Anastasija Cumika

Donald Maldari

THE 184

21 October

The critique on “Creation and Evolution: A New Departure”

The article “Creation and Evolution: A New Departure” was written by a Steven A. Hein in 1973. The main author’s idea is that there are some missing factors in the Darwinian theory of evolution hypothesis, so the creationist theory works better. The author claims that it does not contradict contemporary science. Hein’s discussion is “limited to the subject of abiogenesis”. Hain gives different examples of how the Darwinism theory is not supported by science or contradicts it. That is how he gets to the creationist’s theory because Darwinism does not work anymore. Hein gives scientific support for the creationist’s theory. I do not think that the article is really persuasive because the evidence that the author gave against Darwinism are unsubstantiated and can be still explained by science.

The Darwin theory states that there was inorganic matter and a really long time ago (like billions of years) there were random chemical reactions which led to the organic life. Hein states that it is basically impossible that by just random reaction such a complex organic matter could appear. Scientists have already proven that random chemical reaction are “not programed . . . but are inevitable by the laws of nature” (Maldari 71), so I guess Hein did not know physics well enough to do make a statement. He also states that “increasing the time span . . . will bring to equilibrium – not the increasing complexity which leads to life”. The author is right about the idea that at some point everything will be in equilibrium but before that everything will reach the complexity. Right now we are at the point where things are still getting more and more complex, so there still a long time to go when everything will be in equilibrium.

Hein said that “computer attempts to stimulate random selection in chemical reactions were unsuccessful”, “a true living cell has not been produced to date” and all lab synthetic laboratory production had some presupposed conditions. The problem is thatDarwin’s theory requires billion of years for all the random reactions to work, so it is really hard to prove it in the lab. Also we have no idea

what kind of conditions there were in the earth long time ago, we can just assume that there was something not organic, but we do not know for sure what was that. Hein statement that we cannot prove and show how actually these random reactions happened is very weak.

In every other way I really like Hein's ideas that some intelligence has been involved in abiogenesis. He says that "Every DNA molecule has highly complex code of "canned information" which directs the entire chemical activity of a cell" and "Canned information always requires a programmer". As a scientific minded person I agree that in order to make things work it must be programmed. The only exception is these random chemical reactions in the beginning. With this idea we can state that there was some intelligence before life's origin.

Hein were trying to convince the reader think that Darwinism theory contradicts with science but Hein was, I think, very far from science by his occupation that is why his evidence was wrong, like the idea that it is impossible that random reactions lead to life, or very weak, like the idea that Darwinism theory of abiogenesis was not synthetically proven. On the other hand, I think Hein is on the right track with the idea that there must be some intelligence before life, to code information in our cells. Therefore, I think that Darwin's theory is very close to be true but there was still some intelligence beyond that gave a boost to start these random chemical reactions and coded our DNA.

Excellent essay. As you say, natural and social science are quite capable of explaining evolution through Darwin's theory of natural selection.

Although I know no Russian I do know that Slavic languages do not have articles (a, the), and in every language prepositions are illogical. The only way I know to improve style in English is to read it. I hope you do read lots of English works such as fiction or science text. You'll then naturally begin to imitate them.

A