

BIOLOGY IS NOT A SCIENCE

By

Colin leslie dean

B.Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA,

MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies,

Grad Cert (Literary studies)

BIOLOGY IS NOT A SCIENCE

By

Colin leslie dean

B.Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA,

MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies,

Grad Cert (Literary studies)

Gamahucher press West Geelong
Australia

2010

Biology is not a science

A science needs a system of classification through which it identifies the objects of its study

- 1) Biology is the study of life but Biologists don't know what life is
- 2) Biologists don't know what a species is-thus biologies classificatory system is meaningless nonsense

Without a system of classification a science cannot come into existence

Now biology is the "science of life" but

- 1) **biology cannot tell us what life is** It can tell us **what life does** but it cant tell us what it is that makes an organism alive ie the life force

this is what life does ie what an organism does that has life but it does not tell us what **the life force is**

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life>

Homeostasis: Regulation of the internal environment to maintain a constant state; for example, electrolyte concentration or sweating to reduce temperature.

Organization: Being structurally composed of one or more cells, which are the basic units of life.

Metabolism: Transformation of energy by converting chemicals and energy into cellular components (anabolism) and decomposing organic matter (catabolism). Living things require energy to maintain internal organization (homeostasis) and to produce the other phenomena associated with life.

Growth: Maintenance of a higher rate of anabolism than catabolism. A growing organism increases in size in all of its parts, rather than simply accumulating matter.

Adaptation: The ability to change over a period of time in response to the environment. This ability is fundamental to the process of evolution and is determined by the organism's heredity as well as the composition of metabolized substances, and external factors present.

Response to stimuli: A response can take many forms, from the contraction of a unicellular organism to external chemicals, to complex reactions involving all the senses of higher animals. A response is often expressed by motion, for example, the leaves of a plant turning toward the sun (phototropism) and by chemotaxis.

Reproduction: The ability to produce new individual organisms either asexually, from a single parent organism, or sexually, from at least two parent organisms

all this is is a list of what an organism with life **does** but this list does not tell us **what life is**

to make it clearer some religions would say what makes us alive ie have life is our soul

take this definition from wiki

Life is a characteristic that distinguishes objects that have self-sustaining biological processes ("alive," "living"), from those which do not

this is a blantly circular definition all it says is life is a characteristic of things that are alive ie have life and as such totally meaningless

now even apart from not telling us what it **is** that gives life to an organism scientist cant even agree on their definition of life

To define life in unequivocal terms is still a challenge for scientists

with out being able to agree on **what life does**- let alone not being able to tell us what LIFE IS - the whole foundation of biology collapses

2) biologist classify living organisms by a heirarchy of taxonomies
ie species phylum
but again biologists cant tell us what species is or phylums are

species is a basic concept in biology
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

“In biology a **species** is one of the basic units of biological classification and a taxonomic rank”

Yet biologist don't know what a species is-so much for a science that cant even identify its object of investigation

[http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/bo ... ection.pdf](http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/bo...ection.pdf)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"However, the exact definition of the term "species" is still controversial, particularly in prokaryotes,[2] and this is called the species problem.[3"

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phylum>

"Although a phylum is often spoken of as if it were a hard and fast entity, no satisfactory definition of a phylum exists"

With out a definition of these terms then biologists are really talking nonsense for with out definitions to locate and identify the things they talk about they are really not talking about anything at all If the biologist talks about say speciation or this species proving natural selection but cant tell you what a species or phylum is then he is talking meaningless nonsense. He could as easily said certain gibbles prove natural selection but with out knowing what a gibble is the claim is meaningless

Thus it can be seen that biology is not a science as its classificatory systems cannot identify the objects of its science if it cannot identify the objects of its investigations it

cannot be a science
all it is is a meaningless array of terms which don't identify anything

Biologists don't know what a species is

Biology ends in meaningless nonsense as its idea of species ends in self-contradiction

http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/books/philosophy/Natural_selection.pdf

Many on here seem to think biologists know what species are

We hear biologists and such figures as Dawkins and Gould talk about speciation, i.e. the appearance of new species, BUT biologists cannot tell us what a species or phylum is

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"However, the exact definition of the term "species" is still controversial, particularly in prokaryotes,[2] and this is **called the species problem**.[3]"

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phylum>

"Although a phylum is often spoken of as if it were a hard and fast entity, **no satisfactory definition of a phylum exists**"

Without a definition of these terms then biologists are really talking nonsense. For without definitions to locate and identify the things they talk about they are really not talking about anything at all. If the biologist talks about, say, speciation or this species proving natural selection but can't tell you what a species or phylum is then he is talking meaningless nonsense. He could as easily say certain gibbles prove natural selection but without knowing what a gibble is the claim is meaningless.

