A New Perspective on Human Evolution

â”€

A New Perspective reconsiderar ciertas tensiones percibidas
entre los actuales conceptos en biología
on Human evolucionaría y ciertas declaraciones de
‘Abdu’l-Bahá. Se presenta un resumen de
Evolution la taxonomía y la construcción del árbol
filogenético con especial énfasis en la
cladística, una metodología no disponible
en el tiempo de ‘Abdu’l-Bahá y hasta
DOUGLAS PERRY
ahora no mencionada en la publicaciones
Bahá’ís relacionadas con la evolución.
Abstract El artículo concluye con ejemplos de
This paper reviews past Bahá’í scholar- cómo cladogramas podrían ayudar en la
ship on evolution, identifies a gap in this conceptualización de algunas declaraciones
scholarship in light of current evolutionary de ‘Abdu’l-Bahá relacionadas con la
biology, and uses cladistics—a modern evolución, (por ejemplo, Su declaración
approach to biological classification—to que “el hombre no es animal”). En el
reconsider certain perceived tensions be- uso de esta metodología, la intención del
tween current concepts in evolutionary autor no es reinterpretar la declaración
biology and certain statements of ‘Abdu’l- de ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, tampoco “probar” una
Bahá. A summary of taxonomy and phy- interpretación particular relacionada, sino,
logenetic tree construction is given, with traer conceptos modernos de la biología

special emphasis placed on cladistics, a methodology not available in 'Abdu'l-Bahá's day, and heretofore not mentioned in Bahá'í-authored publications related to evolution. This paper concludes with examples of how cladograms may aid in conceptualizing some of the evolution-related statements of 'Abdu'l-Bahá, (for example, His statement that "man is not an animal"). In using this approach, the intention of the author is not to re-interpret 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements, nor to "prove" any particular interpretation thereof, but rather to bring modern concepts of evolutionary biology into Bahá'í discourse on evolution.

Resumen

Este artículo examina la pasada erudición Bahá'í sobre la evolución, identifica una brecha entre esta erudición a la luz de la actual biología evolucionaría, y utiliza la cladística-una metodología moderna para la clasificación biológica-para

evolucionaría al discurso Bahá'í sobre la evolución.

Résumé

Dans le présent article, l'auteur passe en revue les études bahá'íes sur l'évolution, y relève une lacune à la lumière de la biologie évolutive actuelle et utilise la cladistique – une approche moderne de la classification biologique – pour réexaminer certaines divergences perçues entre des concepts actuels de la biologie évolutive et certaines déclarations de 'Abdu'l-Bahá. Il présente une synthèse de la taxonomie et de la construction d'arbres phylogénétiques, en accordant une attention particulière à la cladistique, une méthodologie qui n'existait pas à l'époque de 'Abdu'l-Bahá et qui n'a pas été mentionnée jusqu'à présent dans les publications bahá'íes relatives à l'évolution. L'article se termine par des exemples illustrant comment les cladogrammes pourraient aider à

conceptualiser certaines déclarations de 'Abdu'l-Bahá sur l'évolution (par exemple,

'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on the topic of evolution have

been the sub-
sa déclaration selon laquelle « l'homme ject of some
n'est pas un animal »). En utilisant cette scrutiny—mostly by
approche, l'auteur n'a pas l'intention de Bahá'ís themselves, who
réinterpréter les déclarations de 'Abdu'l- have tended
Bahá, ni de « prouver » une interprétation to either read these as an
particulière de celles-ci, mais plutôt endorsement
d'introduire des concepts modernes de la of a position that seems to be at odds
biologie évolutive dans le discours bahá'í with established scientific consensus,
sur l'évolution. or as requiring careful interpretation
in order to show that they
are, in fact,
compatible with that
consensus. In this
paper, I offer a different approach by
drawing on relatively recent develop-
I ments in the methods used within evo-
lutionary biology itself. When viewed
Between 1904 and 1905, 'Abdu'l- through the lens of
Bahá gave a series of table talks on a cladistics, the ap-
number of subjects, published in 1908 parent tension between
as Some Answered Questions. From 'Abdu'l-Bahá's
1910 to 1913, He traveled to Europe statements and scientific truth
and North America, and gave many reveals
public talks on a wide range of is- itself to be more a matter of
sues. Again, many of these addresses perspec-
were collected and published as The tive than a fundamental
Promulgation of Universal Peace. One disjuncture in
subject that He addressed in a number need of reconciliation.
of these talks was human evolution. In
these talks, He challenged some of the S C
notions that were current at the time, P S
most notably that because man1 had
descended directly from an ancestor of On the subject of evolution,
much has
been written by Bahá'í
scholars over
the years.
In The Purpose of Physical
Reality,
John S. Hatcher asserts that
"the Bahá'í

other primates, the human being was, therefore, merely an animal like any other (Haeckel 6). ‘Abdu’l-Bahá states that man holds a distinct station in the chain of life, and that this distinction is spiritual rather than merely physical (Promulgation 262).

