THE END OF EVOLUTION

dgboland © 2008

The primary object of this article is not so much Evolution as Evolutionism as it names the modern materialistic theory (as it has evolved), the origin of which is attributed in modern times to Charles Darwin. We will also give some attention to the notion of evolution itself, which in its original signification is a latin-derived name for a “turning out”, something that has been in physical nature since time began, and whose meaning can be applied analogously to all sorts of existing things and groups of things. Thus, it is not a matter of denying the fact of evolution which is ubiquitous in living nature, but of understanding its meaning and scope. There are many theories of Evolution and our concern should be to find what is true and false among them.

One curious thing about the modern Theory of Evolution associated with the name of Darwin is that it appears to apply only to the past. It wishes to account for the diversity of species today by “natural selection” in the past, by which is meant the interaction between things and their surroundings on a random basis. It is as if “nature”, as the sum of a thing's surroundings or environment, by a random process brings about changes to a thing's, or to its species, pattern of behaviour, and so constitutes it a new species. The giraffe (as a discernible species of animal) with a peculiarly long neck, it is proposed by some, was evolved by reason of the change in the circumstances of the previous species eating habits. The horse of today developed from its ancestor by a series of changes to its environment. It is assumed that such environment proved to be inimical to the previous species and by adapting it became the new species as a matter of “the survival of the fittest”.

But the core of the theory is that “natural selection” signifies a purely chance concatenation of circumstances. The notion of selection or choice ordinarily applies only to intelligent agents, but not wanting to allow recourse to a factor extrinsic to “nature”, Darwin quite arbitrarily, or “selectively” one must say, applied it to the chance play of circumstances or environmental factors within nature. The unlikelihood of such a random set of circumstances by itself producing any consistently functioning thing is explained by saying that it came about over a great period of time. The lottery of achieving such a rare result, as it were, was eventually won by some one (period of time). We happen to be living in the time when the whole marvellous order of nature that we see about us, which shows surprisingly little randomness in behaviour, has randomly come together.

On this principle, of course, the stability of the present order of things is precarious. There is no reason to believe that the next stage will not be the collapse of this inherently unstable house of cards, for circumstances are always changing (and it is supposed with a pure and total randomness) so that the present species must become one way or the other “unfit” to survive in the new environment. And

the probabilities are that this will occur straightaway to any and all present species. What took so long to congregate must most likely disgregate in no time, for such a lucky outcome or "turning out" cannot be more than one-off. It would be most unlikely on such odds that the present order of things would be succeeded immediately by another of any similar stability. How come then that this orderly sequence of natural events has been going on for as long as recorded history? One may believe in the miracle of nature but this is ridiculous.

I believe that by dealing in species (which signify the formal reasons of stability in things) instead of in individuals (which are the existing material things subject to change), the materialists who propose this kind of theory assume the fact of stability when it is not compatible with the basic principle of the theory. That is to say the very notion of species is contradictory to having individuals governed only by randomness. By such a process two individuals are most likely to be similar one moment and totally unrecognisable as related the next.

It is the stability of things as they are (i.e. as belonging recognisably to a species as a fixed form of reality) that is the occasion of this mental sleight of hand and the problem for the theory. Why should things stay the same for more than a moment? Why should not all the similar individuals (and thus the supposed species) change overnight? That is to say, why should the fundamental evolutionary principle of random change cease for the time being? Why should it only apply to the past leading up to the period of human knowledge, and not to our experience of the world as we know it?

For the length of time that is posited as accounting for present day species to be now what they are only accounts for this combination of charactistics for a moment. If there is no principle of stability inherent in a thing, or in things of co-incidently similar nature, then the random result can only last for one moment. Heraclitus could see the logic of this reliance on pure flux or evolution, that nothing exists for more than a moment, and even that is disappearing as it appears. Even the luckiest gambler does not have a lasting series of lottery wins. How does such a theory of evolution explain the lack of randomness in the present? It does not, because it cannot.

Philosophically, then, the theory is untenable. At best it is a half-truth. The fault lies in the inveterate philosophical error of seeking to explain the intrinsic nature of material things by one principle only, of being simple-minded where nature is concerned. Darwin like many an inventor of a new theory was reacting against a too simplistic (scientific) theory, of the invariability of species prevalent in his time. Whether or not he himself went too far and fell completely into the opposite simplistic error, is not something that we need concern ourselves with. For it is the theory that bears his name with which we are primarily concerned, not the man; that is with the Theory of Evolution as it puts the whole burden of the natural or scientific explanation of the diversity of species today upon "natural selection " as described above. The truth, i.e. the true theory, as always, lies in avoiding two extremes or errors. Evolutionism is the name given to one error in its

modern form, the other we might call Fixism.

