

BAD SCIENCE:
Evolutionary Wisdom vs. Historical Reality

Evolution generates a cultural mind set receptive to claims that support naturalistic origins, even if evidence from science and history contradicts the claims. **On occasion, the defense of evolution has involved an actual intent to deceive, as revealed, for example, in private letters and journals published after the perpetrator's death.**

Whether deceitfully promoted or not, evolutionary claims have become a kind of "conventional wisdom." Though widely accepted, this evolutionary wisdom is a kind of *historical revisionism* that is completely different from historical reality, as in the cases presented below.

Evolutionary Wisdom:
Charles Lyell proved geological evolution.

Historical Reality: Lyell, popularizer of geological evolution and Charles Darwin's predecessor, boasted that he would deceive mankind into overthrowing the Mosaic chronology.

Lyell's agenda was to discredit the Bible under the guise of "science." Lyell was not formally trained in science, but was a lawyer and only an amateur geologist. For that matter, Darwin was never formally trained in science either (Henry, 2002b, pp. 1, 10).

Lyell's "hidden agenda" was revealed in personal letters published after his death. He wrote that he had "driven" the biblical Flood "out of the Mosaic record" (Lyell, 1881, p. 253). He also revealed his plan for undermining the Bible. He would not make a frontal attack against the Scripture, but "conceived the idea ... that if ever the Mosaic chronology could be set down [discredited] without giving offense, it would be in an historical sketch ..." (Lyell, 1881, p. 271). Lyell's reference to "an historical sketch" meant a work about "historical geology" written from an evolutionary viewpoint. His three-volume *Principles of Geology* (Lyell, 1830; Lyell, 1832; Lyell, 1833) was the fulfillment of this plan.

In sum, Lyell using his legal skills would manufacture an opus alleging an evolutionary version of the earth's geological past. He would lead his readers to doubt the chronology of Moses and the Bible as a whole without directly attacking it or naming it. With his *Principles of Geology*, published when he was in his early thirties, he succeeded immensely.

We are not left to wonder if Lyell was conscious of his indirect maneuver against the Bible. He employed the same tactic generally, rarely asserting dogmatically what he wanted readers to believe, but cleverly allowing them to reach his conclusions on their own. Indeed, he wrote of his use of this tactic to encourage belief in biological evolution: "I left this rather to be inferred, not thinking it worthwhile to offend a certain class of persons by embodying in words what could only be a speculation" (Lyell, 1881, p. 467). Darwin observed Lyell employing this tactic:

"Lyell is most firmly convinced that he has shaken the faith in the Deluge far more efficiently by never having said a word against the Bible than if he had acted otherwise. ... I have read lately Morley's *Life of Voltaire* and

he insists strongly that direct attacks on Christianity (even when written with the powerful force and vigour of Voltaire) produce little permanent effect; real good seems to follow only the slow and silent side attacks" (Darwin, 1873).

The subtitle of *Principles of Geology* revealed Lyell's desire to replace biblical Flood catastrophism with another version of geological history. That version was uniformitarianism, the belief that present-day geological processes have also acted in the past without global catastrophes such as Noah's Flood. The subtitle was "An attempt to explain the former changes of the earth's surface by reference to causes now in operation," a perfect definition of uniformitarianism.

Evolutionary Wisdom:
Darwin originated the concept of natural selection.

Historical Reality: Darwin learned of natural selection from creationist Edward Blythe. Natural selection is a creationist concept. **Blythe correctly viewed natural selection as a negative mechanism resulting in the elimination of weak genetic variants, not as evolution** (Eiseley, 1979, p. 54).

The story that Darwin originated the concept of natural selection has been kept alive by the most eminent of evolutionists. For instance, Julian Huxley declared that "the universal principle of natural selection" was "Darwin's great discovery" (Huxley, 1959, p. xiii).

In July 1837, Darwin began keeping a series of "secret" (private) notebooks on the ways in which species might undergo change. This was just after the appearance of Blythe's articles on this topic in the British *Magazine of Natural History*. Given the wide readership of this magazine, and the similarity of Darwin's concepts to Blythe's ideas, **it is a virtual certainty that Darwin began with Blythe's ideas on natural selection without giving credit to him** (Eiseley and Grote, 1959, pp. 96, 109; Taylor, 1987, pp. 125-126).

