

# IN DEFENSE OF FULL AND HONEST SCIENCE

SOME PERTINENT QUESTION THAT HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS MAY JUST HAVE TO ANSWER

Charles Darwin said that the evolution of all life starts out with life coming from a few original animals. Over time adaptation occurred and life changed, ever so slightly. This seems possible, but the proving of this theory has faced some very notable challenges.

One of the most significant challenges is the development of individual 'muscle memories' over the ensuing decades and centuries, of simple linear time. Thus it just makes sense to say that it takes a very long time for a mouse to evolve into an elephant, as just one example. Each cell in that mouse must change, then communicate that change to other cells, so it can be incorporated in to the process of other cells' development, in a mutually supportive continuous way. Given the number of cells necessary to 'be' an elephant, starting out as a mouse, there is a massive time factor involved, with life and death carrying on the full evolutionary process interrupting the sequence of events to get a 'trunk' to start growing in the cell of that mouse.

The first great question is, "Do we have that much time in the geological record to accommodate just the beginning of a mouse with a trunk and all of the associated problems such as balance and weight growth and its distribution, that accompanies the addition of a 'trunk'. In the "**Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences**", they have concluded that it takes one million years for just one single change to occur, get transmitted to the whole species and then get sufficiently duplicated by the whole of the species. There are 40,000 muscles in an elephant's trunk, with 150,000 individual muscle group-units. (you do the math), but I think it is in excess of or 1.8 trillion years which exceeds the most liberal estimates of the age of the earth by over 1000 times. Who is right: evolutionary theory or geological theory. Or is there possibly another option that does not totally blow out the mathematical side of things and thus returns science to a reasonable position?

In all of this we must remember that each muscle has to initially evolve in one animal, be accepted into that family's over all genetic tree, and this while being systematized and integrated into the newly whole animal as it assimilates sufficiently for the new order to become common place. That is a very big job for a little mouse to do.

It comes down to a basic conflict in science: evolutionary time versus geological time, and these two competitors under the eyes of so many competing biologists, geologist, philosophers and theologians who are "charged" with interpreting the data for us. The prospect of error just grows exponentially with every mere discussion of the subject, with all of this is being complicated even more by the simple fact that the majority of people involved in these discussions are not even field qualified, biologically or mathematically, to undertake these theoretical discussions. One thing is for certain, however: one mistake or one mis-step will take far less time to circle the globe that the proposed genetic change and far more work to correct it than the amount of time we have left to us: the sun may just burn out of fissionable fuel in the mean time.

One other aspect to this time problem is that of the fossil record. The question here is one of simple evidence found versus time. If it takes such a long time for evolution to bring a mouse all the way up the chain of evolutionary adaption chain to that of the elephant, where are the examples of all these intermediary fossil's in the record? We search high and low for 'humanoid' fossil, but no one is searching for mouse fossils with a trunk! Why? Because of the general theory of evolution, these fossils are just as valuable as the humanoid ones, proving just as much. But they too are missing, even out having lived amongst the humanoid ancestors that we have found. Why hasn't anyone ever found such a creature? Now, we do have kangaroo rats in the Australian outback, but no research of any reasonable size has every been undertaken to find examples of these creatures in their intermediary state as they journey up, or down, that evolutionary chain, going from small rodent, to large rodent. Why? Is it all just left to chance? Does science not care about these creatures – or are we so focused on our noses that we forget our toes are part of the whole scheme too? We need both, toes and noses.