No Mathematical Demarcation, nor Foundational Empirical Support, for Darwinian Claims:

Well this is a strange suggestion from the recent article (2014) from 'The Edge' that had asked leading scientists from around the world which idea should be retired from science,,,

"Roger Highfield, a former science journalist now at the U.K.'s National Museum of Science and Industry, wants to retire the idea that evolution is true, not because it is false, but because the dogmatic declaration of its "truth" lures a thinker into a close-minded confidence, unjustified by even the best current science of evolution."

,,, what makes that quote strange is that science is all about testing whether an idea is true or not.,,, A Darwinist, on a blog I participate on, rushed in to supposedly defend that bizarre idea with this statement,,

"Hopefully ID supporters and creationists will take that advice on board and stop referring to the science of evolution as being about the truth. If they want truths then see a mathematician."

Actually, contrary to that Darwinist's assertion, it is now known that 'truth' cannot be based within mathematics, at least not within mathematical equations specific enough to have counting numbers in them. The reason is because of the Godel's proof, i.e. the Incompleteness theorem:

Kurt Gödel – Incompleteness Theorem – video

http://www.metacafe.com/w/8462821

THE GOD OF THE MATHEMATICIANS – DAVID P. GOLDMAN – August 2010

Excerpt: we cannot construct an ontology that makes God dispensable. Secularists can dismiss this as a mere exercise within predefined rules of the game of mathematical logic, but that is sour grapes, for it was the secular side that hoped to substitute logic for God in the first place. Gödel's critique of the continuum hypothesis has the same implication as his incompleteness theorems: Mathematics never will create the sort of closed system that sorts reality into neat boxes.

http://www.firstthings.com/article/2010/07/the-god-of-the-mathematicians

Taking God Out of the Equation – Biblical Worldview – by Ron Tagliapietra – January 1, 2012

Excerpt: Kurt Gödel (1906–1978) proved that no logical systems (if they include the counting numbers) can have all three of the following properties.

1. Validity . . . all conclusions are reached by valid reasoning.

2. Consistency . . . no conclusions contradict any other conclusions.

3. Completeness . . . all statements made in the system are either true or false.

The details filled a book, but the basic concept was simple and elegant. He summed it up this way: “Anything you can draw a circle around cannot explain itself without referring to something outside the circle—something you have to assume but cannot prove.” For this reason, his proof is also called the Incompleteness Theorem.

Kurt Gödel had dropped a bomb on the foundations of mathematics. Math could not play the role of God as infinite and autonomous. It was shocking, though, that logic could prove that mathematics could not be its own ultimate foundation.

Christians should not have been surprised. The first two conditions are true about math: it is valid and consistent. But only God fulfills the third condition. Only He is complete and therefore self-dependent (autonomous).

http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v7/n1/equation#

BRUCE GORDON: Hawking’s irrational arguments – October 2010

Excerpt: Rather, the transcendent reality on which our universe depends must be something that can exhibit agency – a mind that can choose among the infinite variety of mathematical descriptions and bring into existence a reality that corresponds to a consistent subset of them. This is what “breathes fire into the equations and makes a universe for them to describe.” Anything else invokes random miracles as an explanatory principle and spells the end of scientific rationality.,,,

What Mr. Hawking’s contrary assertions show is that mathematical savants can sometimes be metaphysical simpletons. Caveat emptor.

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/1/hawking-irrational-arguments/

So as to the Darwinist's contention that,,,,

"If they (ID Proponenets) want truths then see a mathematician."

Then I suggest, since truth cannot be based in mathematical equations, if people are really seeking ‘truth’ then they will have to go higher than mathematical equations to the One who imparts truthfulness (breathes fire) into mathematical equations in the first place:

Mathematics and Physics – A Happy Coincidence? – William Lane Craig – video

http://www.metacafe.com/w/9826382

1. If God did not exist the applicability of mathematics would be a happy coincidence.

2. The applicability of mathematics is not a happy coincidence.

3. Therefore, God exists.

The Center Of The Universe Is Life – General Relativity, Quantum Mechanics, Entropy and The Shroud Of Turin – video

http://vimeo.com/34084462

John 14:6

Jesus answered, “I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.