In other words, Darwin apparently plagiarized the "natural selection" concept from Edward Blythe. Lest this be considered too hard a judgment against Darwin, it should be recalled that plagiarism is the use of knowledge or information without properly crediting the source, a condition implied for the *Origin* by the fact that the *Origin* contains no footnotes, no bibliography, and virtually no citations of any kind. In this deficiency, the *Origin* does not appear to meet even the standards of its own time. Though in the Middle Ages the borrowing of ideas without attribution was considered an honor to the one whose ideas had been borrowed, by the nineteenth century, works intended as non-fiction such as the *Origin* typically contained careful documentation.

Evolutionary Wisdom:
Darwin showed that evolution happens.

Historical Reality: Darwin claimed that natural selection caused evolution, although acknowledging in other places that this claim has extreme difficulties.

***The Origin of Species* does not present evidence for evolution, only accounts of so-called "microevolution" such as animal breeding.** But Darwin *hinted* that natural selection

acting on variations of the type arising in animal breeding would result in limitless evolution. He wrote, for instance:

"Nature gives successive variations; man adds them up in certain directions useful to him. In this sense he may be said to have made for himself useful breeds. The great power of this principle of selection is not hypothetical. It is certain that several of our eminent breeders have, even within a single lifetime, modified to a large extent their breeds of cattle and sheep" (Darwin, 1860, p. 48).

Darwin's characterization of selection as having "great power" was well considered, leaving the impression in the reader's mind that surely such a "principle" must be capable of much more than causing small variations in sheep or cattle. The first five chapters of the *Origin* – more than one-third of the book --are taken up with such examples which Darwin constantly associated with evolution.

The balance of the 15 chapters (Darwin, 1860) presented few additional claims for evolution, but focused with difficulties of the evolutionary concept. **Darwin acknowledged the difficulties but failed to accept the impossibility of evolution they implied.** As he closed the first five chapters describing modern genetic variation and opened chapter six, he admitted,

"Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered ..."

At this point, the reader might expect Darwin to have questioned whether evolution could happen at all, but instead Darwin pushed forward as if evolution were a virtual certainty, claiming that "... to the best of my judgment, the greater number [of difficulties] are only apparent, and those that are real are not, I think, fatal to the theory" (Darwin, 1860, p. 158).

A discerning reader would notice that up to this point Darwin had not presented a single case of evolution, yet Darwin wrote as if this were not so serious after all. To reach this point, however, the reader would have had to peruse over 100 pages of wordy sentences and long paragraphs, and might have been willing to grant *on faith* that Darwin was right.

In chapter 10 after more than a hundred additional pages of similar assertions, Darwin finally claimed that, "By the theory of natural selection all living species have been connected with the parent-species of each genus, by differences not greater than we see between the natural and domestic varieties of the same species at the present day ..."

Darwin was now telling the reader that "microevolution" must be the basis for "macroevolution." He acknowledged that the number of "transitional and intermediate links" must "have been inconceivably great." Even so, this difficulty was, in his opinion, no more substantial than the problems with his theory, for "assuredly, if this theory be true, such have lived upon the earth" (Darwin, 1860, pp. 288-289). In other words, **if evolution actually happens, then there must be transitional forms as evidence that it happens.** Amazingly, this *reasoning in a circle* is as close as Darwin came to proving evolution in the *Origin*.

Through the balance of the book Darwin continued to infer evolution from genetic variation in domesticated animals,

(e.g., Darwin, 1860, pp. 318-319). **The *Origin* presented argumentation for evolution rather than evidence for it.** The *Origin* was an apologetic, not simply a work of science. Himmelfarb (1968, p. 333) observed that Darwin's "essential method was neither observing nor the more prosaic mode of scientific reasoning, but a peculiarly imaginative, inventive mode of argument." "Imaginative" and "inventive" Darwin's argumentation may have been, but scientific it was not.

