

Misinformation About Evolutionary Biology

The academic community in the United States disseminates two items of misinformation about evolutionary biology:

- 1) Human beings evolved from animals. The truth is that human beings are superior to animals because humans have free will and the conscious knowledge of human beings as opposed to the sense knowledge of animals. That animals can see, hear, and solve simple problems is a scientific observation and the subject matter of evolutionary biology. Understanding and explaining free will and the ability of the human mind to create images, concepts, the past and the future are not topics in biology.
- 2) Natural selection explains the descent with modification of the plant and animal kingdom from bacteria or a bacterium over a period of a hundred million decades. The truth is that natural selection only explains the adaptation of species to the environment.

No biology textbook or peer-reviewed biology journal says human beings evolved from animals or that natural selection explains common descent. Nevertheless, it is widely believed that human beings evolved from animals and that natural selection explains common descent.

The following excerpt from Abe Fortas's majority decision in *Epperson v. Arkansas*, 393 U.S. 97 (1968), is about the laws passed in the 1920s against teaching that human beings evolved from animals. Justice Fortas does not consider it a fact of biology that human beings did not evolve from animals. He considers it an interpretation of the Bible:

“Arkansas' law selects from the body of knowledge a particular segment which it proscribes for the sole reason that it is deemed to conflict with a particular religious doctrine; that is, with a particular interpretation of the Book of Genesis by a particular religious group.”

The following quote from a famous evolutionary biologist shows how a biologist can be correct about evolutionary biology but at the same time be imply in a dishonest manner that human beings evolved from animals:

“Catholics could believe whatever science determined about the evolution of the human body, so long as they accepted that, at some time of his choosing, God had infused the soul into such a creature. I also knew that I had no problem with this statement, for whatever my private beliefs about souls, science cannot touch such a subject and therefore cannot be threatened by any theological position on such a legitimately and intrinsically religious issue.” (Stephen Jay Gould, *Natural History*, March 1997, 13th paragraph)

Gould is saying that if you define a human being as a creature with a soul, human beings did not evolve from animals. This is correct science. However, it is dishonest because he uses the term “soul” instead of “free will.” Everyone grasps the concept of free will because we have it. We all know perfectly well that we can move our hands about any way that we choose, but if we lose our hands in an accident, we continue to exist. However, very few people understand the concept of the “soul.” The Catholic Church teaches not that human beings have souls, but rather that a human being is a composition of body (matter) and soul (form). In other words, human beings are embodied spirits or spirited bodies. Another way of expressing it is to say the human soul is spiritual. Another way is to say human beings are indefinabilities that become conscious of their own existence.

The following quotation from a Ph.D. in linguistics, not biology, proves that the general public is misinformed about natural selection:

“They [Pinker and Bloom] particularly emphasized that language is incredibly complex, as Chomsky had been saying for decades. Indeed, it was the enormous complexity of language that made it hard to imagine not merely how it had evolved but that it had evolved at all.....But, continued Pinker and Bloom, complexity is not a problem for evolution. Consider the eye. The little organ is composed of many specialized parts, each delicately calibrated to perform its role in conjunction with the others. It includes the cornea,...Even Darwin said that it was hard to imagine how the eye could have evolved.....And yet, he explained, it did evolve, and the only possible way is through natural selection—the inestimable back-and-forth of random genetic mutation with small effects...Over the eons, those small changes accreted and eventually resulted in the eye as we know it.” (Christine Kenneally, *The First Word: The Search for the Origins of Language*, 2007, pp. 59–60)

I believe about ninety percent of American biologists would describe themselves as atheists or agnostics, and think that human beings evolved from animals. This does not mean that it is rational to think such a thing. If you ask an American biologist about free will they will say something either irrational or dishonest. The irrational ones say free will is an illusion. The dishonest ones say free will is an *emergent* property of the brain. This is dishonest because *emergence* is a scientific concept. For example, the blueness of the sky emerges from the properties of the atmosphere and light. It was not understood why the sky was blue in the 19th century, but scientists figure it out in the 20th century. The dishonest biologists are implying that free will is a scientific mystery. The truth is that it is a metaphysical mystery. In science, there is a tremendous track record of success. In metaphysics, there is no comparable track record of success.

There is an interesting twist to the fact that no peer-reviewed biology journal says natural selection explains common descent, because there is a peer-reviewed physics journal which promotes this pseudoscience: “Entropy and Evolution” (*American Journal of Physics*, Am. J. Phys., Vol. 76, No. 11, November 2008). The most conspicuous reason natural selection does not explain common descent is that

it occurred so rapidly. It takes 2 decades for a fertilized human egg to create all of the cells in the human body. It took only one hundred million times this amount of time for a bacterium to create the plant and animal kingdom. One hundred million does not even begin to describe the complexity of a chimpanzee compared to a bacterium.

Another way to see this is to calculate the complexity of the primary structure of a protein. Proteins are made up of 20 amino acids. Hemoglobin, for example, consists of 600 amino acids. Sickle cell anemia is caused by one amino acid being the wrong one. Biologists calculate the probability of getting the primary structure of a protein by the random selection of amino acids. This number is much smaller than 100 million decades even if you measure the time in nanoseconds. Also, the primary structure of a protein does not even begin to explain how the primary structure becomes a protein, how proteins become tissues, how tissues become organs, and how organs become organ systems.

Physicists calculate probabilities in connection with the second law of thermodynamics or the law of entropy. This law is that a gas will fill up the entire container it is in because that is the most probable distribution of molecules. Because of this, pro-religion apologists got it into their head that the existence of proteins violates the second law of thermodynamics. This is nonsense because the biological calculation is about which amino acid is next to which. The physics calculation is about the location of molecules in three-dimensional space.

The *American Journal of Physics* article performs an absurd calculation to prove that the existence of proteins does not violate the second law of thermodynamics. It disgraces every physicist in the United States. I explain this in more detail at

https://www.academia.edu/20939526/An_Analogy_Between_Nazi_Germany_and_the_United_States