Even the most ardent champions of evolutionary theory, e.g. Jacques Monod, a highly regarded scientist of recent times, have themselves come to recognise that the modern idea of randomness associated with evolution is unable to account for the stability that is manifest in things around us, and now is made more manifest at the microbiological level of investigation. He even says, as paraphrased by Pope Benedict XVI in his book: "*In the Beginning ...*" *p. 55*), "that for modern biology evolution is not the specific property of living beings; their specific property is, rather, precisely that they are unchanging ..." Monod calls this "the platonic side of the world". Thus, in his view "there is not only becoming, whereby everything is in constant change, but also permanency..." which is the very sign and proof of "enduring and formative principles." "Every organism is, as Monod asserts, conservatively designed."

The quotation given by the pope on page 55 (cf. Monod, *Zufall und Notwendigkeit. Philosphische Fragen der modernen Biologie,* Munich, 1973 at p.132) makes it crystal clear that Monod, like Aristotle, saw that there has to be a principle of stability in the "biosphere". "It fell to the biologists of my generation to lay bare the quasi-identity of the cellular chemistry throughout the biosphere. This was known since 1950, and every new publication reconfirmed it. The hopes of the most convinced 'Platonists' were more than fulfilled." And at page 139: "The whole system is completely conservative, utterly closed in on itself and absolutely incapable of learning anything from the outside world ... It is at its very foundation Cartesian rather than Hegelian".

The language of Monod, of course, shows up his dependence upon modern philosophy, which reflects the irreconcilable duality of the earliest ancient Greek philosophy. Thus, he associates the conservative principle with Plato and Descartes, and the opposite evolutionary principle with Hegel. This modern antithesis is a repeat of the Heraclitean/Parmenidean impasse; for some strange reason the modern mind generally is completely unaware of this problem's solution by Aristotle. What is clear, however, is that the scientist/biologists ought to be even more convinced today that biological or any other natural activity is not governed by a totally random process; that the Theory of Evolution as enunciated by so-called Darwinians and neo-Darwinians is simply wrong, and, scientifically speaking, belongs to the catalogue of past errors and dead-ends in the history of science.

It is only by positing a quasi-infinite time that such a principle, in treating the world as a colossal co-incidence, can be given the sllghtest semblance of credibility. But, as seen above, such a co-incidence of random factors must fall apart as soon as it comes into existence. By itself such a principle accounts for nothing of what is actually happening in the world of our experience. The more evident principle is one that is its exact opposite, a principle of conservation, as noted by Monod, not a principle of change and contingency.

But, we have to be careful here not to fall back into the opposite error

(discussed more fully below), against which Darwin was reacting, and deny any principle of change altogether. Unfortunately, this error is labelled today by many Creationism, no doubt to insinuate that belief in a Creator is equivalent to holding to an extreme scientific position that has long been rejected by scientists. Creation however is not a scientific concept in the modern sense of science, but a philosophical one; as explained below it transcends the accidental or phenomenal order of investigation; it is concerned with bringing new substances into existence (and conserving them once in existence), not with what can be observed about their behaviour at the level of sense knowledge. Just as modern science knows nothing of substance so it is simply not concerned with the question of creation. The Big Bang theory supposes a universe in some way already existing (even if some physicists', such as Hawkings', concept of its original state is no more than that of a mathematical point, a “singularity”).

One does not need to go outside the natural order of secondary causes to find a rational explanation in terms of intrinsic (and even proximate extrinsic) factors. It is a case primarily of accounting for change and permanence in relation to the material things within our experience. As seen below, both from the philosophical and scientific consideration of such things one needs to bring into play two principles, in some way opposed to each other, but having to be kept together. For the facts of nature point not only to change but also to permanency, which opposite features call for principles of opposite character. Only in this way can we have a true theory of evolution, and avoid the extremes of Fixism and Evolutionism.

