

# A HIERARCHY OF EVOLUTION

by Bruce Schweigerdt, MA

May 1992

Most people think of EVOLUTION as an objective science. Nothing could be further from the truth. Evolution is, in point of fact, a collection of mythological formulas, sketches, charts, and volumes of ruffraff sufficient to fill the hallowed halls of academia, blocking out all veracity.

A case in point is taken from the high school textbook, Biological Science: An Ecological Approach (6th edition, page 349, pub. 1987). This five-pound volume discusses the issue of origins from a strictly evolutionary viewpoint; and does this in classical dogmatic fashion.

What is most interesting is the stream of logic which the proponents of evolution use in drawing their spurious conclusions; and this textbook is worthy in providing a brief, but excellent example of their methodology.

Before diagraming the methodological hierarchy, the passage entitled "The First Cells Were Probably Heterotrophs" is here cited in its entirety, with emphasis added:

Are [these] **speculations** of origins **reasonable**? What would happen if a simulated primitive atmosphere were exposed to an energy source? In 1952, Stanley Miller and Harold Urey, at the University of Chicago, decided to find out. Using apparatus like that shown in figure 10.30, they passed electric sparks through ammonia, methane, water, and hydrogen. The electric sparks simulated lightning, and the gases were like those on the earth long ago. Nothing else was added. When the substances were analyzed later, it was found that some simple amino acids had been produced.

That experiment has been verified. Other investigators have used ultraviolet light instead of electric sparks. They have obtained the same kind of results. Since those first experiments, researchers have synthesized many other kinds of organic molecules, including nucleotides and carbohydrates.

Do those experiments suggest a way in which life might have originated in the distant past? Yes, but it is still a long way from complex molecules to even the simplest of known organisms. How, then, might those simple organisms have arisen?

## THE FIRST CELLS **WERE PROBABLY** HETEROTROPHS

**As time went by, it seems likely that** some amino acids in the "organic soup" formed polypeptides and proteins. Other simple organic molecules **also might have formed** larger, more complex molecules. Eventually, some of the larger **molecules might have combined** into clusters, **and the clusters might have merged** to form a primitive cell.

**That is a far-reaching assumption.** The formation of primitive cells from clusters of organic compounds is more difficult to explain than the formation of the organic compounds themselves under the earth's primitive conditions. **The assumption is that at first,** large organic compounds in the organic soup were grouped together at random, forming many types of aggregates. Those different types of **aggregates might have competed** with each other for the organic molecules in the soup that were needed for growth and reproduction. In that competition, some aggregates would have had a composition and an organization that made them more successful than other aggregates. Eventually, natural selection crowded out the less successful ones.

Scientists have proposed different models for a pre-cell. A Russian scientist, A.I. Oparin, **suggested that pre-cells might have been like coacervates.** Coacervates are clusters of proteins or proteinlike substances held together in small droplets within a surrounding liquid, as shown in figure 10.31a. **Sidney Fox,** of the University of Miami, **thinks** pre-cells were more like microspheres, cooling droplets from a hot water solution of polypeptides. Each microsphere forms its own double-layered boundary as it cools.

The ancestors of primitive **cells could easily have been** of several kinds. Different kinds, with different capabilities, **might have come together.** In that way some of the **features could have developed** that are seen today in the simplest heterotrophic bacteria. **The cell ancestors formed** a membrane that separated them from their external world. **They began to grow** by using compounds in the surrounding

environment for spare parts and energy. They evolved a process of reproduction, producing others like themselves.

So, based on all of the "speculation" and "far-reaching assumptions," the numerous levels of "might haves," we are now able to conclude that evolutionary ancestors formed, they began to grow, and they evolved. . . . Is this an objective science?

**A HIERARCHY OF EVOLUTION**  
**An analysis of a high-school Biology Text**  
**by Bruce Schweigerdt, MA**

**ARE THE SPECULATIONS REASONABLE?**

**first cells WERE PROBABLY**

**As time went by, IT SEEMS LIKELY THAT**

**also MIGHT HAVE formed**

**molecules MIGHT HAVE combined**

**and the clusters MIGHT HAVE merged**

**THIS IS A FAR-REACHING ASSUMPTION**

**The ASSUMPTION is that at first . . .**

**aggregates MIGHT HAVE competed**

**pre-cells MIGHT HAVE BEEN like . . .**

**S. Fox THINKS**

**COULD EASILY HAVE BEEN**

**cell ancestors FORMED . . .**

**THEY BEGAN TO GROW. . .**

**THEY *EVOLVED* A PROCESS OF REPRODUCTION . . .**