***Evolutionary Wisdom:* Darwin believed that natural selection causes evolution.**

Historical Reality: Realizing that it never could, Darwin eventually abandoned this idea. **Darwin completely dropped the claim that natural selection causes evolution in the last edition of the *Origin* published under his supervision** (Hedtke, 1983, p. 1). This was the sixth edition which he edited by 1872 and which was published without further revision until 1882, the year of his death. **This edition is out of print, and the second edition, which promotes natural selection as causing evolution, is usually the one sold.**

The second edition was in fact the last edition to uphold natural selection as the mechanism for evolution. Successive editions promoted natural selection less and less. **In the sixth edition, Darwin abandoned natural selection altogether** (Hedtke, pp. 31-32), plainly rejecting it:

"I have now considered enough, perhaps more than enough, of the cases, selected with care by a skillful naturalist, to prove that **natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures;** and I have shown, as I hope, that there is no great difficulty on this head" (Darwin, 1872, p. 188). **Darwin thus acknowledged that natural selection as an evolutionary mechanism was disproved.**

Darwin continued to reject natural selection as the means of evolution for the rest of his life. Slightly more than a year before his death in 1882 he sought to diminish the role of natural selection by asking rhetorically whether there was "any one who has said that the evolution of species depends only on natural selection" (Darwin, 1880, p. 32). *The obvious answer was supposed to be No.*

Darwin never rejected evolution. He rejected only natural selection as the cause for evolution. What mechanism did Darwin adopt in place of natural selection? The answer is as startling as his rejection of natural selection itself. **He turned to the discredited theory of the "inheritance of acquired characteristics" proposed by Lamarck in 1801.**

He wrote, "As far as concerns myself, I believe that no one has brought forward so many observations on the effects of the use and disuse of parts, as I have done in my *Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication*; and these observations were made for this special project" (Darwin, 1880, p. 32). The book he named here was published in 1868, meaning that **in less than a decade after the *Origin* appeared in 1859, Darwin had begun changing his mind about the place of natural selection in evolution.**

In the last several decades, scientists have increasingly rejected natural selection as a possible mechanism for evolution

without giving up the belief in evolution itself (Henry, 2002b, pp. 6, 12; Henry, 1999, pp. 2-3, 7). The modern intelligent design movement also rejects natural selection as a mechanism for evolution (Henry, 2006, p. 1), though some intelligent design advocates believe that God may have used evolution.

Evolutionary Wisdom:

Darwin published the *Origin of Species* because the weight of scientific evidence meant that evolution's time had come.

Historical Reality: Darwin did not confidently rush the *Origin* into print. He was cautious, even timid, about having it published. The story of what moved him to publish it when he did illustrates the old saying that *truth is stranger than fiction*. He was driven into publishing the *Origin* in 1859 because **the previous year his contemporary, Alfred Russell Wallace, had received ideas virtually identical to Darwin's in a fever-induced trance in the jungles of Malaya.**

Wallace received in *one afternoon* the crux of the natural selection theory that Darwin had been developing for twenty years (Himmelfarb, 1968, pp. 245-247; Taylor, 1987, pp. 76-78; Hedtke, 1983, pp. 5-6). What was the source of Wallace's information?

Certainly Wallace was aware of evolutionary concepts that had long been fashionable in European thought. Both he and Darwin synthesized these ideas into a more fully developed evolutionary theory. However, **Wallace also belonged to the Society for Psychical Research and for many years was deeply immersed in spiritism** (Taylor, 1987, pp. 75-76). Was Wallace's mind receptive to input from the spirit world?

This possibility is not as far fetched as may at first appear. Wallace's friends knew of his spiritist activity. Mutual friends first proposed that Wallace and Darwin be recognized as "co-discoverers" of evolution by natural selection.

However, spiritism was not generally respectable in Victorian England, so eventually the Establishment dropped Wallace's name from the theory.

We are left with some extremely intriguing questions: **Would Darwin have published the *Origin*, thereby giving evolution a patina of scientific respectability, if not for Wallace's timely revelations?** And was the source of these revelations associated with Wallace's spiritism?

Evolutionist Loren Eiseley described Wallace's experience as "a lightning flash of insight" that provided "Darwin's unpublished conception down to the last detail, independently duplicated by a man sitting in a hut at the world's end" (Eiseley, 1959, p. 80). The end result was that Wallace "had forced the world's most reluctant author [Darwin] to disgorge his hoarded volume" (Eiseley, 1959, p. 81).