The modern focus is on the biological. But this is only a contraction of the consideration of a fundamental philosophical or metaphysical problem about explaining the nature of reality as we know it. Heraclitus and Parmenides are the thinkers who first proposed theories at this fundamental level, but they happened to fall into the two extremes mentioned. It was not till Aristotle that the problem was resolved by saving what was true in both errors. Generally speaking, a theory is wrong not in what it asserts but in what it denies.

There is change and accordingly we need to posit a principle of change. Heraclitus was right in asserting this and Parmenides was wrong not to allow for same in his philosophy. But as Aristotle noted long ago the changing character of natural things or bodies can only be fully explained if we posit two principles; a principle or reason why things can be called the same despite changing in some respects, which is called “substance”; and a reason why they are not the same or can be said to have changed, which is called “accident”. Thus despite undergoing many accidental changes we remain the same one substance. We are not simply all substance without accidents; nor are we simply an unordered bundle of ever-changing accidental characteristics (as Evolutionism comes down to asserting).

For example, the scientists tell us that our bodies are in a continuous process of change so that all the cells are replaced over a relatively short period of time (some say seven years), which means that materially we are not the same

person we were nor have the same body we had over seven years ago. But what does our experience tell us: that despite this fact we are not essentially a different person, nor is our body a different bodily substance from what it was before. Something changes, no doubt; but we remain, body and soul, the same. That also is what has to be accounted for; not merely the changing aspect of things.

But Aristotle noted something more fundamental about bodily change. The changes that first impress us are as it were on the surface of things, accidental, accordingly not affecting "substantially" the material things in which they occur. Plants grow bigger and are the same plants; wild animals become domesticated, change habitats and adapt to new surroundings yet are still the same animals. The playful cub and the savage lion are the same animal.

However, the substances of bodily things do also undergo change, in a different and deeper way. Plants die, or are eaten by animals and what had the form of a plant becomes animal. The individual substances of plants and animals do not remain through the change. Yet it is still only a change, not an annihilation. So Aristotle took his twofold principle of explanation into the very substance of material things, and called them primary matter and substantial form. Form, then, became the fundamentally unchanging reason or determining principle in bodies, matter the determinable principle or the principle to explain the change in substance. This can be made clearer if we think of the two principles in terms of potency and act. Matter is the potential principle which can take this or that actual substantial form.

Here, however, the relationship between the two principles becomes clearer. With accidental change, what changes are the accidental forms and the substance that remains is as it were a (secondary) matter. With substantial change, the substance is changed in form, and what remains unchanged is primary matter. Hence matter itself is not subject to change but is the principle of change, the reason why things can change forms. Change itself is explained in terms of a new form; change is a transformation, from one form in matter to another.

Hence, in accidental change we have a change of accidental forms in the same substance which stands as an unchanging (secondary) matter to them. Likewise, in substantial change we have a change of substantial forms in the same (primary) matter. Thus, the ultimate substrate of all change is the matter in (bodily) substances, called therefore material things. This is the ultimate explanation for the changes that occur also in the accidental order. The changes of an accidental kind in nature (which can too be dispositive to substantial changes) brought about by external circumstances are also to be attributed to the existence of a material principle in things. Their character of randomness is related to the indeterminancy and pure potentiality of primary matter.

But, though it is to be given its due influence it is an error to put all the burden of explanation on randomness, as the modern Theory of Evolution does. To do so it to take the part for the whole, and to be unable to account for the evident stability or "permanence" that is found in nature. Evidently, the excessive

determinism that was in the scientific explanations of biological species prior to Darwin, as it was in science generally, led to this over-reaction.

There is therefore to be taken into account when looking for principles to explain our changing material universe not only the distinction of accidents from substances but also the more fundamental distinction within substances of substantial (or primary) form and primary (or substantial) matter.

Unfortunately, the modern scientific mind does not get beyond the first distinction. Moreover, being focused on what is sensible or observable only at that level, it does not penetrate beyond the accidental or phenomenal, and therefore has no great interest in the substances of things as such. In fact, quantity, which itself has a quasi-material function in relation to the other accidents or phenomena, takes on the nature of a quasi-substance (*a le* Descartes) and a quasi-matter (mass and its particles are conceived in quantitative terms) performing the double role of the permanent substrate and primary receptacle of scientific phenomena (which are the accidental forms as detected by the senses). In the biological order of things the basic structure of "life", DNA, is conceived in terms of a quantitative arrangement.

