairfield Osborn and others and appointed as belonging to a creature that jointed the characteristic notes of chimpanzee, pithecanthropus and man. What an extraordinary mixture. They called this supposedly paleontologist cocktail as “hesperopitheus haroldcookii” or simply “Nebraska Man”.

But it had very short scientific life and fame. Five years after, when better analysis were carried out, it was proved that “Nebraska Man” was by no means an intermediary creature between the ape and man. It was simply a fossil of a kind of pork! (According to D. T. Gish, op. cit. pp 187-188).

#### **d)The “Man” of Peking”**

There is a forth fossil, considered authentic until our days, even though having a history almost as mysterious and intricate as the Piltdown Man – included the presence of the mischievous figure jesuit Teilhard de Chardin – and it is the “Sinanthropus Pekinensis” or Man of Peking.

Its complicated history begins in 1921, when two molars were found, proceeding from Chou-Kou-Tien, a village near Peking. Six years after -1927 - a third molar was given to Dr. Davidson Black. It was these three teeth that permitted the beginning of a talk over the Peking Man.. The local excavations were done under direction of Chinese paleontologist Dr. W. C. Pei, who found in the same place in 1928 the craniums and inferior maxillary fractions. Black described these pieces as having more similarities to monkey fossils than to human ones.

Since 1929, the Father Teilhard de Chardin – the same plead guilty to forge the Piltdown fraud – began to take part of researches at Chou-Kou-Tien, in the role of geological counselor...

Coincidentally, it was in 1929, too, that Dr. Pei revealed the discovery of a well-kept cranium similar to the one of the Java Man. Next to the cited fossils were also found many others of several kinds of animals.

Three other craniums were found in 1936, when researches, from 1934 (when Dr. Black died) on were under direction of an American scientist, but with a German origin, named Franz Weidenreich. One of these three craniums was examined by the famous fossil expert Marcelin Boule in the very place of the discovery, who considered it very similar to the

Pithecanthropus of Java. Boule wrote: "On the whole the structure of Sinanthropus is still very alike the one of a monkey" (According to D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 192).

Concerning cranial capacity of these fossils, it was estimated it was between 900 and 1.200 cubic centimeters, that is, between cranial capacity of actual monkey and man. Also inferior maxillaries, just like the teeth, were described as being similar to monkeys' despite the superior dental arcade being shaped more like a horse-shoe than a "U", which is typical of monkeys.

The characteristics of fossils of Peking, so akin to those of the Pithecanthropus of Java, Boule e Vallois named them Pithecanthropus Pekinensis, therefore, looking more like a monkey than a human being. In this sense Boule and Vallois criticised Dr. Black by having named the fossil as Chou-Kou-Tien of Sinanthropus, i.e. Man of China, when he was only based, at that time, on the teeth, while it should only be named after they had found the cranium.

From the original fossils, Dr. Weidenreich decided to make a model.

When the war between China and Japan began, the bones would have been sent to the United States and ...disappeared. Of them, only the models made by Weidenreich remained, which are not trustworthy, because not even photos were taken from the disappeared fossils.

What makes it even more baffling about these models is that the first descriptions made by Black and afterwards by Boule and Vallois affirmed they looked a lot more like monkeys than man, while the aspect of the models is absolutely human. The models do not seem to reproduce the original fossils, but the

Weidenreich's conception, ideas and wish.

What has happened to the original fossils? How did they disappear? Mystery...

Nowadays science and the world have to believe in the reliability of Weidenreich models without the originals to compare. Sinanthropus asks for an act of faith!...

Not only the fossils disappearance was a mystery, but the divergence between their descriptions and the actual appearance of the models arouse much sound suspicions. Furthermore there were a lot of collateral non-solved problems. For instance, why only craniums and no big bone as femurs were found?

In effect the craniums found at Chou-Kou-Tien – all of them! And there were almost forty! – had an orifice in occipital bone, which indicates they had suffered violent death. Now then, in the same geologic stratum there had been found stone tools and stone weapons, as well as campfire signals (According to H. Brodrick, "El Hombre Pré-Histórico", Fondo de Cultura Econômica, 1955, apud Atanásio Aubertin, *Evolução das Espécies: Apriorismos e Confissões Gnósticas*, artigo, 1962). No doubt these were proves that man already existed by then.

Everyone that studied the case – even Weidenreich – admits that Peking fossils are creatures that had been hunted.

Boule and Vallois rightfully ask:

*"How to explain the almost complete absence of long bones and*

*this kind of selection of osseous parts, all of which belonging to cranium, with predominance of inferior maxillaries? Weidenreich believed that this selected parts did not arrive to the cave [where they were found] by natural means, but that they would have been carried there by hunters who attacked principally young individuals and selected by preference, as spoils or trophies, heads or parts of them. This explanation itself is very plausible. But the question is: who was then the hunter? (According to D. T. Gish, op. cit. P. 195).*

To Weidenreich the hunter would have been the *Sinanthropus* himself! He would have been the hunt and hunter at same time. More plausibly, Boule and Vallois affirmed:

*"The hunter was truly a man."* (According to Gish op. cit. p.196)

The problem would have been solved if there were human fossils in the same stratum. Now then, after much tergiversations, Father Teilhard confessed that, in fact, in the same stratum where the *Sinanthropus* were found, human fossils were also found. In consequence, *Sinanthropus* was not a man's ancestor, once there were already man contemporary to him.

Father Patrick O'Connell, who was in China in time of Chou-Kou-Tien discovery, affirmed in his book *Science of Today and Problems of Genesis* that he believes Dr. Pei destroyed the original fossils before the return of Chinese government to Peking in order to occult that the models made by Weidenreich were not precise copies of the fossils. O'Connell called attention to the point that very few publicity has been given to the fact that fossils of 10 modern men had been found in same site of Chou-Kou-Tien and that this men were linked with numerous stone instruments found in this same local. According O'Connell the *Sinanthropus* is a fraud.

### **e) The infant mandible of Ehringsdorf**

This fossil was discovered on 1916, in layers of the medium Paleolithic, and was of Neanderthal race. It was, therefore, a human being fossil. What caused much interest was the fact that, while being human, it disclosed a primate dental characteristic. In this Neanderthal fossil, the molar tooth was of root, while the second pre-molar tooth was still a milk tooth. Well, this only happens with the monkey's dentition, and since 1939 it is proved that the Neanderthal dentition was the same as human being dentition.

American scientists K. Koski and S. M. Garnno had demonstrated that this molar was removable. They had pulled out a molar milk tooth from the fossil of Ehringsdorf, and incrustrated in its place a root molar tooth.