Eiseley concluded, "the whole of Western thought was about to be swung into a new channel because a man in a fever had felt a moment of strange radiance" (Eiseley, 1959, p. 81). **The "new channel" that Western thought was about to enter was, of course, evolution, but it was also much more.**

For many, evolution has been a way of escape from Christianity and a doorway into a paganism consistent with age-old Satanic designs (Henry, 2003a, pp. 2-3). **We are left with the possibility that this "strange radiance" Wallace experienced was more than the product of his own mind.**

Evolutionary Wisdom:

In-bred "purebreds" (pure "master races") are new species evolving.

Historical Reality: Darwin's own family inadvertently tested the principles of evolution by natural selection among themselves, producing a succession of miscarriages, premature births, deformities, and mental derangements from the very type of inbreeding that Darwinism encouraged.

Darwin married a first cousin on the belief that since they were both of superior "stock" their children would benefit. Such a marriage would be illegal in most places today, and even in Darwin's time was relatively rare. While his choice in marriage may have been a symptom of the class prejudices common then, nonetheless when he married Emma in 1839, he had been fully influenced by Lyell toward evolution. By then he had been keeping his "secret" notebooks on natural selection for nearly two years.

The result of their union was a collection of misfits, both physical and mental. Of the ten children, "Mary died shortly after birth; another girl, Anne, died at the age of ten years; his eldest daughter, Henrietta, had a serious and prolonged breakdown at the age of fifteen in 1859. Three of his six sons suffered such frequent illness that Darwin regarded them as semi-invalids while his last son, Charles Jr., was born mentally retarded and died in 1858, nineteen months after birth" (Taylor, 1987, p. 127).

A century after Darwin's marriage to Emma, **Adolf Hitler applied the Darwinian master race concept in German social planning** (Henry, 2003a, pp. 5-6). This led to the genocides of World War II.

Evolutionary Wisdom:

"Gill slits" in human embryos show we came from fish.

Historical Reality: Ernst Haeckel falsified drawings of embryos as "evidence" for his idea of embryonic recapitulation, the idea that we all grow through evolutionary stages with embryonic "gill slits" and other evolutionary vestiges.

In 1868 Haeckel publicized his "biogenetic law." This states that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny," meaning that an embryo in the womb grows through stages retracing its supposed evolutionary history. Haeckel fraudulently "revised" embryo drawings to support his "law." German embryologist Wilhelm His exposed Haeckel's fraud in 1874, but this fraud continues to be taught in modern texts as fact.

Haeckel's fraud was widely publicized, especially after a scientific "court of inquiry" called him to answer the fraud charges. There is no scientific reason for continued presentation of the biogenetic law.

The popular idea that the developing human embryo has "gill slits" is a product of Haeckel's fraud. The alleged gill slits are supposed to show that we evolved from fish. **Modern biology texts persist in teaching this idea although humans have no gill slits at any stage of embryonic growth.** One text has claimed, "[Embryonic] development of a mammal thus proceeds through a series of stages, the earlier stages unchanged from those that occur in the development of more primitive vertebrates" (Raven and Johnson, 1989, p. 1110).

Some modern texts explicitly claim that human embryos have the discredited "gill" structures, as in the following example: "But the similarities among the embryos themselves provide the most startling evidence of evolutionary relationships ... **Gill pouches and tails are more vestiges of our primitive ancestry**" (Brum and McKane, 1989, p. 414). **The human embryo never has "gill pouches" but pharyngeal arches that develop into a part of the jaw.** The so-called "gill pouches" never relate to breathing in any way.

Evolutionary Wisdom:

The development of the horse proves that animals evolved.

Historical Reality: The story of how the horse evolved was conceived from an assemblage of fossils arbitrarily ranked from small to large, some of which were not horses at all.

Nowhere in the world are the fossils of the horse series found in successive strata: "But perhaps the most serious weakness of Darwinism is the failure of paleontologists to find convincing phylogenies or sequences of organisms demonstrating major evolutionary change. ... The horse is often cited as the only fully worked-out example. But the fact is that the line from *Eohippus* to *Equus* [the so-called "modern" horse] is very erratic. It is alleged to show a continual increase in size, but the truth is that some of the variants were smaller than *Eohippus*, not larger. **Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time**" (Taylor, 1983, p. 230).