Some argue that
species can breed with each other

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring... [this following part will be discussed in the appendix where it will be shown leads to nonsense and again biologists can't agree on what a species is] While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche

yet this definition is shown to end in meaningless nonsense

take the Bactrian and dromedary camels they are different species yet they can breed with fertile off spring which should mean they are the same species- yet they are different species

http://www.camelphotos.com/camel_breeds.html

Wild camels have three more genes than domestic camels and so they have concluded that they are a completely different species.

yet these two different species can interbreed and have fertile off spring

<http://www.geocities.com/plin9k/limiting-species.htm>

thus we have a contradiction
dromedary and Bactrian camels are different species
yet they can interbreed , which only species can

thus the notion of species ends in self contradiction

thus because biologist cant tell us what a species is

thus all of this taxonomy is meaningless nonsense

Quote:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

Total number of species (estimated):

7 - 100 millions (identified and unidentified), including:

* 5-10 million bacteria[13];

Bacteria belong to the kingdom Protocista. Typical features include; Circular DNA, Plasmids, Meurin Cell walls, Mesosomes, and 70S Ribosomes. Bacteria have many feeding behaviours - Saprophytes, Parasites, Patogens, Mutualites, Autotrops and Heterotrophs. Bacteria reproduce by binary fission, a form of asexual reproduction - this uses the process of mitosis only.

* 74,000-120,000 fungi[14];

Typical features of the Fungi kingdom include; A true nucleus, Chitin Cell walls, many feeding behaviours - Saprothitic, parasitic, but all are heterotrophs.

Fungi can reproduce both Asexually (by mitosis) and sexually (by meiosis). This offers a selective advantage in changing environments

Of the identified eukaryote species we have:

* 1.6 million, including:

o 297,326 plants, including:

+ 15,000 mosses,

+ 13,025 Ferns and horsetails,

+ 980 gymnosperms,

+ 258,650 angiosperms,

199,350 dicotyledons,

59,300 monocotyledons,

o 28,849 fungi & other non-animals, including:

+ 10,000 lichens,

+ 16,000 mushrooms -Kingdom Fungi,

+ 2,849 brown algae - Kingdom Protocista,

+ 9,671 Red and green algae - Kingdom Protocista

o 1,250,000 animals, including (Kingdom Animalia):

+ 1,203,375 invertebrates:

950,000 insects,

81,000 mollusks,

40,000 crustaceans,

2,175 corals,

130,200 others;

+ 59,811 vertebrates (Phylum Chordata):

29,300 fish,

6,199 amphibians,

8,240 reptiles,

9,956 birds,

5,416 mammals.

this demonstrates that biology is not a science as its classificatory system ie species ends in meaningless nonsense

APPENDIX

locked into an untenable taxonomy based on the notion that species breed amongst themselves-which is contradicted by species hybridization -
 biologists
 have in fact created new animals

Genetics entering into biology has turn biology into a joke
 once biologist where looking for the missing link
 know biologist are looking for the ur camel and the ur elephant
 why
 because genetics and biology have know created these two new species
 take the discovery that

http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2001/08/0824_twoelephants.html

DNA Tests Show African Elephants Are Two Species

Genetic fingerprinting shows that Africa's forest and savanna elephants are as different from one another as lions and tigers and should be considered as two genetically distinct species, an international group of researchers reports.

Up until now, elephants have been divided into two species—Asian and African. However, there has been considerable debate among experts as to whether the differences between Africa's forest and savanna elephants were

significant enough to identify them as separate species. The DNA evidence, reported in the August 24 issue of the journal Science, provides a definitive answer to the long-debated controversy.

this means there must have been an original elephant from which these two new elephants evolved

thus we have the ur elephant

also

genetics has shown the wild camel and the domestic camel are different species

http://www.camelphotos.com/camel_breeds.html

“Wild camels have three more genes than domestic camels and so they have concluded that they are a completely different species. “

thus we now have the ur camel

what next

the ur cat

ur dog

it never ends

rather than just say they are totally different animals biologists who are locked into an untenable taxonomy based on the notion that species breed amongst themselves

have in fact created new animals of the ur type

happy hunting biologists sorta like looking for a unicorn perhaps

what a complete joke rather than have a complete new think about anomalies and contradiction in their definition of species due to species hybridization biologist just close there minds and what do we get new animals being created -something out of frankenstiens laboratory

TAKE BIOLOGIES NOTION OF SPECIES AND SEES WHERE IT LEADS US-INTO AN ABYSS OF NONSENSE

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"A usable definition of the word "species" and reliable methods of identifying particular species are essential for stating and testing biological theories "

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

the usable definition of species via "A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring."

ends in contradiction due to species hybridization

so then biologists fudge the definition when it dont work by taging on secondary elaborations ie dna etc

they tag on extra definitions to save what is in facta contradictory definition

when applying the DNA test they in fact use the usable definition

ie

A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring

to make the first identification

then they apply other tests

ie

such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche. Presence of specific locally adapted traits may further subdivide species

take the bactrian and dromedary camels

they say they are said to be "camels"

then they apply the DNA test and then decide they are different species of camels

http://www.camelphotos.com/camel_breeds.html

"Wild camels have three more genes than domestic camels and so they have concluded that they are a completely different species."

you could have said they were totally different animals instead

but because the usable definition is used the biologist were stuck with calling them camels