Later, the French paleontologist Pierre Legoux, communicating the Science Academy of Paris, demonstrated that all the mandible was fraudulent, being mounted and presenting instant contradictions between its parts. (According to Pierre Legoux, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie de Sciences*, tomo 252, p. 1821, year 1961, apud Atanásio Aubertin, art. cit.).

### **3- PRETENSES MAN'S ANCESTRALS**

As we have seen, when proved that the man did not descend from apes – as Darwin intended – the evolutionists adopted the thesis that apes and man had a common ancestor. In spite of not considering themselves any more sons of primates, they started regarding them as their cousins...

From this common ancestral of apes and of men had came, between 10 to 17 millions years ago, the *Ramapithecus*. From

this, would have derived the famous Australopithecus, which such prestige has enjoyed at Universities campus, and that has regularly frequented magazines and newspapers. These rock'n'roll singers rivals in journalistic prestige would have lived between 4 and 1 million of years ago. As for the Australopithecus, they would have been born -- between 1.5 million and 300,000 years ago -- both falsified by the assembly resulting in the Java Man, or the made up Sinanthropus. These false children of the Australopithecus are known as being of Homo Erectus kind, although nothing keeps them standing. What evidently also throws suspicions about their supposed "parents". The frauds on the children were such and so serious, that prudence leads us to have doubts regarding all their evolutionistic family. Finally, from the fallacious children of Homo Erectus would have born what is called today the Homo Sapiens, strange designation which means only Man, rational animal, and that so little Sapiens has revealed,, particularly when becomes materialist.

Homo Sapiens examples would had been the Neanderthal Man and of Cro-Magnon, which would have begun existing 100,000 years ago.

Let us study, now, this so false family, in order to investigate what we can find of authentic, and let us begin by the great-grandfather Ramapithecus.

### **a) The Ramapithecus**

The first fossils fragments of Ramapithecus were found in 1915. In 1932, in India, new elements of this being were found, but it was only in 1960 that the new "star" of Evolutionism was launched with all the propaganda fuss which greeted the new proof of Darwin's rightfulness. It was mainly the paleontologists David Pilbeam and Elwyn Simons who presented it as being man's predecessor.

Based on what did they affirm this? On very little, for they only

had of some teeth of the Ramapithecus and nothing else.

With so little basis, the evolution of the star life of the great-grandfather Ramapithecus was very short. When it was only 12 years old of university fame, a first dart was thrown to it that reached it fully. Dr. Robert Eckhardt, from University of Pennsylvania, in an article published on 1972 asked himself if the Ramapithecus could be considered as an ancestral of the man, and he answered:

*“Whether genetically variability is considered, the answer is no”*  
(According to D.T. Gish, op. cit. p. 141).

Eckhardt did many measurements on the teeth of the Ramapithecus and on the Dryopithecus, because it was in these measurements that Pilbeam based himself to affirm that the Ramapithecus was an ancestral of man. Well, according to measurements made by Eckhardt, there had more variations between living chimpanzees than the Ramapithecus and Dryopithecus. Eckhardt concluded, then, that Ramapithecus was a monkey, because of its morphologic aspect as its behavior. Further, Eckhardt's conclusion was confirmed by other scientists who proved that the dental arches of Ramapithecus was the same of monkeys', because it did not have the shape of horseshoe, typical of human palate. Alan Walker and Richard Leakey definitely established that the Ramapithecus had nothing in common with the man's origin.

The Ramapithecus' "godfather" himself - David Pilbeam – stated that it was an abuse to conclude that the Ramapithecus used to walk erect only by the simple analysis of its tooth. Despite of this, Pilbeam insists that his Ramapithecus is a hominid. Leakey and Walker, however, consider it as a mere orangutan, and so similar with this animal that they ended up declaring: it is heretical to say, but maybe the orangutans are living fossils [of the Ramapithecus]. Meanwhile, contradicting

its own conclusions, Walker wrote afterwards that the Ramapithecus was “an ancestral of orangutan, chimpanzee, gorilla and of man” (According to D.T. Gish, op. cit. p. 143).

After so many contradictions, the Ramapithecus abandoned the hall of fame, where it had a flash career.

## **b) The Australopithecus**

They are still in full glory, under the media and the materialistic intellectuals spotlights.

The first of them was discovered in 1924 by Raymond Dart, which denominated it Australopithecus Africanus. His discoverer introduced it as resembling the monkeys in the cranium form, but also similar to man by some particularities of cranium and of the teeth.

In 1936, it was discovered a cranium of an adult Australopithecus Africanus, in Sterkfontein, in Transvaal. Two years later, in Kromdraai, Robert Broom found a fossil that was classified as Australopithecus Robustus, because of his rustier, rude and strong aspect, its big and thick teeth.

New and important discoveries of African fossils were accomplished by Louis Leakey and by his wife Mary, from the 1950s to the 1960s, in the Olduvai Canyon, Tanzania. The fossils found by them were similar to the ones that had been discovered by Broom.

From what was found by Leakey, they drew the conclusion that Olduvai's fossils would have about 2 million of years. Curiously, in the same geological layer where Louis Leakey found his fossils, there were also weapons and stone instruments. One of the sons of Leakey, Jonathan, found a fossil cranium similar to the Australopithecus, however with cranial capacity a lot

larger -- about 700 cc. -- what led Leakey to consider him, initially, as an intermediary between Australopithecus and the man. Louis Leakey called him, then, Homo Habilis, because of the stone instruments discoveries in the same geological layer.

Later, however, Leakey himself classified this fossil as an Australopithecus, for this reason your current scientific name is Australopithecus Bosei.

From this Australopithecus, they distinguished two different species: one stronger, and another, relatively more delicate. It is Australopithecus Robustus and Australopithecus Africanus, both with small cranial capacity (about 500 c.c.), what approaches them to the gorillas. The evolutionist scientists, in general, came to the conclusion that these beings usually walked on their foot.

There was not, however, unanimity. The celebrated English anatomist Solly Lord Zuckerman studied these fossils for more than 15 years, comparing them with monkeys' and men's bones, and he found out that Australopithecus is a monkey!

Charles Oxnard, another scientist of Southern California University, having studied the Australopithecus concluded that, even though most of the scholars had considered that Australopithecus walked by foot, and because of this it was known as man's ancestor, the bones studies led him to say that it neither walked by foot, nor seemed to be related to the man, and not even to the chimpanzees and to the gorillas.

Rak and Clarke also demonstrated that the Australopithecus's anvil-bone is more different from the man's anvil-bone, than it is from the current monkeys'. The current monkeys are then, at this point, more similar to the man than the Australopithecus, and nobody dares to affirm - today - that the man comes of the ape. And it also does not come from the Australopithecus.

