

# Evolution is true, if it is untrue...

Miro Brada, 2013 [Holland Park, Ice House Gallery](#)

Evolution is, unlike religion, often presented as 'objective', 'scientific', 'atheistic'. But like religion, evolution justifies the power structure: 'those above' are (genetically) better adapted than 'those below', which intends to keep people obedient: amor fati. It is not so surprising that some religious people don't see a dispute between evolution and God (or bible). Personally I am not very interested in evolution (neither Big Bang) whether it is true or not. But couple of years ago I found out that evolution logic in itself was biased - regardless of mutations, natural selection, etc.



Evolution leads to this paradox: 2 people argue about evolution, one supports, another refutes. If evolution is universally true (anytime), the supporter MUST have an advantage over the refuter. The advantage results from better adaptability to environment (key criterion of natural selection). The truth (or what is truer) is closer to reality than untruth, i.e. the truth improves adaptation. Then the statement: 'evolution is true' is motivated by the 'evolutionary' advantage. So it is BIASED (if it is true). I.e. evolution is true, if it is untrue (then it may be unbiased)...

It resembles Wittgenstein's conclusion in his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (1922): "*what we cannot talk about we must pass over in silence*". I.e. evolution is true (unbiased), if we don't talk / know about it (then it may be unbiased)...

Also it corresponds to *Russell's paradox* (1901): "*Let R be the set of all sets that are not members of themselves. If R is not a member of itself, then its definition dictates that it must contain itself, and if it contains itself, then it contradicts its own definition as the set of all sets that are not members of themselves*". i.e. evolution (=set of all sets) is true (=contains itself) only if it is untrue (=if it does not contain itself)...

Evolution may be thought as statistics - i.e. it is valid on average, but momentary truth is unnecessary. But it can't be applied when evolution itself is discussed (if it is true or untrue). Otherwise it could imply: evolution is sometimes true sometimes untrue, which would mean evolution is untrue, as truth must be 100% true.

There have been cases when truth was / is disadvantage. E.g. was it evolution when Middle Age authorities burnt *Giordano Bruno* (1600)? Is war, economic crisis, nuclear waste, betrayal... evolution? Bruno, *Galileo* knew Earth circles Sun, not reverse. It was accurate unlike Middle Age dogmas, but it was disadvantage. Society (what majority obeys) is part of adaptability, although it may support lie or perversity. If the majority thinks (obeys) evolution is untrue, it is untrue, even it is true. If the majority thinks evolution is true, it is true, even it is untrue. Adaptability (key criterion of natural selection) depends so on the power being a sociological reason why evolution is impossible.

Another way to doubt evolution is its lack of intricacy, when its principle: natural selection (with mutations) according to adaptability is too simple. If the simple repeats, it can speculatively explain complicated thing. It is however uneasy to prove, and has limits, when the simple can hardly explain something too complex (brain, eye, engine).