

Dear dissentfromdarwin.org,

I am a PhD mathematician who has recently (in the last couple of years) examined carefully the claim that the neo-Darwinian synthesis adequately accounts for the variety of life on earth. I have read countless texts on geology, biology (and cosmology) in a multitude of sub-disciplines and can honestly affirm that I am skeptical that the evidence points toward anything like mutation plus natural selection as being the cause of the variety of life that we see both today and in the fossil record.

Furthermore, I do not find any of the more involved hypotheses to hold water. Many of them are without evidence, or inferred from studies which are chosen specifically to support that particular hypothesis, and even then the fit is poor. Also, individual hypotheses which are cited as being well-supported components of the theory of evolution, in fact contradict one another.

I have serious questions about convergence being invoked so often to explain similar features in supposedly unrelated organisms.

I see no satisfactory Darwinian explanation for the Cambrian explosion and feel that the evidence is quite strong that this is a real feature of the fossil record, not an illusion. Similarly the mammal explosion and current theories of the subsequent spread of mammal species over the world invite many difficult and in my opinion, unresolved questions.

I believe there is a real lack of fossil intermediates in many branches of the "tree" of life and see very little quantifiable analysis that would suggest this is to be expected in many cases.

Dinosaur to bird evolution is in serious trouble.

I am quite unconvinced that there is any link between the afarensis finds and the homo genus.

I find that the continual discovery of molecular/genetic evidence that contradicts long established phylogenies derived from morphological and developmental considerations is quite damning to the modern theory of evolution as is the plethora of contradictory trees proposed in almost every phyla of life. Clearly there is also a profound lack of understanding of the interrelationships of the different phyla, something that one would imagine a comprehensive and robust theory of evolution might aim to provide.

As a mathematician and experienced computer programmer, I find it disconcerting that genetic and other evolutionary algorithms are pointed to as evidence that evolution works. The fundamentally flawed principles that these "experiments" are based upon and the derisible simplicity of the systems "evolved" both have more to say about the failure of evolution to produce meaningful innovations than it does about the robustness of the theory of evolution.

The fact that no satisfactory naturalistic theory of the origin of life has been put forward and successfully tested, surely attests to the inadequacy of philosophical naturalism as a basis of science or indeed of human knowledge. More worrying is the deliberate ploy of philosophical naturalists to segregate the origin of life issue from evolution in order to bolster the apparent success of the latter as a purely naturalistic theory.

I find it embarrassing as an academic to find that a fraud is made of evolutionary science in many Universities around the world where evidence at the level of the oversimplified analysis that textbooks give the subject, is presented as the reason for belief in the theory of evolution. Furthermore, it is embarrassing that many textbooks present what can only be described as fraudulent evidence for evolution to students, as outlined by Jonathan Wells in his *Icons of Evolution*.

Finally, above all, I never cease to be amazed at the supreme arrogance of science, which assumes that it must extinguish all other claims to truth because it alone relies on logic and reason, whilst at the same time excluding by unswerving dedication to naturalistic principles, that which it claims to extinguish, namely the possibility of a supernatural (i.e. non-naturalistic) first cause, or even worse, the possibility of a design or designer, whether supernatural or not. Such arrogance beggars belief.

I believe that we have arrived at the current point in the history of science by systematically looking for evidence to support our favorite conjectures, rather than actively seeking evidence which independently confirms conclusions reached by other lines of scientific enquiry. We have tended to focus on the results of individual studies rather on the conglomeration of evidence from all similar studies.* We have been satisfied with evidence which merely supports, rather than evidence which strongly implies our stated conclusions. We have failed to quantify our assertions, satisfying ourselves instead with broad generalized statements which have no intrinsic quantitative meaning. We have drawn far too many conclusions from experiments where there are not statistically relevant samples. We have been far too easily satisfied by post hoc interpretations of the evidence where the desired conclusion did not appear to be supported by it. We have not sought to falsify popular conjectures by earnest experimentation designed to detect counterexamples to popular claims. We have allowed consensus to rule. We have not reacted strongly enough to sensationalized over simplistic press releases and media articles which deliberately mislead members of the public with regards to the importance and relative strength of results. Most importantly we have made a habit of making a strong claim with only weak evidence, in order to guarantee funding and increase prestige. Every week press releases are made outlining some new find, which is presented as confirming a favorite hypothesis which in fact runs counter to evidence and claims made the week before, with respect to a different hypothesis.

The public are left with the view that science is always progressing, when in fact the limited evidence which apparently supported the proposed hypothesis has no chance of firmly establishing that which is proposed and contradicts that which came before, and that which will appear in the same rag the next week.

It is my opinion that the entire edifice of evolution is such an hypothesis. A multitude of mutually contradictory hypotheses or a set of hypotheses, the sum of which is sufficient to explain anything, is proposed, each hypothesis claiming to explain some aspect of the evolution of life on earth. A small team of researchers will search for evidence to support their favorite hypothesis. When they find even a small piece of evidence which appears to support their desired conclusion it is presented in a light that makes it appear as proof positive of the proposed conclusion. All the while, other researchers work on establishing their bizarre claims, and everyone, including researchers themselves are left with the feeling that there is an overwhelming variety of evidence which broadly supports the theory of evolution. This happens, even though the findings of the individual studies disagree. Every geology and biology professor is aware of this, but few are willing to state or even admit to themselves that this is the state of affairs. Instead, they claim that the theory of evolution is a robust, comprehensive system which adequately explains the variety of life found on earth today and in the past.

I feel that it is unlikely that my position with regard to evolution will change dramatically in the near future, the state of affairs being so dire. Therefore I see no reason why my name should not be added to the list of PhD. scientists who dissent from the theory of evolution.

Regards,

Dr. William Hart.

PhD. Mathematics

Currently an Assistant Professor of Mathematics University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

*Some people may perceive the comments where I use the word "we" as an admission from me on behalf of the University that I work for, that "we" have failed to apply the scientific method. Of course that is not the intention of those comments. I only mean we in the broad sense of "us academics" who I count myself among, despite my professional disagreement over the issue of evolution.