### c) "Lucy"

Particularly famous became the discovered fossil, in Hadar, Ethiopia, by Donald Johanson and Maurice Taieb in 1973, fossil which Donald Johanson and Taieb initially considered as belonging to a monkey. The bone they had discovered was of the knee joint. Afterwards, having found other fossils, considered that this knee joint was similar to the human's. From that they concluded that Hadar's fossils would have belonged to one being intermediary between monkey and the man.

Regarding the fossil's age, they attributed 3.000.000 of years to it, what it was a record for human fossils. This would be, therefore, the oldest human fossil ever found.

Having examined the famous knee joint of Hadar, Mary Leakey, Richard Leakey and C. Owen Lovejoy affirmed that this joint was of a human knee.

In new researches in the same local, in 1974, they discovered new fossils, about which Donald Johanson declared: " All the previous theories about the lineage origin that leads to the modern man now has to be totally reviewed. We must discard many theories and consider the possibility that man's origin was about more than 4 million of years ago" (According to D.T. Gish, op. cit. p. 152).

In following month (November, 1974), Johanson found a fossil of an arm bone of hominideous, and, after that, found parts of a cranium, and other bones, forming, in the total, about 40% of a skeleton. It was the fossilized skeleton of one feminine being that Johanson denominated "Lucy", because, in the hour to discovery, he was listening to the Beatles' song *Lucy in Sky with Diamonds* (which initials stand for the ones of the lysergic acid, LSD).

The cranium that they had found seemed to be one of a monkey, and its capacity was about 380 to 450 c.c.

Johanson hurried to proclaim that "Lucy" was a hominid of 3.5 millions of years that walked on foot, just as the modern men, despite of having had a monkey cranium.

In 1975, new fossils were found in Hadar. They belonged to 13 individuals, 9 adult and 4 still young beings. Johanson soon called them "the First Family".

In the following year (1976), Donald Johanson and Maurice Taieb published a work in which they said that the material discovered belonged to the genus Homo, and that "Lucy" had similar aspects to Australopithecus.

Gish shows that the fact of having given a woman's name to his fossil, the use of expressions as "The First Family", "children", and still other terms referring to human beings induced people to believe that, in fact, "Lucy" was the famous lost link between monkey and the man.

However, soon a debate took place. Tim White, the scientist that Johanson had associated with his researches, diverged of him, and after all, convinced him that Hadar's fossils were simple Australopithecus'. Since then one changed the its denomination to "Australopithecus Afarensis".

One set up then the following general scheme:

This pretense man's genealogical tree placed a serious problem.

Throughout the long years of study of Lord Zuckermann and Oxnard regarding the *Australopithecus Africanus* and *Robustus*, it had been proved that they did not walk with both feet, in the human way. Well, if it was right, how would then their - Lucy - walk on its feet millions of years before? Something was wrong.

Other scientists, having studied better Hadar's fossils, concluded that it was mere *Australopithecus Africanus*, against Donald Johanson' pretenses.

Jack T. Stern and Ronald Susman, anatomists from New York University, concluded by their studies on fossils of Hadar that they were beings that climbed trees, having an exclusively arboreal life, although they could occasionally walk on foot on the ground. This threw down the pretensions of Donald Johanson of introducing his "Lucy" like a hominideous being.

Stern and Susman showed that "Lucy" and the "First Family" had countless monkeys characteristic, like:

- a) long and curved hands, similar to the chimpanzees', and appropriate to grab branches;
- b) long feet, curved and very muscular, like the ones of beings that climb trees;
- c) the glenoide cavity also typical of beings that climb in trees;
- d) the iliac sheet was more similar to the chimpanzee's than to the man's;
- e) the femur head was more similar to the chimpanzee's than

to the man's;

f) the same occurs with fibula;

g) the famous knee joint, that Donald Johanson had classified like very similar to a human's or really human, was considered monkey's and proper to arboreal locomotion.

From all of this Stern and Susman concluded that Hadar's fossils -- including "Lucy" -- were Australopithecus, and that their occasional bipedality was similar to that of chimpanzees and spider-monkeys.

By his turn, Paul Turtle, an anthropologist of Chicago, agreed with Stern and Susman in the thesis that "Lucy" had to have arboreal life.

#### **d) The Cranium 1470 of Man of TurkanaLake**

Richard Leakey, one of the sons of the couple Louis and Mary Leakey, became famous due the discoveries made by his staff at the edges of the Turkana Lake margin (once Rodolfo Lake) in Eastern Africa.

Richard Leakey, despite the advantage of having learn his parents' teachings and experience, did not have a regular academic education. Therefore he must always refer to experts to analyze and classify his fossil discoveries.

In 1968, Richard Leakey found three Hominid fossil maxillas near TurkanaLake. In the following year, he found a cranium of Australopithecus Bosei, similar to the so-called Olduvai Man's, found in 1959.

In 1972 a man of Richard Leakey staff – Bernard Ngeneo --found fractured rests of a cranium named, further on, Cranium 1470. The number was extracted from the KenyanNationalMuseum fossil classification. Fragments found were jointed and solidified in order to compound a cranium of a creature that they classified as Hominid.

Richard Leakey attributed to the Cranium 1470 such an old age that he ended up asseverating: “Either we get rid of this cranium or we get rid of our theory regarding the primitive man”.

Particularly, the discovery of Richard Leakey would more than to doubt the existence of Donald Johanson’s fossil: it eliminated it as a man's ancestor, because if Cranium 1470 belonged to a man's ancestor, the fossil known as Lucy couldn’t be considered one anymore. The evolutionists had to choose one between the two. The two could not be man's ancestor.

What happens is that Donald Johanson considered that after the “Lucy” discovery, no theory about man’s origin could ignore her.

The Cranium 1470 was extraordinarily big to the advanced age to it attributed - between 3 and 4 million of years. It did not show salient superciliary bones and the top of it was elevated. Its cranial capacity was about 800 c/cand it looked more modern than the Homo Erectus, that is, it seemed more like the actual man than to to the Java and Peking Men.

Like that Leakey described it: “On the whole, the form of its cranial chest resembles remarkably modern man’s, lacking the heavy and salient orbital arcades that are characteristics of Homo Erectus from recent deposits in Africa and Asia” (Walter Sullivan, art. “Cranium augments the History”, in the journal O Estado de São Paulo).

Richard Leakey's discovery put in the garbage all fossils that were been worshiped by evolutionists. And he insisted on presenting it as the most authentic and proved man's ancestor.