Michael Denton (1985, p. 182) concluded that, "The single line of gradual transformation from *Eohippus* to *Equus* presented in most recent texts of evolutionary biology is largely apocryphal."

The "horse series" in museum displays generally depict an increase in size. Yet living horses, from tiny American miniature ponies to the enormous shires of England, span a size range matching that of horse fossils. Further, evolutionists have commented on the *non-evolution* of the horse:

"The gradual emergence of the horse has been frequently cited as proof of evolutionary theory. Nearly a century ago, T.H. Huxley, 'Darwin's Bulldog,' made much of the series leading from the little four-toed *Hyracotherium* (formerly known as *Eohippus*) of 55 million years ago to modern one-toed horses. But even this lineage proceeds by jumps between many branches ..." (Wesson, 1991, p. 40).

"... [T]here was a time when the existing fossils of the horses seemed to indicate a straight-line evolution from small to large ... **As more fossils were uncovered ... it was all too apparent that evolution had not been in a straight line at all ...** Unfortunately, before the picture was completely clear, an exhibit of horses ... had been set up at the American Museum of Natural History, photographed, and much reproduced in elementary textbooks (where it is still being reprinted today)" (Hardin, 1961, pp. 225-226).

The story of the how the horse evolved continues to live on. In a June, 1982, interview with Luther Sunderland (1988, p. 78), Niles Eldridge said, "I admit that an awful lot of [fantasy] has gotten into the textbooks as though it were true. For instance,

the most famous example still on exhibit downstairs [at the American Museum of Natural History] is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps fifty years ago. That has been presented as literal truth in textbook after textbook."

The supposed evolution of the horse has been an important buttress to the theory of evolution. Along these lines, G.A. Kerkut (1960, pp. 144-145) observed, "It would not be fitting in discussing the implications of Evolution to leave the evolution of the horse out of the discussion. The evolution of the horse provides one of the keystones in the teaching of evolutionary doctrine, though the actual story depends to a large extent upon who is telling it and when the story is being told. **In fact one could easily discuss the evolution of the story of the evolution of the horse.**"

Evolutionary Wisdom:

***Homo erectus* is evidence of linkage between apes and an.**

Historical Reality: The original *Homo erectus* was the so-called Java Man, which Eugene Dubois "reconstructed" as "evidence" for human evolution. **Java Man was actually an collection of ape and human bones that Dubois hid in his cellar for twenty years, allowing virtually no one to study them.** Yet textbooks continue to promote *Homo erectus*, Java Man's modern incarnation, as evidence that we evolved from apes (Fix, 1984, pp. 111-113; Lewin, 1987, p. 23).

The differences among the ape and human bones in Java Man were obvious: "If we possessed only the skull and the teeth, we should say that we are dealing with beings, if not identical with, at least closely allied to the Anthropoids [apes]. If we had only the femura [thigh bones], we should declare that we are dealing with Man" (Boule and Vallois, 1957, p. 123).

Further, other *Homo erectus* remains have been described as fully human: "In its parts and proportion only the skull of the Lake Turkana boy would look odd to someone not trained in anatomy. The rest of his skeleton, essentially human, differs only subtly from that of a modern boy" (Leakey and Walker, 1985, p. 629). **If the ancient skeleton is essentially like the modern form, where's the evolution?**

But even the differences emphasized in this statement really mean nothing, for Simons (1963, p. 880) recognized that, "**High physical and dental variability in given species of man and apes has long been known ...** but it is clear that this has not been taken into account by the majority of past and recent describers of fossil hominoids [ape men]." Thus the *Homo erectus* skeleton mentioned above had slight skeletal variations falling in the normal human range.

Evolutionary Wisdom: Apes and men are related.

Historical Reality: "Evidence" for human evolution was fabricated as "Piltdown Man," a hoax that lasted forty years (1983, pp. 201-226). The perpetrators escaped exposure by blocking the scrutiny that would have unmasked them.

The fragments were kept literally under lock and key in the basement of the British Museum. It was nearly impossible for even eminent scientific authorities to gain access

to them. In 1933 when anthropologist Louis Leakey wished to examine the fossils he was allowed to see them only briefly and was required to do further study on plaster casts of the originals (Gould, 1979, p. 44).

