

Creating an
evolutionary way of
seeing things



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Creating an Evolutionary Way of Seeing Things K. C. Cole discusses in her article, “ Seeing Things,” that there is never just one way to look at something. There are numerous views one can take on when observing possible scientific theories. Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution is criticized and compared to the theory of creationism. Both theories are prime examples of seeing things from a different perspective influenced by either science or religion. The ability to see things clearly resonates in both arguments and each side presents a different way on how to perceive their own theory.

To have clear vision you must be able to make decisions based on the information given to you as well as provide intelligent answers about how you see things. Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution has been a point of argument since the day it was published nearly 150 years ago. Darwin’s way of seeing things is one that many people identify with, yet it is still incredibly controversial. Charles Darwin suggested that, “ Over time, gradual changes continually occur in the physical makeup of plants and animals. Genetic mutations and other factors are responsible for these changes.

If the changes are great enough and happen over a long enough period of time, a new species will eventually evolve provided that the plant or animal survives the changes” (Bruno). Darwin was able to realize the truth in these genetic mutations by observing nature as it McFadden 2 evolved around him. He made his discoveries through detailed studies of his subjects, reptiles and birds, and by testing his findings until he was satisfied they were accurate. This way of seeing is one that directly relates to K. C. Cole’s article, “ Seeing Things. “ Scientific perception has a different authority from personal

perception, because it can more easily be shared. It's a way of seeing that many people can agree on- or at least agree on a way of thinking about it" (82). Darwin used his scientific findings to back up his theory, which was easily understood and accepted by his fellow colleagues. When people have hard evidence in front of them, they have no reason not to believe it. Darwin's theory of natural selection is explained better using examples rather than a raw definition.

Darwin explains natural selection in terms of wolves hunting their prey. Wolves prey on deer, and if by some chance the deer decrease in numbers during the winter season, one can safely assume the strongest of the pack would survive. The strongest wolves would be preserved or selected provided that they retained their strength during the following seasons and be able to continue to adapt to the environment they reside in (Darwin 7). The explanation of evolution by natural selection is a brilliant answer to this complex matter because it is not a theory of chance.

The evolution of species represents a gradual buildup over millions of years, which begins with something very simple but works up slowly to greater complexity. This way of thinking is one that can relate to an idea Carl Sagan's Baloney Detection Kit discusses called Occam's razor. Sagan states that, " If there are two hypotheses that explain the data equally well choose the simpler" (Baloney). Evolution as presented by Darwin is a tangible idea, while the Intelligent Design theory is harder to grasp and does not provide hard evidence to support McFadden 3 t. Even though many people do believe in scientific side of how the world evolved, some do have serious critiques on the theory. " Much of it revolves around the appealing idea that <https://assignbuster.com/creating-an-evolutionary-way-of-seeing-things/>

living things are simply too exquisitely complex to have evolved by a combination of chance mutations and natural selection” (Ayala). The main argument is that all of the living structures that make up our world have such complex systems that it makes it nearly impossible to predict how a plant or animal could react to the changes.

For example, the human eye structures are so elaborate that some have come to the conclusion that it would require, “...the integration of many genetic units, each improving the performance of pre-existing, and functionally less perfect eyes” (Ayala). Another argument commonly used to dispute the theory of evolution is the suggestion that there are missing pieces in the fossil record from the Cambrian period, a time in which there was an explosion of numerous new species (Wallis).

This is essential because fossils are the starting point on deciding whether or not Darwin’s theory of the evolution of species is a fact. If we want to know whether species have changed we need to take fossilized materials into consideration. Biologists sometimes reject or ignore the sudden appearance of animal life and its notable part involving the Cambrian period. The recent research has, however, led to this “ sudden increase of organisms being more and more difficult to ignore” (Bruno). Scientists from the evolutionary side of the argument disagree and compare it to detectives at a crime scene not being able to account for every minute of a crime. “ You have to make inferences from footprints and other types of evidence” (Wallis). Most scientists lean towards the theory of evolution to describe the development of species, but there are still those that believe science has influenced McFadden 4 species to progress somehow. The others who refute all of the <https://assignbuster.com/creating-an-evolutionary-way-of-seeing-things/>

statements Charles Darwin and other scientists have made trace it to a greater influence as being responsible for the world's evolution of life.

The theory that Creationism presents suggest that, "...matter and all things were created, substantially as they now exist, by an omnipotent Creator, and not gradually evolved or developed" (Bruno). Intelligent design advocates that there is one greater being that is responsible for all of the changes that have occurred over millions of years. Not to say that this being is a religious figure, but in most cultures, the belief of some type of god being responsible is common.

As our generation approaches a new age of thinking, " the Creationists desire a larger following and therefore realize they must take religion out of the evolutionary equation" (Nelkin). Though they were motivated by their religious beliefs, Creationists avoided the mention of religious concepts as they sought to get around the 1st Amendment, which states the right of separation of church and state. Unlike twenty years ago, the new era of Creationists try to invoke skepticism rather than refer to biblical passages. Intelligent design properly formulated is a theory of information... [it] becomes a theory for detecting and measuring information, explaining its origin and tracing its flow...[it] is therefore not a study of intelligent causes per se but of informational pathways induced by intelligent causes. As a result intelligent design presupposes neither a creator nor miracles" (Hasker). To have a religious figure be the explanation of the evolution of species may not appeal to everyone's approach of seeing things.

Carl Sagan's Baloney Detection Kit states the idea that, " Arguments from authority carry little weight" (Carl). This can pertain to Creationism because in the McFadden 5 Catholic religion god is considered to be an authority, therefore how should we put trust into the theory of Creationism. K. C. Cole makes a point in saying, " The strength of our beliefs is buoyed by the connections between our observations and beliefs" (90). Every human has some sort of a belief system but that system can really only be supported when there is evidence behind it.

The way of Creationism is one that is based on opinions rather than facts. " They produce little or no evidence to support their own position. ID promoters barely try to undermine evolution as a vast and sophisticated model of the world, supported by millions and tested and interlocking facts" (Brin). ID has adapted and learned to base their arguments on science rather than religion, due mainly to the lack of evidence they provide. " You can't prove intelligent design by an experiment" (Wallis). ID is merely a theory with no evidence to back it up. It is an idea based purely on religious opinion.

K. C. Cole discusses how she always feels somewhat skeptical when she hears physicists confidently claiming to have " seen" certain particles (Cole 76). The fact of the matter is that you can't truly trust what you see or hear until you have some basis of evidence you can believe in. The Creationists today are, "...insisting that evolution theory itself is a religion, built not on science but belief" (Nelkin). They define science in terms of directly observable facts and suggest that no one was present when life first appeared so the theory of evolution is no more than a form of religion.

The argument of Evolution vs. Creationism will continue until solid evidence can be seen by all and used to prove which theory is correct. Both theories presented provide different outlooks on the advancement of our species and how we can choose to see it. Charles Darwin's natural selection theory McFadden 6 provides insight into the science of evolution as well as providing evidence to support his thoughts. This evidence helps in deciding what to believe when the proof is easily seen.

The theory of intelligent design is based off of a belief system rather than scientific facts, although with the turn of the century, they are continuing to claim they are not religiously based. The science of Darwin's theory deals with the question " how? " while the philosophy of the creation theory deals with the question " why? " These theories can be used as instruments of science to help better understand how, as a species, we came to be. We can perceive things accurately when we examine the facts and make decisions for ourselves, rather than basing our choices purely on beliefs.