"Despite the fact that the cranium be different from one of our species Homo Sapiens, it is different too from every other known forms of primitive man, not adjusting, consequently, in any of existing theories about man's evolution", R. Leakey affirmed (According to Walter Sullivan, art. "Cranium augments the History", in the journal O Estado de São Paulo).

In 1981 the first divergence came out. While Richard Leakey insisted that the cranium 1470 was one of a Homo Habilis, one of his adjoined scientists, Alan Walker, affirmed it was an Australopithecus'.

Notwithstanding, Leakey insisted. During a conference in California, San Diego, he affirmed: "The cranium 1470 invalidates all current theories about man's origin, but there is nothing to replace them" (According to D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 166).

Another rising questions emerged concerning the dating of Cranium 1470: even though it has been found in an old geologic stratum it was so little fossilized that one had to employ special substances to solidify it, and even a drop that felt on it was enough to go through it. If it was so old, it would have to have a very bigger degree of petrification. R. Leakey himself as well as Alan Walker had affirmed so. But in 1973, Leakey said that all fossils found at Turkana Lake were heavily mineralized. Why this contradiction?

In a debate against Donald Johanson, R. Leakey made a big X over the man's genealogic tree proposed by Donald Johanson, where "Lucy" was the principal figure, and when the later asked

him what to put in its place, Leakey wrote a big interrogation mark. Concerning this great divergence, James Lewin, a columnist of the famous scientific magazine "Nature", wrote his famous book "The Bones of Contention" showing in clear way the divergences between the evolutionist anthropologists of our days. Such was the scandal caused by Lewin's book that a commentator of the book wrote that "contrary to what many people proclaim, the scientific 'objectivity' is a myth" (Newspaper Folha de São Paulo, 1989).

In view of the contradictory points between the Australopithecus "Lucy" and the Cranium 1470, Stephen Jay Gould affirmed:

"What is left of our ladder, if there are three coexistent Hominid lineages (A. Africanus, the robust Australopithecus and the H. Habilis) none of which deriving clearly one from another? Furthermore none of the three developing any evolutionary force during their existence on earth: none becoming more cerebral or more erected as they approached our days" (S. Jay Gould apud D. T. Gish, op. cit. p. 171)...

By these reasons Stephen Jay Gould begun to believe that there was no direct lineage, a "ladder conducting directly from animal to man, but Evolution would have done itself more like a bush which ramifies itself in several directions.

It is a way to maintain erected the evolution dogma – like a bush – once the evolutionist ladder has fallen down.

#### **4 – Authentic human Fossils**

While they make a point stressing the characteristics of Australopithecus in order to make believe they are authentic man's ancestors, on the other hand, they attempt to induce people to believe that human fossils in fact had features nearly

animal. The so-called “Neanderthal Man” is exactly in that case. They attempt to exhibit him looking like a monkey, until someone commented, with finesse, that maybe he has been the most defamed man in History.

The first fossil of this kind was discovered in 1854, in Neander river Valley, near Dusseldorf. In 1908, another similar fossil was found at Saintes, in the Correze region, France. Later, a lot of exemplars were found crosswise Europe and Asia, demonstrating that the Neanderthal Man habited vast regions of world. This race would have lived since 200.000 to 35.000 years ago.

The classic fossil of Neanderthal had as a distinguishing characteristic the great super orbital salience. Furthermore, his forehead was small with accentuated facial angle and prominent mandible. His bones appointed that he had a bigger physical constitution than the modern man.

In spite of the rude lines of his face, increased by reconstitutions in order to make it even more similar to simians – clearly to make it easier the acceptance of evolutionist thesis – the Neanderthal Man had a bigger cranial capacity than the actual man! We know very well the importance given by evolutionists to cranial capacity as corroborative element of humanization. But, in respect to Neanderthal Man, seldom can we find a book that gives distinction to the fact he had bigger cranial volume and capacity, about 10% more than modern man's.

In respect to his exaggerated super orbital salience, today we know it was caused by degenerative acromegaly, for its turn caused by inadequate nutrition.

Marcelin Boule generalized the idea that Neanderthal Man

walked on legs somewhat arched and the body somewhat leaned, as gorillas. Meanwhile, several neanderthalian craniums showed the foramen magnum identical to modern cranium, proving that the pretense leaning position attributed to him is imaginary.

Daniel Cohen affirms that the stupid aspect and brutality often attributed to Neanderthal Man “are before of all conjectures that reflect the background and biasing of the artist who reconstituted him. And adds:

“There is no proof of his stupidity. In reality, it is somewhat bewildering to observe that the average size of the Neanderthal Man’s cerebral behavior is a little bigger than modern man's – 1.600 c.c. – comparing with 1.450 c.c. from this one” (Daniel Cohen, O Estudo do Homem de Neandarthal, journal O Estado de São Paulo, 19/ I /1969).

François Bordes says about this fossil now focused by us:

*“Reconstitutions show him as a little better than the big monkeys and his tools are described as rough (...).The truth is, however, completely different”* (F. Bordes, Mousterian cultures in France, article in Science magazine, vol. 134, p. 803, 1961).

The naturalist N. Mercier, analyzing the archeologist discoveries made at St. Cesaire (France) in 1979, concluded that Neanderthal Man co-existed with Cro-MagnonMan. This proves, then, that Neanderthal Man was not a predecessor of the Cro-Magnon Man. Furthermore, both were rude instruments and tools makers, even though the Cro-Magnon’s were more perfect.

Now then, at St. Cesaire were found neanderthalian fossils

next to instruments made by Cro-Magnon Man!

In 1989, the Nature magazine published an article of French and Israeli scientists announcing the discovery of a neanderthalian skeleton who had the bone hyoid, absolutely fundamental to the speech. This fact proves that Neanderthal Man was anatomically able to speak.

Dr. Baruch Arensburg from TelAvivUniversity affirmed that skeletons found into a cave in Kebara, at Israel, had 60.000 years of age. The hyoid bone belonging to this fossil is identical in format, size and position to modern man's and, in consequence, the Neanderthal Man could speak as much as the so-called Homo Sapiens (According to journal O Estado de São Paulo, 28/IV/1989).

Another discovery occurred into Shrinadar caves, at Persia, between 1950 and 1980 by dr. Ralph Solecki from Columbia University, indicates that Neanderthal Man practiced at its time a kind of cult to the death. Solecki found at Shrinadar seven neanderthalian skeletons recovered with powder, which was examined, revealing to have a great percentage of flower pollen. Well, this fact indicated that Neanderthal Man comprehended the flower symbolism, and that, if he put flowers over his cadavers it was because he believed that something of them kept on existing even after death and cadaverous putrefaction. Therefore, they believed that there was something immortal in man and, somehow, there would have a life after death.