Historical Reality: A supposed link, the "Nebraska Man," was concocted from the tooth of an extinct pig (Fix, 1984, pp. 11-12; Lewin, 1987, pp. 54-55).

Even the number of *legitimate* fragments around which evolutionists have striven to prove our descent from apes is startlingly small: "The fossils that decorate our family tree are so scarce that there are still more scientists than specimens. **The remarkable fact is that all the physical evidence we have for human evolution can still be placed, with room to spare, inside a single coffin**" (Watson, 1982, p. 44).

In the same vein, two prominent evolutionists remarked: "Human paleontology shares a peculiar trait with such disparate subjects as theology and extraterrestrial biology: it contains more practitioners than objects for study" (Pilbeam and Gould, 1974, p. 892).

Evolutionary Wisdom:

Neanderthal Man and Cro-Magnon Man were primitive.

Historical Reality: Neanderthal and Cro-magnon specimens were pieced together to make them appear primitive. Correctly assembled, they are "modern" (Cuzzo, 1998, pp. 37-40 ff.).

Neanderthal Man did exist but was not a primitive link. Sir Arthur Keith decades ago characterized Neanderthal Man as advanced: "His skill as a flint artisan shows that his abilities were not those of a low order. He had fire at his command, he buried his dead, he had a distinctive and highly evolved form of culture – **Neanderthal man was certainly not a dawn form of humanity**" (Keith, 1925, p. 159).

With the passing years, Neanderthal Man has been increasingly recognized as fully human: "The Neandertals were not so different from us, although decidedly more robust" (Weaver, 1985, p. 614). **In other words, Neanderthals were not only fully human, they were even more advanced than we, at least in body structure.** Cro-magnon Man was likewise more robust than we. Rather than representing evolution, **Neanderthals and Cro-magnon show that human race has physically degraded since their time.**

These people in fact lived after the dispersion from Babel in places where survival was difficult. Most "primitive" remains "have been found in Europe, the Far East and Africa, i.e. **in marginal regions of Asia that are most unlikely to have formed the cradle of the human race.**" These were the frontiers of areas populated by post-Babel people. "No remains are known to us from central Asia [the location of Babel], where most scholars who have occupied themselves with the (historical) origin of man place the earliest races" (Koppers, 1952, p. 239).

Evolutionary Wisdom:

The Scopes "Monkey Trial" of 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee, showed that biblical creation is outmoded.

Historical Reality: Both Piltdown Man and Nebraska Man were some of the main evidence used for human evolution in

the Scopes trial. The Scopes Trial was a media event devised by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to make creation appear ridiculous. To this day this media event is acknowledged to have virtually eliminated the mention of creation from public school textbooks. **The Scopes Trial was memorialized in the play *Inherit the Wind*, with name changes to allow license for departure from historical reality.**

Francis Hitching wrote: "Today no more is heard of Nebraska Man. ... He nevertheless served his purpose in another Darwinist triumph, the Tennessee Monkey Trial of 1925. When John Scopes was accused of teaching Darwin's theory contrary to Tennessee state law, the [Nebraska Man] tooth was proudly displayed as evidence that man had a long evolutionary past; so were Eugene Dubois' fossils, even though Dubois himself had ceased to believe in them; and so was Piltdown Man, now known to be the most notorious forgery of all" (Hitching, 1982, p. 182).

Evolutionary Wisdom: Life evolved from dead chemicals.

Historical Reality: "Origin of life" experiments have been publicized as scientific milestones when in fact no one has produced life in the lab (Wang, 2007, p. 10). Price (1974) included a number of seminal papers on the "generation of life" in the lab, beginning with the classic Urey/Miller experiment purporting to show how life could have spontaneously generated on the primordial earth. However, *none* of these papers actually reports that life was produced in the lab.

Further, modern "cloning" experiments have not truly made new cells. No cell has been made from "scratch," only by recombining parts of preexisting cells. Use of preexisting parts is not the "creation of life in the lab."

Evolutionary Wisdom: Life has evolved all over the cosmos.

Historical Reality: Extraterrestrial life has been promoted as a real phenomenon and as "proof" that life must be evolving everywhere, when in fact **no physical life has been found beyond the earth** (Henry, 2005, p. 1).