AGAIN

fact is

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"A usable definition of the word "species" and reliable methods of

identifying particular species are essential for stating and testing biological theories "

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

as wiki says a definition must be made for the testing of theories

fact is definition of species ie wiki

A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring.

leads to contradiction due to species hybridization thus biology cant even begin to test its theories

also

you are taking the effect for the cause

DNA is not used to find species

the usable definition of species is used then biologists use DNA for any fudging required in the definition due to anomalies contradictions

wiki

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is

adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

the sharing of similar DNA is said to determine what is a species

similarity is a subjective thing

on this criteria we are a species of banana

http://wiki.answers.com/Q/How_much_dna_do_humans_share_with_a_banana

According to evolutionary biologist Robert May, President of Britain's Royal Society, "We share half our genes with the banana" (2001), but genes only make up 2% of human DNA - the answer depends on what proportion of the remaining 98% is the same. Humans have 23 pairs of chromosomes and bananas 11 pairs - even if the 11 banana chromosomes were identical to human ones (they're not) it would still mean that less than half of human DNA would be found in a banana.

or perhaps species of mice fruit flys or yeast

<http://www.mindfully.org/GE/GE4/Humans-Over-Primates-NOT12apr02.htm>

Once nature figures out how to accomplish something, it doesn't reinvent the wheel. As a result, mice share around 85% of their genes with humans. Yeast shares 46%. Those tiny annoying fruit flies that descend on overripe bananas share 60%. Oh, and the banana itself shares about 50%.

based on similar DNA we are a species of banana

http://www.makingthemodernworld.org.uk/stories/defiant_modernism/01.S.T.02/?scene=6&tv=true

Even the DNA of plants is similar to that of humans. We share 60% of our DNA with a banana. DNA is generally to be found in chromosomes usually coiled up very tightly, like the tape in a cassette.

Images with the text:

http://www.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/publicat/primer2001/4.shtml

Over 40% of the predicted human proteins share similarity with fruit-fly or worm proteins.

<http://www.dnalc.org/view/555-Model-Organisms.html>

Organisms share similar genes because they have inherited them from common ancestors. Even humans and yeast share many genes! ... If we look at a portion of the amino acids derived from the Ras gene, we can see similarities between humans and yeast.

<http://www.koshland-science-museum.org/exhibitdna/intro03.jsp>

What percent of their genes match yours?

Another human? 100% - All humans have the same genes, but some of these genes contain sequence differences that make each person unique.

A chimpanzee? 98% - Chimpanzees are the closest living species to humans.

A mouse? 92% - All mammals are quite similar genetically.

A fruit fly? 44% - Studies of fruit flies have shown how shared genes govern the growth and structure of both insects and mammals.

Yeast? 26% - Yeasts are single-celled organisms, but they have many housekeeping genes that are the same as the genes in humans, such as those that enable energy to be derived from the breakdown of sugars.

A weed (thale cress)? 18% - Plants have many metabolic differences from humans. For example, they use sunlight to convert carbon dioxide gas to sugars. But they also have similarities in their housekeeping genes

. DNA identification has its pit falls

<http://www.suite101.com/content/dna-barcode-of-life-a205480>

but DNA being used to identify new species may lead to revision the classic taxonomy

ie showing it is untenable ie based on species breeding together

DNA identification just assists the classic already know taxonomy ie it is used once the species has been identified by the usable definition of species breeding

but the criteria used to identify new species is not agreed upon the whole

thing is a dog's dinner over what criteria to use again DNA identification is a subjective thing used on known species and no agreed criteria for identifying new species-but what appears any criteria will show the current taxonomy based on inbreeding with species to be untenable

and you call biology a science nothing but a discipline where truth is a manner of consensus and a show of hands

<http://www.suite101.com/content/dna-barcode-of-life-a205480>

"there is nothing conceptually new in DNA barcoding except the standardisation of the technique and the use of a single gene. Apart from molecular diagnostics, the other major application is discovery of new species. Mitochondrial DNA divergence has been proposed as a primary criterion for recognizing species boundaries which would probably lead to a revision of the classic taxonomy. This marker has already been proven useful to assess taxonomic diversity and to identify new or cryptic species. DNA barcoding is also a powerful tool to study species diversity.

Pitfalls of DNA Barcoding

The DNA barcoding system relies on greater COI sequence divergence between species than within species. However, some groups such as plants have a much slower rate of cytochrome c oxidase I gene evolution than animals. Therefore, a more suitable marker is needed for use in DNA barcoding these groups. Chloroplast genes such as *rbcl* have been proposed as a barcode candidate for plants.

In addition, new or rapidly diverged species arising from divergent selection or polyploidy might be overlooked. Controversy has also arisen from using a single molecular marker rather than multiple taxonomic characters and ecology. Nevertheless, genetic barcoding will assist classic taxonomy and greatly improve our current knowledge of the biodiversity and phylogeny of biological species."

Thus biologists don't know what a species is-so much for a science that can't even identify its object of investigation

Thus we see the notion of species ends in an abyss of nonsense where biological truth comes down to consensus and a show of hands –and they call biology a science what a joke