Regarding this, Daniel Cohen says:

“The discovery of mortuary flowers at Shrinadar empowers an argument exposed during a long time by a combative minority of anthropologists and paleontologists -- that Neanderthal Man

is a direct ancestor and perfectly honorable of man, and not a kind of final product of a simian evolution”.

## **VII - EVOLUTION AND FAITH**

### **1 - THE EVOLUTION PROBLEM FOR THE FAITH**

In the Church History, whenever a heresy appears, there arises, soon after, a group that begins by defending an intermediate position between orthodoxy and the condemned heresy. And usually the semi-heresy is more dangerous than the first proposed heresy. Admittedly, there is not a “semi”- heresy. Either a thesis is orthodox or it is heretical. But the Church, wisely, always distinguished, in the heresy and in the mistake, more or less serious shades. It is with “semi”-heresy, with the concealed and tortuous affirmations, with the suspicious thesis and with heresy taste that the heretics seek, always and shrewdly, to infiltrate their most heterodox doctrines.

On the other hand, as there are more moderate people tending to come to a balance, there are others that, pretending to combat exaggerations and extreme positions, actually are always seeking agreements with the mistake and with the evil. These ones are the most dangerous channels of errors, because their apparent moderation gives them a credit that facilitates the introduction of the concealed mistakes. The hidden or concealed heresy is always the most dangerous.

With the appearance of Darwin’s heretical thesis – heretical because it denies the fact that there is only one God “creator of all the visible and invisible things” – soon arose Catholics who tried to defend a conciliation between Darwinist Evolutionism and the Catholicism.

Admittedly, it is necessary to distinguish among people that tried to study the matter, searching to free from blame what could perhaps exist of scientific truth in what the evolutionists were saying and the catholic doctrine. These deserve praise, while trying to save the truth, they had in view the clear and total condemnation of the heresy.

However, there were others that, under the excuse of saving the truth, sought and seeked, actually, an approval of the erroneous thesis. It is this "Christian Evolutionism" – the mitigated Evolutionism – which we intend to criticize.

The heresy that welcomed Evolutionism, applied even to Metaphysics and Theology, Modernism, the subtlest and most chameleonic heresy that has ever existed. Modernism defended the thesis that the Divinity itself evolved, and, alike, all the beings evolve too. In consequence, the truth would be constantly changeable and one could never affirm something as stable. Because of this, the Church dogmas themselves would evolve, in time. Everything would be, then, relative and unstable. Creed, moral, aesthetics, truth, good and beauty, everything would be changeable. And it was on this metaphysical relativism that was built the Babel of the XX century, with its doctrinaire uncertainty, its moral relativism, its anti-art, and also – after Vatican II – its evolutionary, humanist and unstable NewChurch.

In the heart of all of these mistakes of the century, from Auschwitz to Gulag century is the Darwinist Evolutionism.

We can recall then, that:

- 1) Darwin launched his theory of Evolution of species as thesis to prove Materialism and Atheism. Because of this he received the admiration and the support from Karl Marx.

2) Beside this, it is absolutely necessary to stress that the Evolutionism is fruit of a Gnostic metaphysical conception, because the thesis that every being evolves is in Gnosis' essence, and it demands a dialectic metaphysics irreconcilable with Catholicism.

3) The Modernist heresy - condemned by Saint Pius X in the encyclical Pascendi -- was Gnostic and as such, had to defend an evolutionist metaphysics that was applied to the Divinity itself and to the created beings.

4) Condemned the Modernism, it did not disappear. On the contrary, it is today triumphant, either in the theological environments, in the parochial bulletins, to the simple sextons, to Episcopal documents, or to the simple sanctimonious ladies that repeat what the vicar tells them as if he had infallible word, or even in the documents of Vatican Council II, a pastoral council, and therefore, fallible.

We saw, in the previous chapters of this work, that the Evolutionism has never been scientifically proved. In the scientific places with highest reputation, it suffered and suffers even more today, after the biochemical discoveries, fierce contestations. Paradoxically, in the religious places its prestige has grown. Among scientists, the Evolutionism is known as a not proved thesis and even as vanity. Unfortunately, in the clergy, it is considered almost a dogma by many clergymen. Some priests have more fear to attack evolution than the existence of hell.

A century after Darwin's death, his theories continue in a hypothetical stage. And of some hypothesis upon which fell the dishonor several fraudulent actions. But, if the materialistic Evolutionism suffers so many mortgages and frauds, the

mitigated Evolutionism makes headway on its career. And it is an ecclesiastical career.

Fooled by the scientific progress, enraptured by the technique advances, and in the eagerness of conciliating the Church with the modern world - thesis condemned by Syllabus of Pio IX -- many Catholics tried to harmonize Darwin and Moses, Evolutionism and Creationism. It created the mitigated Evolutionism, a "Christian" Darwinism.

To the mitigated Evolutionism, the Darwinism central thesis would be right: the evolution, in fact, exists and it would be already proved. However, they try to baptize the Darwinism, saying that God would have already made the world under the evolution law. In a certain moment of evolution, God would have taken an animal and would have infused in it an immortal soul. Thus, Darwin could receive the *Nihil obstat* and the Episcopal *Imprimatur* and, even, papal one.

The main "Christian evolutionist" was the jesuit Father Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, famous for his participation in Piltdown Man's and of Sinanthropus Erectus frauds, as well as for his Gnostic system - pantheist - Christian, entirely similar to the modernist heresy..

Other mitigated Evolutionism important defender were the renowned Cardinal Augustin Bea, also a Jesuit, Pio's XII confessor, of whom he was friend, and, afterwards, one of the main responsible for the Vatican II ecumenical mistakes, especially in documents about ecumenism and about the Jewish. It would have been Cardinal Bea the inspirer of the encyclical "Divino Aflante Spiritu", by Pius XII, that softly and silently opened the Church doors to very serious mistakes. It would have been he also the Pio XII inspirer in the composition of "Humani Generis" encyclical, particularly in the part

concerning the evolution.

In “*Humani Generis*” Pius XII makes restrictions to the evolutionist thesis, especially regarding the consequences which would derive from the acceptance of simian origin of man.

In effect, if the man came from the monkey – or from any other animal – it would be logical to admit that many monkeys would have evolved to the human stage. Thus, the men would not descend from only one couple. There would have existed various original couples of various human races. The monogenism would not have existed, but a polygenism.

Consequently, the thesis of the original sin of Adam which was inherited by all men would be compromised. And, with the polygenism and the denying of the original sin, Christ’s redemption, the Baptism, the Church and all revelation would be compromised. Because of this, Pius XII, in *Humani Generis*, affirmed that the polygenism could never be accepted.