Moreover, since the Darwinist held that ‘truths' can be found in mathematics, I implored him to show us ‘IDiots’ (Darwinists derogatory name for ID proponents) the exact mathematical demarcation criteria of neo-Darwinism so that we may finally learn how to properly designate real Darwinian science from the pseudo-science of Intelligent Design?

“nobody to date has yet found a demarcation criterion according to which Darwin can be described as scientific”

– Imre Lakatos (November 9, 1922 – February 2, 1974) a philosopher of mathematics and science, quote as stated in 1973 LSE Scientific Method Lecture

Oxford University Seeks Mathemagician — May 5th, 2011 by Douglas Axe

Excerpt: Grand theories in physics are usually expressed in mathematics. Newton’s mechanics and Einstein’s theory of special relativity are essentially equations. Words are needed only to interpret the terms. Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection has obstinately remained in words since 1859. …

http://biologicinstitute.org/2011/05/05/oxford-university-seeks-mathemagician/

“However, mathematical population geneticists mainly deny that natural selection leads to

optimization of any useful kind. This fifty-year old schism is intellectually damaging in itself, and has prevented improvements in our concept of what fitness is." –

On a 2011 Job Description for a Mathematician, at Oxford, to 'fix' the persistent mathematical problems with neo-Darwinism within two years.

"On the other hand, I disagree that Darwin's theory is as `solid as any explanation in science.; Disagree? I regard the claim as preposterous. Quantum electrodynamics is accurate to thirteen or so decimal places; so, too, general relativity. A leaf trembling in the wrong way would suffice to shatter either theory. What can Darwinian theory offer in comparison?"

(Berlinski, D., "A Scientific Scandal?: David Berlinski & Critics," Commentary, July 8, 2003)

Active Information in Metabiology – Winston Ewert, William A. Dembski, Robert J. Marks II – 2013

Except page 9: (Gregory) Chaitin states [3], "For many years I have thought that it is a mathematical scandal that we do not have proof that Darwinian evolution works." In fact, mathematics has consistently demonstrated that undirected Darwinian evolution does not work.

http://bio-complexity.org/ojs/index.php/main/article/view/BIO-C.2013.4/BIO-C.2013.4

"It is our contention that if 'random' is given a serious and crucial interpretation from a probabilistic point of view, the randomness postulate is highly implausible and that an adequate scientific theory of evolution must await the discovery and elucidation of new natural laws—physical, physico-chemical, and biological."

Murray Eden, "Inadequacies of Neo-Darwinian Evolution as a Scientific Theory," Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution, editors Paul S. Moorhead and Martin M. Kaplan, June 1967, p. 109.

Macroevolution, microevolution and chemistry: the devil is in the details – Dr. V. J. Torley – February 27, 2013

Excerpt: After all, mathematics, scientific laws and observed processes are supposed to form the basis of all scientific explanation. If none of these provides support for Darwinian macroevolution, then why on earth should we accept it? Indeed, why does macroevolution belong in the province of science at all, if its scientific basis cannot be demonstrated?

http://www.uncommondescent.com/intelligent-design/macroevolution-microevolution-and-chemistry-the-devil-is-in-the-details/

Or if mathematics is not a Darwinist's cup of tea, and he more of an empiricist, perhaps he can just demonstrate for us that Random Mutation/Variation and Natural Selection are the way in which species have originated?

