

## Claim CA001:

Evolution is the foundation of an immoral worldview.

### Source:

Moon, Rev. Sun Myung. 1990 (27 Mar.). Parents day and I.  
<http://www.unification.net/1990/900327.html>

### Response:

1. Evolution is descriptive. It can be immoral only if attempting to accurately describe nature is immoral.
2. Any morals derived from evolution would have to recognize the fact that humans have evolved to be social animals. In a social setting, cooperation and even altruism lead to better fitness (Wedekind and Milinski 2000). The process of evolution leads naturally to social animals such as humans developing ethical principles such as the Golden Rule.
3. Some bad morals, such as [eugenics](#) and [social Darwinism](#), are based on misunderstandings of evolution. Therefore, it is important that evolution be taught well to negate such misunderstandings.
4. [Despite claims otherwise](#), creationism has its own problems. For one thing, it is founded on religious bigotry, so the foundation of creationism, by most standards, is immoral.
5. Probably the most effective weapon against bad morals is exposure and publicity. Evolution (and science in general) is based on a culture of making information public.
6. Scientists are their own harshest critics. They have developed codes of ethical behavior for several circumstances, and they have begun to talk about a general ethics (Rotblat 1999). Creationists have nothing similar.
7. Some people feel better about themselves by demonizing others. Those people who are truly interested in morals begin by looking for immorality within themselves, not others.

### References:

1. Rotblat, Joseph. 1999. A Hippocratic Oath for scientists. *Science* 286: 1475.
2. Wedekind, C. and M. Milinski. 2000. Cooperation through image scoring in humans. *Science* 288: 850-852. See also Nowak, M. A. and K. Sigmund, 2000. Shrewd investments. *Science* 288: 819-820.

## Further Reading:

Huxley, T. H. H. 1894. Evolution and ethics.

<http://aleph0.clarku.edu/huxley/CE9/index.html>

## Rebuttal:

I will produce a rebuttal to each statement made in accordance to the creationist statement.

1. In the defense of evolution to be immoral Talk Origins describes it as “immoral only if attempting to accurately describe nature is immoral.” So now lets logically look at how we come about describing nature as immoral. Nature is not moral or immoral. They do not exist in nature. Nature by definition is the material world, esp. as surrounding humankind and existing independently of human activities. Therefore, as morals exist in human activities and not in the surroundings of humankind we can conclude that nature is not moral and that immorality does not exist without morality concluding that nature is not immoral either. Evolution describes humankind as to be a product of evolution and therefore apart of nature. If we as human beings accept ourselves in the natural stance then we become no longer moral by way of our morally integrated society. Although we do not become immoral through our natural stance but through our societal stance it allows immorality through ignorance to accept a moral standard that does not exist in our nature.
2. The social setting of human beings as use of origins of morals is understandable, but we then have to start taking a look at the objectivity of those morals. Who constituted what is right and what is wrong, why is it right or wrong, and what is the outcome of immorality are all questions to its objectivity. But, when we consider our existence as natural through evolution, then we lose the objective in the morals. For as morals are now concerned they are of nature and do not truly exist allowing for something to as easily become immoral as it can become moral and visa versa. Also to say that we are social beings therefore we come up with morals for our interactions would constitute other social organisms to derive morals but they don't because they are of nature.
3. I don't understand how you can negate such misunderstandings such as Social Darwinism when they are derived from the core principles in which evolution is derived. To consider these as misunderstandings is to consider evolution as a misunderstanding.
4. The idea that Creationism is based off of religious bigotry is absurd. Creationism is an attempt to scientifically prove the claims of the Judeo-Christian belief of origins, nature, and historical events. Just as evolution as made up of theories and facts in order to support itself in a society that requires this in order to gain legibility, the beliefs of the Judeo-Christians need evidence and theories in order to support itself. Obviously it is based from the beliefs of the religion but it

involves no bigotry in the matter. If anyone is to defend the ideas of atheism with the theory of evolution then they are just as bigoted as a creationist.

## References:

1. Dictionary.com