Pius XII, initially in this encyclical, took a strong position against the Evolutionism when saying:

“There is some that, admitting imprudently and indiscreetly that system called evolution, which has not been fully proved on an unquestionable way even in the domain of natural sciences, explains the origin of all this, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in continual evolution; communists gladly subscribed to this opinion so that, when the souls of men have been deprived of every idea of a personal God, they may the more efficaciously defend and propagate their dialectical materialism.”

“Such fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy which, rivaling “idealism”, “immanentism” and “pragmatism”, has assumed the name of “existentialism”, since it concerns itself only with existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.”

Pius XII, afterwards, remembers that many Catholics requested the Church of taking as much as in consideration the new discoveries of Science. The Pope says then, when it refers to true scientific discoveries, Church certainly have to take them into account. But, when it regards to mere hypothesis which is still not proved, one should act prudently.

“...the Teaching Authority of the Church does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology, research and discussions, on the part of men experienced in both fields, take place with regard to the doctrine of “evolution”, in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter—for the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God -- however this must be done in such a way that the reasons for both opinions, that is, those favorable and those unfavorable to evolution, be weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation and measure, and provided that all are prepared to submit to the judgment of the Church, to whom Christ has given the mission of interpreting authentically the Sacred Scriptures and of defending the dogmas of faithful”

These prudent words were said to a world impregnated of evolutionist and relativist mentalities and principles. It was as if somebody allowed a discussion, in a club where there were many alcoholics, about the possible benefits of wine, as in the Scripture says “The wine cheers the heart of just.”

The position assumed in *Humani Generis*, albeit condemning the polygenism, eased the way for a possible comprovation of Evolutionism by Science, and thus its acceptance by the Catholic doctrine.

Pius XII used to notice that, even in his time, many Catholic thinkers had exceeded the prudential limits of a simple discussion about the evolutionist hypothesis, treating the problem, as if it was already scientifically proved. The Pope lamented this imprudent attitude, but alerted those that the polygenism was not admissible.

“When, however, there is question of another conjectural opinion, namely polygenism, the children of the Church by no means enjoy such liberty. For the faithful cannot embrace that opinion which maintains either that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all or that Adam represents a certain number of first parents” (Pio XII, *Humani Generis*, Denziger 2328).

There are, thus, two theses considered inadmissible by Pius XII:

1) That after Adam nor all the men had descended from him, by natural generation;

ci) That the name of Adam designates a group of parents, and not only a single person.

The text, however, is a lot subtle.

We have to admit that AFTER Adam all the men descend of him.

But BEFORE Adam?

The text of Pius XII leaves opened a possibility that there would have existed men before Adam!!!

And this possibility would allow conciliating the Evolutionism with Catholicism. And it was by this lack that the Evolutionists and Modernists attempted to invade the catholic fortress. And the invasion was of such intensity, and such an importance that John Paul II, in his speech, which we have cited before, to the Pontific Academic of Science on October 1996, admits that Evolutionism is no longer a hypothesis but a demonstrated scientific thesis, while to the most up-to-date science, Darwinism Evolutionism is "VANITY".

Cardinal Bea himself – of whom we so sadly recall – affirmed that the Evolutionism faces insurmountable obstacles to conciliate with the data of Scripture. Further, regarding the origin of the body of Adam, says Cardinal Bea, it would be possible to try to harmonize Evolutionism and Catholicism. The problem is Eve!

Since the Holy Scripture affirms that Eve was taken from Adam, and for Evolutionism, she would also have to have origin in a preexisting animal. It is impossible to harmonize the Scripture with Evolution.

The Holy Scripture says "NO!" to Evolutionism!

Let us see, now, synthetically, what can be argued against this

mitigated Evolutionism.

Evidently, all the arguments of Metaphysical character that we line up against the Evolutionism can be also applied against Evolutionism in its mitigated form, in other words, the Christian modernism. And, firstly, the principle that from the minor cannot be derived the major.

The mitigated evolutionists admit that God would have created the matter under the law of evolution and that, from the solid matter to the cell, and from the cell to the animal, would have existed, in fact, evolution of the minor to the major. They still affirm that, in a certain moment of evolution, God would have infused a rational soul in an animal already existent.

Well, if God had created all nature under the law of evolution, why would He have interfered to create the human soul? Would not the rational soul also be a fruit of this evolution.

And, to all these evolutionists, what says the Holy Scripture would not be an obstruction to their theory, because, if we can argue, as says Pius XII, the simean origin of man, despite the data of Scripture, why should theses data be accepted when it regards to the human soul?

God created the universe according to His image and similarity. All the visible things were done to reflect the invisible qualities of God. It is what teaches Saint Paul in the Epistle to the Romans: "Ever since the creation of the world, his invisible attributes of eternal power and divinity have been able to be understood and perceived in what he has made." (Rom. 1,20).

Well, God is immutable, and its immutability has to be reflected by something in the mutable things. And one of the things by

which is reflected the immutability of God in the mutable things is the immutability of the forms and of the species. God made the things accidentally mutable, with their immutable essences or nature. (Cfr. Collin, Manual de Filosofia Tomista, Gilli, Barcelona, 1950, n. 65, I vol, p. 107).

The mitigated Evolutionism, admitting the evolution of the matter only, does not escape of condemnations made by the Church against the Relativism and Modernism. Because if there is continuous evolution of the matter, therefore it is impossible to form a stable idea of what things are. Thus, we could not have idea of what each thing is. There would not exist truth, adequacy of the idea of the person who knows to the known object, because both the object and the person who observes would be in continuous change. There would not be truth. The - mitigated or rude - Evolutionism takes to the Heraclitan relativism, destroying all the Catholic Criteriology, with disastrous and heterodox theological consequences.

It is because the Evolutionism logically conducts to Materialism and to Relativism that Marxists totally support it. The mitigated Evolutionism eases therefore the way to the introduction of Relativism and Socialism among Catholics. By the way, that was what was registered in all troubled history of the XX century.

In the Decree Lamentabili, Pope Saint Pius X condemned the following theses as expressions of the modernist heresy and mentality:

“LVII: The truth is not less variant than man, therefore it evolutes with himself, in himself and by himself”.

“LXIV: Science progress demands Christian’s doctrine concepts to be remodelled about God, the Creation, Revelation,

the Verb made flesh and Redemption”.

(Note that San Pius X condemns the modernist idea of Catholic concept review on creation that Modernists desired to combine with evolutionist “Science”).

It is useful to remember that the doctrine of the immutability of the created essences is supported by the Holy Writings itself, once in Genesis it is repeated ten times that God created things “according to its species”, by saying that every plant and every animal should have fruits and nestlings “according to its species”, which means, according to its DNA.