This has important consequences when we come to talk about the species of things. For the scientist, so engaged with nature, does not have a concept of species in any substantial sense. His notion of species has to be taken from the accidental order. Things in this order, however, are subject to incessant change, though some accidental features have a certain stability (to be explained from the influence of their nature or substance), e.g. their shape and size. These and other constants discovered are then used to identify a "species" and to denote a difference of "species" for scientific purposes.

But, from a deeper philosophical point of view, as outlined above, both these constants and variables are still within the accidental order. They say nothing of, or rather are only indicative of, the true species of things within the order of substance. The argument among scientists over evolution, therefore, does not necessarily touch the philosophical issues at the level of substantial changes.

It is necessary, however, to explain why the modern theory for which Darwin is given the credit, though false in taking randomness or contingency as the whole scientific explanation of natural changes, has been almost universally received, and enthusiastically so, by the scientific community and is promoted in modern education generally to such an extent that anyone who challenges it is treated as scientifically illiterate. This may be partly explained by its affinity with the materialist/atheist ideology that is of such influence in the modern world especially at the academic level. Adherents of such a worldview, even though they are not biologists or scientists, see it as a very convenient stick to beat religion with, especially the Catholic religion.

But there is more to it than that. Many who are not anti-religious, and even those who are deeply religious scientists/biologists, see evolution as a sufficiently verified (scientific) fact and are somewhat embarrassed by the resistance of some

of their co-religionists to admitting this. They were no doubt heartened to hear the late pontiff speak of evolution as “more than a hypothesis”, which would seem to signify that it can be taken as a fact or at least as a respectable scientific theory. In more recent times, however, a highly placed member of the hierarchy, Cardinal Schoenborn, Archbishop of Vienna, has entered the debate to speak out against the so called (neo)darwinian theory of evolution in so far as it is based upon the pure randomness of external factors in nature. This, as he rightly sees, is a philosophical position that goes beyond, and indeed runs counter to, the scientific evidence. It amounts to an ideology as described above, which is aptly called Evolutionism.

It is not enough to assign a role to God as standing outside nature, as it were, and letting it run its own course, if one denies any principle of stability within nature. The argument is about the nature of secondary causality, and the modern theory as presented generally is that “natural selection”, conceived as quite random, is sufficient to explain the processes of natural evolution. It is this simplistic character of the theory that the good Cardinal is critical of, as we all must be. The furore that his participation in the debate has caused, not only among atheist scientists but also highly respected Catholic scientists, shows how courageous one needs to be to take on the deeply entrenched ideology of Evolutionism which, unfortunately, even religious scientists have difficulty in disengaging from the (partial) truth that there is in the scientific theory of Evolution.

It behooves us to keep always in mind the difference between (biological) evolution considered from a philosophical point of view and from a scientific viewpoint. In modern times, in their focus on living bodies (which are more clearly subject to change than non-living bodies), scientists, i.e. biologists, began to notice that such bodies were more subject to variation than previously thought. The argument then developed as to whether “species” could change.

At first, perhaps influenced by Aristotle's philosophical approach to the subject matter, and mistaking the meaning of “species” as applied at the (philosophical) level of substance for that as applied at the (scientific) level of accidents, the scientists stuck to the notion that species do not change. That is to say the known variables might be allowed to change but the long believed constants could not, for they belonged to the unchanging or “specific” constitution of animals and plants. (A confusion of natural genera and species with logical genera and species also no doubt played a part in such thinking).

It was, however, a losing argument on the older scientists' part. For as more extensive and intensive research was had it became apparent that there could be change or “evolution” in the “species” of flora and fauna, as species were understood scientifically. Darwin's biological revolution would not have been so successful if the time was not ripe for a rejection of the old biology in this fundamental regard (which we called above Fixism). It is just unfortunate that the scientists' view that was proved to be erroneous in adopting an extreme

invariability of scientific or biological species was to be followed by another at the opposite extreme.

Such extreme views are unforgiving when it comes to criticism of the other extreme, as liberalism is of socialism or vice versa. Moreover, they view the truth, or true theory even from the scientific point of view, which in this case is that there is both change and fixity in nature, if their limits may be difficult to determine exactly, as belonging to the other extreme. So Evolutionism, now in the ascendant, inevitably saw any theory that holds to a belief in species as unchanging in any respect as belonging to an anti-scientific Fixism, for which it has nothing but scorn.