What Scientific Idea Is Ready To Be Retired? Fully Random Mutations – Kevin Kelly – Jan. 2014

Excerpt: What is commonly called “random mutation” does not in fact occur in a mathematically random pattern. The process of genetic mutation is extremely complex, with multiple pathways, involving more than one system. Current research suggests most spontaneous mutations occur as errors in the repair process for damaged DNA. Neither the damage nor the errors in repair have been shown to be random in where they occur, how they occur, or when they occur. Rather, the idea that mutations are random is simply a widely held assumption by non-specialists and even many teachers of biology. There is no direct evidence for it.,,,

Mutations have also been shown to have a higher chance of occurring near a place in DNA where mutations have already occurred, creating mutation hotspot clusters—a non-random pattern.,,,

,,,the lack of direct evidence for actual random mutations has now reached a stage where the idea needs to be retired.

There are several related reasons why this unsubstantiated idea continues to be repeated without evidence. The first is fear that non-random mutations would be misunderstood and twisted by creationists,,,

http://www.edge.org/responses/what-scientific-idea-is-ready-for-retirement

Revisiting the Central Dogma in the 21st Century – James A. Shapiro – 2009

Excerpt (Page 12): Underlying the central dogma and conventional views of genome evolution was the idea that the genome is a stable structure that changes rarely and accidentally by chemical fluctuations (106) or replication errors. This view has had to change with the realization that maintenance of genome stability is an active cellular function and the discovery of numerous dedicated biochemical systems for restructuring DNA molecules.(107–110) Genetic change is almost always the result of cellular action on the genome. These natural processes are analogous to human genetic engineering,,, (Page 14) Genome change arises as a consequence of natural genetic engineering, not from accidents. Replication errors and DNA damage are subject to cell surveillance and correction. When DNA damage correction does produce novel genetic structures, natural genetic engineering functions, such as mutator

polymerases and nonhomologous end-joining complexes, are involved. Realizing that DNA change is a biochemical process means that it is subject to regulation like other cellular activities. Thus, we expect to see genome change occurring in response to different stimuli (Table 1) and operating nonrandomly throughout the genome, guided by various types of intermolecular contacts (Table 1 of Ref. 112).

http://shapiro.bsd.uchicago.edu/Shapiro2009.AnnNYAcadSciMS.RevisitingCentral%20Dogma.pdf

Well so much for Random mutations/variations providing proof for Darwinism! How about Natural Selection? Can Darwinists demonstrated that that second pillar of Darwinian thought is true?

“Although living things occupy a three-dimensional space, their internal physiology and anatomy operate as if they were four-dimensional. Quarter-power scaling laws are perhaps as universal and as uniquely biological as the biochemical pathways of metabolism, the structure and function of the genetic code and the process of natural selection.,,, The conclusion here is inescapable, that the driving force for these invariant scaling laws cannot have been natural selection.”

Jerry Fodor and Massimo Piatelli-Palmarini, What Darwin Got Wrong (London: Profile Books, 2010), p. 78-79

http://www.uncommondescent.com/evolution/16037/

WOW, dimensionally speaking, Natural Selection is not even on the right playing field! The reason why ’4-Dimensional’ metabolic pathways are impossible for Darwinism to explain is that Natural Selection operates on the 3-Dimensional phenotypes. ’4-Dimensional’ metabolic pathways are simply ‘invisible’ to natural selection. The reason why 4-Dimensional things are completely invisible to 3-Dimensional things is best illustrated by ‘flatland’:

Flatland – 3D to 4D shift – Carl Sagan – video

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UnUREICzGc0

Moreover, even if Natural Selection were on the right playing field, dimensionally speaking to be a viable explanation, Natural Selection would still be hopelessly blind to the subtle changes it is required to select at the molecular level,,

The GS Principle (The Genetic Selection Principle) – Abel – 2009

Excerpt: The GS Principle, sometimes called “The 2nd Law of Biology,” states that selection must occur at the molecular/genetic level, not just at the fittest phenotypic/organismic level, to produce and explain life.,,, Natural selection cannot operate at the genetic level.

http://www.bioscience.org/2009/v14/af/3426/fulltext.htm

This devastating ‘princess and the pea’ problem for natural selection is pointed out by Dr. John Sanford at the 8:14 minute mark of this following video,,,

Genetic Entropy – Dr. John Sanford – Evolution vs. Reality – video

http://vimeo.com/35088933

All of which begs the question, if showing both of the two primary pillars of Darwinian thought to be false cannot falsify Darwinism, exactly what scientific finding could falsify Darwinism?