On the other hand, it’s necessary to take into consideration that, in the Holy Writings the verb “Bara” – created – is only used when its subject is God, and that this verb is always related to God’s doings. “Bara” always means God creating something that transcends the natural order, or making something new. (Cfr. Num XVI, 30 and Jer XXXI, 22).

In chapter I of Genesis, the verb “Bara” is employed to mean that God has done something new, when He made something from nothing, which means that God created. So, when one reads, in this very first Chapter of Genesis, where God says: “Let us make – (Bara) – man to our image and likeness” (Gen. I, 26), we must understand that He created the man.

Note that it is not written: “Let us make man’s soul”, but **“Let us make man”**. Nevertheless, man is not only soul. He is also body. We should then understand that God created man – body and soul.

Obviously, we must remember that Holy Writings clearly states that God made man’s body out of the slime of the earth, that is,

man's body was not created from nothing, but the Creator used a previously created matter. But the mitigated Evolutionism considers that "slime of the earth" could be an existing animal.

This interpretation goes too far, because if God has used an already existent animal's body to make man's body, it would be normal for him to say that way. Why and how would He call a monkey slime of the earth? Saying that "slime of the earth" should be understood by monkey or primate is only a "wishful thinking" of mitigated Evolutionism, without any logical or exegetical basis.

Furthermore, human soul should be infused in a material body proportional to it. Body is for the soul as the matter is to the substantial form. To infuse a human soul in a primate body would be as incompatible as having a high-tech software being installed in a legacy AT PC. The software would not work, because the hardware would not be proportionate to such a sophisticated "software". The brain or nervous system of no animal is enough to permit the "functioning" of the human soul. So, God did not use the body of any animal to infuse a rational human soul in it.

The body serves the soul by capturing, through material senses, the needed information so the soul's intellective potency abstracts the rational knowledge. Besides it, the soul uses the body to express ideas and feelings. Nevertheless, every organ used to perform a particular task has to be proportional to it, in order for the task to be conveniently performed by the organ. There is no animal's body proportional and able to be used by the rational human soul. So God did not infuse a human soul in any existing animal to create the man. He made a body from the mud especially capable to host the rational soul. Cfr. Saint Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, I, q 76, a. 5).

That's another reason why Saint Paul taught: "All flesh is not the same flesh, but one is the flesh of men, another of beasts, another of birds, another of fish" (I Cor XV, 39).

If man's flesh is not the same of animal's, this means that man's body is not the same of animal's ones, so, God did not infuse a human soul into a pre-existing animal to create man.

*"It is doctrine theologically common, approved by a decree from the Biblical Commission, that the narrative from the Genesis teaches the immediate formation of Adam's and, above all, Eva's body, what discards the production of the human body by means of evolution".* (E. Collin, Handbook of Thomist Philosophy, Luis Gillii editor, Barcelona, 1950, vol I, n. 145, p. 208).

By the way, if God had used another alive being, in whose body He would have infused a rational soul, it is evident that both man and animal should have the same genetic code, thus it was supposed to be possible the crossing between them. Nevertheless, the monkey does not have the same genetic code of man. They are two completely different specimen, and, for this reason, it is impossible the crossing between them.

Another difficulty one faces when justifying the mitigated Evolutionism is the biblical sentence that says:

***"And the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth: and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul"*** (Gen II, 7).

Be aware that this sentence makes clear that God blew on man's face with "A breath of life, and man became a living soul". So, a mud-made body had no life. It was not, thus, a pre-existing animal body. Only if one means that God used a

monkey's body or a dead primate, which would be much illogical – because one would have to admit the evolution of a dead animal into a living and more perfect body than the animal's – and little worth .

If God inspired life into a mud-made body, that body was unanimated and not dead. That is why the Holy Scripture says that God made Man of the “slime of the earth”, in other words, from an inorganic material, not a dead one.

And if it was allowed to give such amplitude to the expression “slime of the earth” that could be understood as “pre-existing animal”, what should one understand - and what would be left of Faith – applying the same amplitude to the Annunciation of the Angel, or to the meaning of Resurrection?

One would get logically and heretically where Loisy and Hans Kung have arrived. The last one ended up even stating that Christ's resurrection was the biggest fraud in the History.

If God has acted as mitigated evolutionists interpret, all the narrative of the Writings on Adam's body molding by God would be useless and fraudulent.

The name Adam and the Hebraic word to earth – “adama” – are obviously related. If God made man from a pre-existing animal, the use of the word “adama” would be illogical. Adam came thus from the earth and not from a pre-existing animal.

As we have seen, the mitigated Evolutionism flows naturally into polygenism. We have also seen that Pius XII condemned the polygenism, as being against the Faith, in the encyclical *Humani Generis*.

“Now, it is no way apparent how such an opinion [of those who admit polygenism] can be reconciled with that which the sources of revealed truth and the documents of the Teaching Authority of the Church propose with regard to original sin, which proceeds from a sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which, through generation, is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own.” (Cfr. Rom. V, 12-19; Council of Trent, Can. 1-4, Pio XII, Humani Generis, n. 36).

On the other hand, if polygenism was truthful, not only the dogma of original sin would be destroyed as demonstrated Pius XII – and with it all Catholic doctrine on Redemption and the Savior – but we also would not be able to state that men are all brothers. This would deny the “dogma” of Masonic universal fraternity, as well as humanitarian feelings. This is an argument only “ad haereticos”, but that comes handy.

Many people are impressed by certain accidental similarities between monkeys and man. Nevertheless, there are other animals with accidental similarities with man. For instance, the parrot “speaks”; the dolphin is able to learn extraordinarily; the elephant has an outstanding memory.

This similarities, as much as the other ones, that remind human virtues or vices only demonstrate that God made animals symbolically representing virtues and sins of men, so that the men, considering the animals’ behavior, could have a better rational attitude. That is why the Holy Writings says: **“Yea, neither by sight can any man see good of these beasts. But they have fled from the praise of God, and from his blessing [after sin]”**. (Wis. XV, 19).

Well, the figure of a monkey is a grotesque caricature of the sinner man, the animalized man that is made ridiculous by his sins. This is the relation between both, and not the one that

exists between cause and effect. Saying that monkey looks like man, and, for that reason, ought to be its ancestor, means to confuse someone's caricature with his second efficient cause.

Man has been created by God as the king of all creation: "Rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the earth" (Gen I, 28) commanded God to men.

Well, the verb "rule over" indicates that God has given man lordship over animals, lordship that implies the transcendence over them, including over the monkey.

