CONCLUSION

THE EVOLUTIONARY THEORY AND THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

https://www.ejristos.com/GPfalsifiesEvo/ScientificMethod/ETandTheScientificMethod.pdf

José del Carmen Rodríguez Santamaría
https://www.ejristos.com
Bogotá, Colombia

5 de septiembre de 2022

There are so many reasons to believe in the Evolutionary Theory that it is strange that it is false.

We are so incredibly similar to dogs, chickens, fish, and plants, that each person has the sacred duty to reinvent the Evolutionary Theory, which must say that all living beings are brothers because we come from the same ancestor. But if that were true, says the Scientific Method, then the Genomes, which contain the DNA, must be all the more similar the greater the morphological similarities. True. And the differences should allow us to postulate who came out of whom, which can be corroborated by morphological studies and fossil strata. True: the result is recorded in the evolutionary tree, which represents the pinnacle of our scientific culture. There we see that we have recent ancestors with the chimpanzee, the bonobo, and the gorilla. And that it is most likely that our closest brothers are chimpanzees.

However, a puzzle is not complete until the last piece falls into place, forming a great artwork in which everything fits together and there are no gaps. That is why the Scientific Method never stops asking questions. Precisely, since we have the DNA, we can formulate a very simple one: Is it true that mutation is random? It is so important that this be the case because, without random mutation, materialism would succumb.

We resolve that question in the context of particular evolutionary explanations. A very traditional one is that of the giraffes. The Theory of Evolution says that the long hands, legs, neck, and tongue of the giraffe appeared by mutation. Those that caused elongation of the aforementioned organs were gathered by Natural Selection. In fact, they represented the expansion of the food niche, more power in the fights between males, as well as exclusiveness for acacia trees that are higher than 3 meters. The Scientific Method assumes this is true and asks why did not the jaws and snout did not get longer. The answer is that mutation is not random or that Natural Selection is not impartial. This implies that Darwinism is not good at explaining Nature, while Lamarckism is better suited because it welcomes the work of unnatural agents.

Nevertheless, one can always invent objections to the reasoning above, which will always be debatable. The problem is that adding fights to fights is very frustrating. Will there be any way out?

We have two.

The first is to recognize the essence of the Genome: DNA is a string of nucleic acid bases. But our Genome, the DNA integrated into our cells, is a set of verbal instructions, which use an automatic interpretation code, the Genetic Code, and therefore is classified as a computer program or Software.

Recognizing that the genome is Software immediately enables us to understand why the Evolutionary Theory is false. The Theory of Evolution preaches that Evolution gathers small progress that sums up to Perfection. This can be broken down into complexity + functional excellence. The former implies long and specific programs, while the latter means that if the eye is to see, it does so magnificently, and Evolution cannot make any improvement.

But since the Genome is Software, instead of finding a highway to perfection, what Evolution finds, in reality, is that all progress has the possibility of being destroyed by a mutation. It is similar to what happens with the texts of human languages, in which the change of a letter makes them lose their meaning or perhaps obtain a very different one that does not combine with the context. This produces lethality or notable damage or change to function. We call chaoticity this property of computer programs and all human languages. However, given enough time, Evolution can overcome all of that. Therefore, the only sure thing is that every problem solved by Evolution leaves behind innumerable proposals that were lethal, or deleterious, useless, or of little use. We summarize this in a catchphrase:

There is not and cannot be Evolution without there being Evolution of Perfection.

This points, in the first place, to the failures of Evolution that must have been committed massively. A failure is a defect that is defined by comparison with the final and perfect products. That is why, we have an inescapable prediction: given that anatomy is an extremely complex affair, the Fossil Record must be full of misshapen skeletons. What have archaeologists reported? They pride themselves on a multitude of perfect and wonderful fossils that they display in museums. This is how they teach us, in light of the Scientific Method, that the Evolutionary Theory is false.

Our second exit is to adopt the point of view of someone looking at a landscape from a high mountain: the details may be lost, but the general geography is completely clear. With this objective, we base ourselves on an abstraction that puts Evolution, something real and undeniable, to fight against complexity, the natural enemy of all creative entities. More specifically, we have:

We can simulate Evolution on computers. The result is known as Genetic Algorithms. But, be careful, as the Genome is Software, the Genetic Algorithms that must be used to test the Theory of Evolution cannot be just any. Instead, these must be aimed at synthesizing computer programs that solve specific problems. This line of research is called Genetic Programming.

To put the Evolutionary Theory to the test, we give these algorithms the task of solving a family of problems that are classified by levels, just like in video games. When Evolution solves a given problem, to reproduce a binary sequence of length x, it is given another of an immediately higher level, of length $x+1$. What we are interested in measuring is how many resources, counted in the number of individuals or chromosomes, are necessary for each level and from there we can extrapolate to high levels, unattainable in the simulations. The result is that the Evolutionary cost to solve a problem is exponential in the level x. This is so high that in one day a desktop computer hardly exceeds level 100. Extrapolating to billions, as is the number of base pairs in our DNA, we conclude that the resources of our Universe are negligible. As an observable prediction we have that at any time in its history, Evolution should exhibit incomplete products galore, where mediocrity and suboptimal quality are abundantly represented. In short:

Chronic imperfection is the hallmark of Evolution.

Therefore, to decide if the Evolutionary Theory is false, it is enough for each person to look at his or her own body in search of structures or functions that leave him very dissatisfied. If there are no complaints, or if they are tolerable, the verdict is that the Theory of Evolution is false. But if they are intolerable, the fight continues, for which we have already extensively shown how it is done: the Scientific Method is applied, which seeks that all the observations, with all the questions and all the answers, form a self-contained, self-explanatory, and consistent artwork. If that is not possible, and there are contradictions, the theory under study is false. This is precisely what the Author feels: living beings in every detail are astonishing marvels that lack any sign of the Evolution of Perfection. Therefore, the Evolutionary Theory is obviously false.