Some evolutionists have coined the term "exobiology" to refer to the study of extraterrestrial life. But exobiology has been described as the only scientific discipline whose "subject matter has never been observed and may not exist" (Dobzhansky et al., 1977, p. 366).

Evolutionary Wisdom:

Many planetary systems besides ours could support life.

Historical Reality: Extrasolar planetary systems have been publicized as if some of them must support life, but **our solar system has the only life-supporting planet known.**

Further, claims of new planets do not come from truly observing any planets. These claims are based on observing stars with certain characteristics. These characteristics are taken to be evidence of new planets. Most stars, for example, belong to close-knit systems in which most of the stars are too dim to be easily visible. Alpha-Centauri is such a system. Alpha-Centauri used to be thought of as a single star. Then it

was found to have a companion star, making a "double" or "binary" star system. Eventually astronomers discovered another star in the Alpha-Centauri system. Now this system is known to have at least three stars, two of them relatively dim.

In such a system, the gravitational force of the dimmer stars tugs on the brighter one, making it "wobble." The stellar companions of Alpha-Centauri were suspected to exist long before they were seen, because astronomers could observe the Alpha-Centauri wobbling (Henry, 1999, pp. 3-4).

Since most stars are in star systems, most stars wobble. If the unseen companions orbit a star preferably (but not necessarily) somewhat like the sun, astronomers sometimes assume that the dim companions must be planets in a kind of solar system (Ham et al., 2002, p. 175.).

Evolutionary Wisdom: Life on earth is nothing unusual.

Historical Reality: Man, the earth, the sun, and the solar system are commonly described as "mediocre" and "average." In this view, the sun, for example, is nothing remarkable: "The Sun is an ordinary, even a mediocre star" (Sagan, 1980, p. 243).

Actual data about the sun reveal that it is quite special: "The Sun is a main sequence star with an age of 4.5 billion years, a spectral type G2 and, of course, a mass of 1.00 [solar mass]. Its absolute magnitude ... is + 4.85. **Contrary to popular belief, these properties make the Sun a very 'unaverage' star**" (Crowell, 1987, p. 17).

To date, observations show that we are unique, the earth is unique, the sun is special if not unique, and the solar system is unique. No other life or life-supporting planet has been found. The discovery of sun-like stars has been claimed, but these are less stable than the sun (Henry, 2003b, p. 39).

Conclusions

Evolution establishes expectations that condition the mind to receive questionable data as truth. Most scientists are careful and ethical practitioners of their craft. Even so, conventional wisdom is uncritically accepted because of the expectations that evolutionary philosophy generates. This conventional wisdom forms the backbone of evolutionary presuppositions.

Additional examples of this type of conventional wisdom are the claims that (1) dinosaurs evolved into birds (Henry, 2003a, p. 1); (2) an asteroid impact caused dinosaur extinction (Henry, 2002a, p. 70); (3) primitive peoples exist (Henry, 2007, p. 2); and (4) primitive languages exist (Henry, 1985, p. 2; Henry, 1997, p. 3). Investigation would show that these and other similar claims lack a scientific foundation.

Notes. Bolding in quotations is added.

Boule, M., and H.V. Vallois. 1957. *Fossil Men*. Dryden Press.

Brum, Gil. D., and Larry K. McKane. 1989. *Biology*. Wiley.

Crowell, Ken. 1987. "Visit the Nearest Stars." *Astronomy*. 15(1):16-22. January.

Cuozzo, Jack. 1998. *Buried Alive: The Startling Truth about Neanderthal Man*. Master Books.

Denton, Michael. 1985. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. Alder & Alder.

Darwin, Charles. 1860. *The Origin of Species*, second edition. Reprinted 1958. Mentor.

Darwin, Charles. 1872. *The Origin of Species*, sixth edition. Reprinted 1948. Watts, London.

Darwin, Charles. 1873. Cambridge University manuscripts, October 22 and 24. In Himmelfarb, p. 387.

Darwin, Charles. 1880. "Sir Wyville Thomson and Natural Selection." *Nature*. 23:32. November 11.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius Grigorievich, F.A. Ayala, G.L. Stebbins, and J.W. Valentine. 1977. *Evolution*. Freeman.

Eiseley, Loren C. 1959. "Alfred Russell Wallace." *Scientific American*. 200(2):70-84. February.