Because every man is made from the slime of the earth and a rational spiritual soul, man is a resume of all creation, which would not be that clear if God had used an animal body to make man's body. Should it have been that way, man would tend to overlook beings inferior to the animal's world.

When Christ incarnated, He dignified every creation, because in man the entire created universe was synthesized, from the rude matter until the spirit.

## **2 - EVE**

The doctrine of the mitigated Evolutionism brings serious consequences in relation to Eva's origin and its relationships with the position of the Church in relation to Christ.

The first question to those who defend the mitigated Evolutionism is: "How about Eva? How did the woman appear? Would she also have been done from an existent animal? Didn't Eva come from the man? How about the doctrine of the

original sin? For if Eva didn't come from Adam, not all the human beings come from him.

The text of the Scriptures that narrates the formation of Adam's body is read by the mitigated evolutionists as being purely a symbolic report. They have much more human respect in relation to the report of Eva's creation. How to defend in face of an assembly of atheistic university students that Eva was made of a matter removed of Adam's flank? And soon the scientifically human respect makes them ridicule the biblical report, wondering the man has one rib less than the woman.

No. The human being – both man and woman – has twelve ribs, just like Christ had twelve apostles, the year twelve months, the day twelve hours. And one of the apostles betrayed Christ, as Eve betrayed Adam, making him sin.

The Holy Scriptures tells that Adam named all the animals conveniently (Cfr. Gen II, 20). In the Scriptures, naming means to express its essence, and, at the same time, to express domain on the nominated, because only the lord of something can name it.

Adam named the animals, after God had said that man should not be alone: "It is not good for man to be alone: let us make him a help like unto himself" (Gen II, 18).

And why was it not good for man to be alone?

In first place, because the man is a social being to which God gave language capable to express his thoughts. If man lived alone, the language would be not only useless, but a harmful talent, because having thoughts and not being able to express them, or to be useless to express them would be rather a

burden than an advantage.

Besides, God made the man sexual, to generate. And as He made the animals male and female, likewise He should make a feminine human being, so that the generation would be possible. That is why God said that He would do for the man a "helper like himself", and comments St. Thomas that this aggregation could only have been done for the generation, because if were to work, He would have made other man that would be more useful than the woman, physically weaker.

The sacred text says that God made all animals pass before Adam, and It adds: "but for Adam there was not found a helper like himself" (Gen II, 20). And then Adam named all the animals and he did not see among them none that was similar to him. Not even the monkey, although the genetic code is so close seemingly.

And when God made Eve out of Adam's rib, he, when seeing her, exclaimed:

***"This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh"*** (Gen. II, 23)

Why "now"? Because, at that time Adam saw that Eve was similar to him, although he did not have her genetic code exam. Eve was flesh of his flesh, bone of his bones, that is, had his same nature, the same genetic code.

And ***"she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man"*** (Gen II, 23).

The text of Genesis is then very explicit: Eve was taken from

Adam. She was made out of his matter, and not out of an animal being previous and the predecessor of man. And Pious XII repeats this very lesson:

*"The aid given by God comes from the first man, and she is flesh of his flesh, formed as companion, that receives her name from the man, because she was taken from the man "* (Pious XII, Address to the Papal Academy of Sciences, 30 / XI / 1941, Acta Apostolicae Sedis, XXXIII, 506, apud D. Estevão Bettencourt, OSB, Ciência e Fé, Rio de Janeiro, 1958, p. 105)

The unsuspecting Cardinal Bea – of sad, ecumenical and not very orthodox memory -- ex- Rector of Pontifical Biblical Institute, wrote "We cannot see another possible solution under the exegetic and theological point of view except affirming that Eve was formed of a part of Adam's body by a special intervention of God, and that happened in order to immaculate by means of such proceeding some fundamental religious truths and of highest importance" (Agustin Bea, Questioni Bibliche, II, 52, apud D. Estevão Bettencourt, op. cit. p. 104).

The theory of the evolution thwarts directly the text of the Holy Scriptures. We are not only dealing with the literal meaning of the Bible, or giving it what the rationalists call "fundamentalist interpretation".

Let us see, then, if the analogical signification of Genesis is favorable to the evolution.

When mentioning the meaning of the Christian marriage, and the meaning of the married union, St. Paul teaches us: "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the church" (Eph V, 32)

Why does St. Paul say this?

The description of the formation of Eve's body starting from a removed matter of Adam's flank has always been a prophetic image not only of what would happen with Christ in Calvary, but also of Christ's relationship with the Church.

Therefore:

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Adam was the first man, in time.                  | — | Christ is the first men in value.   |
| God gave to Adam a deep rest, image of the death. | — | Christ died in the cross.   |
| While Adam slept, God opened its flank.           | — | After Christ died in the cross, the centurion opened His flank with the lance   |
| From Adam's side, God retired a matter.           | — | From the wound on Christ's chest poured blood and water.  |
| From the matter taken of Adam's                   | — | From the side of Christ was born the Church, divine and human. Divine for Its head--Christ, represented by the blood. |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| side God made Eve's body.                                  |   | Human for Its members--the men--represented by water.  |
| Eve was Adam's only wife.                                  | — | The Church is Christ's only wife. What -- by the way --- condemns ecumenism.   |
| Adam and Eve join and they have the children of the flesh. | — | Christ and the Church join to have the children of God. God could save the men speaking to them, by the grace, directly to the heart. He did not do it and He does not wish to do it. He wants to save men by means of other men, while members of the Church. |
| Adam had one single wife.                                  | — | Christ only has and He can only have one single Church, an a single wife, only one mystic body, from which it is impossible to separate Him. That is why Adam cannot separate from Eve. The divorce is illegitimate  |

In case the report of the Holy Scriptures about the creation of Eve's body is not historical, the whole doctrine of the Church as Mystic Body of Christ would fall apart, with serious consequences for the Faith, for the sacrament of the marriage, as well as for the priestly celibacy. In fact it is interesting to verify that the substitution of the doctrine of the Church as Mystic Body of Christ for the doctrine of the Church as People of God in Vatican II, when opening the doors to ecumenism, also opened enormous breach to an increased easiness in the

processes of matrimonial nullity--that today is almost equivalent to the practical acceptance of the divorce-- or to the abandonment of the priestly celibacy.

More than a century ago, it has been trying to adapt the text revealed to fables and deliriums supposed scientific. Michael Behe will say to vanities, that it is like he calls the Darwinist theory.

Today, it is the Science itself that denies those vanities, fables and deliriums.

São Paulo, September of 2003

Orlando Fedeli

Fábio Vanini, biologist

Marina Marques Vanini, doctoring in Biology

Dr. Daniel Almeida de Oliveira, Physician