Of related note: Intelligent Design does not suffer from such lack of mathematical rigor:

Evolutionary Informatics Lab – Main Publications

http://evoinfo.org/publications/

Moreover, Intelligent Design can easily be falsified by empirical evidence:

“Orr maintains that the theory of intelligent design is not falsifiable. He’s wrong. To falsify design theory a scientist need only experimentally demonstrate that a bacterial flagellum, or any other comparably complex system, could arise by natural selection. If that happened I would conclude that neither flagella nor any system of similar or lesser complexity had to have been designed. In short, biochemical design would be neatly disproved.”

- Dr Behe in 1997

Michael Behe on Falsifying Intelligent Design – video

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N8jXXJN4o_A

Moreover, ID has positive evidence for its claim that Intelligence, and only Intelligence, can generate functional information/complexity, whereas Darwinism has no evidence that it can produce non-tivial functional information/complexity:

Creating Life in the Lab: How New Discoveries in Synthetic Biology Make a Case for the Creator – Fazale Rana

Excerpt of Review: 'Another interesting section of Creating Life in the Lab is one on artificial enzymes. Biological enzymes catalyze chemical reactions, often increasing the spontaneous reaction rate by a billion times or more. Scientists have set out to produce artificial enzymes that catalyze chemical reactions not used in biological organisms. Comparing the structure of biological enzymes, scientists used super-computers to calculate the sequences of amino acids in their enzymes that might catalyze the reaction they were interested in. After testing dozens of candidates,, the best ones were chosen and subjected to "in vitro evolution," which increased the reaction rate up to 200-fold. Despite all this "intelligent design," the artificial enzymes were 10,000 to 1,000,000,000 times less efficient than their biological counterparts. Dr. Rana asks the question, "is it reasonable to think that undirected evolutionary processes routinely accomplished this task?"

per Amazon Description

Dr. Fuz Rana, at the 41:30 minute mark of the following video, speaks on the tremendous effort that went into building the preceding protein:

Science – Fuz Rana – Unbelievable? Conference 2013 – video

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-u34VJ8J5_c&list=PLS5E_VeVNzAstcmbIlygiEFir3tQtlWxx&index=8

The Capabilities of Chaos and Complexity: David L. Abel - Null Hypothesis For Information Generation - 2009

Excerpt of conclusion pg. 42: "To focus the scientific community's attention on its own tendencies toward overzealous metaphysical imagination bordering on "wish-fulfillment," we propose the following readily falsifiable null hypothesis, and invite rigorous experimental attempts to falsify it: "Physicodynamics cannot spontaneously traverse The Cybernetic Cut: physicodynamics alone cannot organize itself into formally functional systems requiring algorithmic optimization, computational halting, and circuit integration." A single exception of non trivial, unaided spontaneous optimization of formal function by truly natural process would falsify this null hypothesis."

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2662469/

Can We Falsify Any Of The Following Null Hypothesis (For Information Generation) - D. Abel

1) Mathematical Logic

2) Algorithmic Optimization

3) Cybernetic Programming

4) Computational Halting

5) Integrated Circuits

6) Organization (e.g. homeostatic optimization far from equilibrium)

7) Material Symbol Systems (e.g. genetics)

8) Any Goal Oriented bona fide system

9) Language

10) Formal function of any kind

Verse and Music;

John 1:3

All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made.

Hillsong – Mighty to Save – With Subtitles/Lyrics

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-08YZF87OBQ