Eiseley, Loren C. 1979. *Darwin and the Mysterious Mr. X*. Dutton.

Eiseley, Loren C., and A. Grote. 1959. "Charles Darwin, Edward Blythe, and the Theory of Natural Selection." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 103:94-158. February.

Fix, Wm. R. 1984. *The Bone Peddlers*. Macmillan.

Gould, S. 1979. "Smith Woodward's Folly." *New Scientist*. 82:42-44. April 5.

Gould, S. 1983. "The Piltown Conspiracy." *Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes*. Norton.

Ham, Ken, John Morris, Henry Morris, Carl Wieland, J. Henry, and Jack Cuozzo. 2002. *When Christians Roamed the Earth*. Master Books.

Hardin, Garrett. 1961. *Nature and Man's Fate*. Mentor.

Hedtke, Randall. 1983. *The Secret of the Sixth Edition*. Vantage.

Henry, J. 1985. "The Origin and History of Language." Revised 2005. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 1997. "Thinking Biblically about Science." Revised 2007. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 1999. "Ye Shall Be As Gods: The Modern Search for Extraterrestrial Life." Revised 2007. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 2002a. *The Astronomy Book*. Master Books.

Henry, J. 2002b. "Charles Darwin and the Origin of Species: Dispelling Fourteen Myths about Darwin." Revised 2007. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 2003a. "The Deadly Influence of Evolutionary Beliefs." Revised 2007. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 2003b. "The Sun Is Not an Average Star." *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*. 17:35-42.

Henry, J. 2005. "Extrasolar Planets, ET Life and UFOs." Revised 2007. <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 2006. "Intelligent Design and the Bible." <creationconcepts.org>.

Henry, J. 2007. "The Tasaday Controversy: A Lesson in the Pitfalls of Evolutionary Expectations." <creationconcepts.org>.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. 1968. *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*. Norton.

Hitching, Francis. 1982. *The Neck of the Giraffe*. New American Library.

Huxley, Julian. 1959. "Introduction." *The Origin of Species*. Mentor, 1959.

Keith, Arthur. 1925. *The Antiquity of Man*. Lippincott, London.

Kerkut, G.A. 1960. *Implications of Evolution*. Pergamon.

Koppers, W. 1952. *Primitive Man and His World Picture*. Sheed & Ward.

Leakey, Richard, and Alan Walker. 1985. "Homo Erectus Unearthed."

National Geographic. 168(11):624-629. November.

Lewin, Roger. 1987. *Bones of Contention*. Simon & Schuster.

Lyell, Charles. 1830. *Principles of Geology*. John Murray, London. Reprinted 1990. University of Chicago.

Lyell, Charles. 1832. *Principles of Geology*. John Murray, London. Reprinted 1991. University of Chicago.

Lyell, Charles. 1833. *Principles of Geology*. John Murray, London. Reprinted 1992. University of Chicago.

Lyell, K.M., editor. 1881. *Life, Letters and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*. John Murray, London. 1881. Vol. 1.

Pilbeam, David, and Stephen J. Gould. 1974. "Size and Scaling in Human Evolution." *Science*. 186:892-901. December 6.

Price, C., editor. 1974. *Synthesis of Life*. Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross.

Raven, Peter H., and George B. Johnson. 1989. *Biology*. Times Mirror/Mosby.

Sagan, Carl. 1980. *Cosmos*. Random House.

Simons, Elwyn L. 1963. "Some Fallacies in the Study of Hominoid Phylogeny." *Science*. 141:879-889. September 6.

Sunderland, Luther D. 1988. *Darwin's Enigma*. Master Books.

Taylor, Gordon Rattray. 1983. *The Great Evolution Mystery*. Harper & Row.

Taylor, Ian T. 1987. *In the Minds of Men*. TFE Publishing.

Wang, Linda. 2007. "Origin-of-Life Researcher Dies." *Chemical and Engineering News*. 85(22):10. May 28.

Watson, Lyall. 1982. "The Water People." *Science Digest*. 91(5):44. May.

Weaver, Kenneth F. 1985. "The Search for Our Ancestors." *National Geographic*. 168(11):560-623. November.

Wesson, Robert. 1991. *Beyond Natural Selection*. MIT.