It (Evolutionism) has no conception of species as Aristotle understood them, namely, as the substantial formal or essential principles in bodily things, such as in humanity, which do not change. It is these species that Aristotle compared to numbers. But even the accidental order has its own "specific" stability derived from that of the substance. So it is not wrong to talk of fixed species in scientific terms. But such species do not have the definiteness of numbers. They are stable, but such stability is from the substance; it is not in the substance. Moreover, by scientific observation, it is not always possible to determine exactly the line between constancy and variability.

This principle of stability, however, whether as seen in the material substance of things or in their accidental features, is not the only principle in individuals things, so that individual human beings and all other individual bodily things, can and do undergo change but, whilst they exist, only of an accidental kind. In coming into or going out of existence they can and do involve a substantial change, but only because the matter in them loses one and takes on another substantial form, or the matter in another thing takes on their new substantial form.

It is not impossible, however, for God to so arrange things that one or many substantial species might be at the extinction of individual members (some or all) the prelude or dispositive material cause of an entirely new species, so that the matter of one species is used in the creation of another. Indeed, if the "dust" or "slime" of the Scriptures means some existing material being, this is what happened at the creation of Adam. In a way, too, this happens with the conception of every human being. For the spiritual soul of man can only be put in matter by God; it cannot come out of matter.

But it is not necessary, nor does it seem appropriate, to posit such a continuous divine intervention in relation to material things below man. Darwin was right to endeavour to limit the explanation of natural change of biological species, if there be such, to something within the order of natural or secondary causes. But, as is clear from what is said above, the scientists/biologists are not talking of species and their evolution in the same sense as Aristotle. They do not entertain the consideration of species at the level of material substance. As noted above, and as is clear from the whole modern scientific method, species are

defined according to the multiple accidental features of things, in terms of such accidental features that singly do not distinguish one species from another but do so through a combination of same.

The extent to which these accidental features may be affected by time or circumstances or over time by a change in environment is not perfectly evident. Moreover, the lines which distinguish one scientific species from another are often blurred. Thus, what was previously regarded as a constant, even though understood in terms of accidents or phenomena, might very well be later discovered to be variable (and so what was believed to be a "species" may become extinct); or the opposite might "turn out", namely, what was a variable over some more or less extended period of time (e.g. the incidence of an unusually long necked giraffe) may become through change in environment a constant, thus bringing a new "species" into existence.

Philosophically there is nothing against the boundaries of scientific species shifting through change of circumstances, especially over a long time. There is much scope then for adaptation of a particular species to its environment and its apparent "evolution" into another, without for that affecting its species from a philosophical point of view as a special form of substantial being. It is another matter, however, if it alleged that an obviously higher (philosophical) species evolves out of a lower, without the agency, "intervention", of a higher form of being.

From the limited perspective of a purely empirical science one cannot say that one "species" is better or more perfect than another. Hence, the picture of Evolution presented for popular consumption as a progressive yet nonetheless "blind" advance from lower forms of being to higher and higher species, from amoeba up to *homo sapiens,* is science fiction rather than science fact. It is presented as scientific truth by modern educationalists who have their own materialist/atheist agenda. But, as emanating from a materialist interpretation of nature, it is part of the modern Theory of Evolution as it is an ideology, i.e. as it is Evolutionism. Indeed, if such a general picture of evolutionary ascent has any truth it rationally demands the intervention of God at every substantial step (e.g from plant to animal life); something that Darwin was wanting to exclude.

From the viewpoint of reason adequately considered, i.e from a philosophy based in common sense, there is no way that a species, in the sense of individual substances having the same substantial specific form, can by natural means "turn out" to be or evolve into individual substances of another specific form. For created or natural agents can only produce forms like themselves, or of a lesser actuality than themselves, (though the facts upon which the ancients and mediaevals relied to found such a latter possibility have been shown by modern science to be explicable in the former way – e.g. "spontaneous generation" instead of being attributed to the influence of celestial bodies is quite evidently explicable by the presence of already existing life of the same species). The assumption in the modern materialistic theory of evolution that what is evidently of a higher nature

might have evolved in a merely material fashion from the lower, such as animal life from plant life, is quite absurd.

It is possible, of course, for the matter of one specific material thing to take on the specific form of another bodily thing, even of a higher species, such as the matter of plants taking on animal form. But it will always be found that it involves an agency on the side of the higher form of being, i.e. the more perfect species. Nothing that is passively potential of itself, as primary matter is, gives rise to anything actual; so matter as such cannot produce any form or species of things. Any such power has to be based in something already actual at the same level of being or higher as what is brought into existence.

The materialist evolutionist is deceived in this regard by a failure to distinguish between passive and active potency. He sees matter as somehow able to generate actively the multiplicity of species existing. But the action of an active potency or power supposes the existence of something actual of a nature equal to the power it commands. If one wants to explain how all creation has evolved from a common potential state then one needs to ultimately refer it to an actual principle capable of producing or creating it, which is the power of God. All material things (below man) may come out of the passive potency of matter, as a first material principle, but only on the condition that they come also from an agency proportionate to the effect and ultimately from the active power of God (who is also needed to account for the presence of matter in the first place), as a first agent or maker.

But the modern argument over evolution is not conducted at the metaphysical or philosophical level of substance. It is concerned only with "species" changes as the scientist detects them; that is, as they are observed at the level of accidents or phenomena.

On the supposition that we understand species in the scientific (accidental) sense we could allow that all the current (scientific) "species" of plants and animals have evolved by "natural selection" from earlier ones (or even an earlier one or "common ancestor"). For it is possible that by change of circumstances they have over time acquired a new and different "constancy" that makes us classify them as a new species. We do not know the ultimate (philosophical) specific differences within the evidently different genera of plants and animals, and such variety that there is may be accounted for by accidental or environmental factors. This by no means allows any such "evolution" from plants to animals, for it is evident here even to our common sense that we would pass the specific boundaries of bodies in regard to their substances. As already indicated, such a change calls for an agency able to effect the creation of a new and higher form of being (i.e. a new species taken at the level of substance), which by definition is unable to come exclusively from below.

Evolution, therefore, can be said to be established as a fact provided we are clear that we are talking about accidentally based scientific "species", we do not deny that there is also a principle of stability operative in the accidental or

phenomenal aspects of things founded in the unchangeable forms of substances and we avoid the philosophical absurdity of attributing the resultant “species” to pure randomness. Randomness can play a part in the explanation of the result, but it cannot be the whole explanation. Otherwise, as seen above, there could be no stability at all in the new species.

That is to say Darwin deserves credit for breaking down the old biological theory of Fixism in regard to species, considered scientifically, and restoring a role to natural factors in bringing about quite significant changes in the behaviour and even physical characteristics of living things. But, the theory as generally accepted errs by going to the extreme of excluding altogether any intrinsic principle of conservation or fixity in the different kinds of living things, which in philosophical terms falls into the error of Heraclitus of attempting to explain all as “evolution” or pure flux.

From a fully rational standpoint the Theory of Evolution, so conceived as based on a single and simple principle of “natural selection”, or the random co-incidence of external factors, is insufficient to account for the world as we know it, no matter how long it has lasted. Without recourse to a more fundamental principle of stability, the intrinsic “enduring and formative principles” alluded to by Monod, which can be equated with the forms of Aristotle, we cannot explain why things remain beyond the moment the things that they are, nor can we properly understand evolution itself, for it necessarily involves a movement from one determinate accidental form of being to another (or of one determinate substantial form of being to another, provided divine agency is supposed).

It is not therefore a matter of denying that things change or even that “species” evolve in the manner indicated, but of explaining this evolutionary change, avoiding the two errors into which, without a sound philosophical notion of “species”, we are prone to fall. In modern times, a simplistic approach to theory seems first to have inclined scientists/naturalists to the extreme of Fixism, or Determinism in regard to the species of living nature; and then, by way of reaction, on the appearance of evidence that contradicted this theory, to have moved scientists/biologists to the extreme of Evolutionism, or Indeterminism.

Perhaps, without reverting to the former error of the absolute fixity of species, scientifically understood, we can recover the partial truth in it, namely, that there is a principle of stability in all material living things, founded in the substantial forms of things. Similarly, we might be able to retain the partial truth that is in the modern Theory of Evolution, namely, there is also a principle of instability, or “randomness”, in living nature providing occasion for the evolution of “species”, or to changes over time that are greater than previously thought possible.

Hopefully, we will see an end to Evolution as currently equated with Evolutionism, which is simply a materialism and frankly atheistic, and see the development of a true scientific theory of evolution which is not only able to attest to the wondrous beauty of the living and evolving flora and fauna of nature but

also to the greatness of their Maker.