Further, in Close Connections, Hatcher deduces from ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s comments that

1 ‘Abdu’l-Bahá uses this term, as others did at the time, to indicate humanity in general.

even though these stages of transformation may be radically different in appearance” (122).

Anjam Khursheed, in Science and Religion: Towards the Restoration of an Ancient Harmony, asserts that the Bahá’í writings affirm evolution, but that this evolution is divinely directed and not the outcome of blind chance (88–92).

In an article published in the Journal of Bahá’í Studies, Craig Loehle presents the view that humans did not evolve accidentally, but according to God’s purpose, as “the unfolding of God’s Plan” (51). However, this planned unfolding

teachings reject the views of both the creationists and the evolutionists as their theories are commonly presented.” Creation as a whole is eternal, and evolution (cosmological, geological, and biological) is the unfolding of that creation (48–52).

the transformation of human evolution “occurs solely within a species or state,

complexity—implying the action of an invisible force. Moreover, this force must possess the properties of life itself, including the higher consciousness of humans. From this, Hatcher concludes that this force must be divine.

Following the thought of this earlier article, Hatcher held neo-Darwinian theory to be based on the complete randomness of both mutations and natural selection (a position no longer held in modern evolutionary biology).2 Resting on this assumption of total randomness, Hatcher attests that neo-Darwinian theory is incapable of explaining the

“complexification” of
is not to be perceived in a Creationist evolution (Epilogue). As in his article
sense as literally a step-by-step inter- of fifteen years prior, he argues for the
vention by God, but rather as a gradual existence of an “evolutionary force,”
actualization of potentialities mediated divine in origin.
by an evolutionary process according Such a position verges on “intelli-
to natural law. He also develops the gent design,” the theistic position that
concept of human beings as a “special life holds evidence of purposeful cre-
creation” (i.e., transcending other life ation that cannot be based on chance
forms) and yet emerging with other life alone. However, as noted, Hatcher’s
forms through biological evolution. fundamental premise, that of the
William S. Hatcher offers a cogent complete randomness of both muta-
argument for the increased “com- tion and natural selection, is disputed
plexification” of evolution as proof by current research in evolutionary
of the existence of God (“A Scientific
Proof”). He starts with an analogy. 2 Modern evolutionary biology as-
The directedness of a falling object, serts that mutations, broadly speaking, are
which theoretically is free to move in not entirely random in the statistical sense,
any random direction, but which only but are shaped by adjacent probabilities—
moves in one direction—down—of- for example, the location of the mutating
fers proof that there is an “invisible base pair in a nucleotide sequence. As a
force”—gravity—acting on the object. rough analogy, the outcome of the role of
Similarly, evolution is generated by the a die is not completely random in the sta-
random actions of mutation and nat- tistical sense, but is limited or shaped by
ural selection, yet it, too, only moves the number of sides of the die. This has
in one “direction”—towards greater important implications for the apparent di-

rectionality of evolution.

biology (Martincorena and Luscombe; Gregory, "Understanding Natural Selection"). In his 1993 book, The Challenge of Bahá'u'lláh, Gary Matthews seeks to reconcile the apparent contradiction between biological human evolution (as it was then understood) and 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on the uniqueness of the human station by arguing that the contradiction is semantic: the emergence of the soul constitutes a new "species" in a general, not biological, sense. He adds that further research "may someday settle this issue" (109).

Paul Lample, the compiler of Bahá'u'lláh's Teachings on Spiritual Reality, states that the Bahá'í teachings support the scientific concept of evolution while rejecting that evolution operates solely by chance; evolution is essentially purposeful (101). He also asserts that 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements must be taken simply at face value, and that, that gathered the main statements of 'Abdu'l-Bahá regarding evolution, and analyzed them in light of general evolutionary concepts. They concluded that, although humans are biologically part of evolution, "man is much more than an animal," being endowed with a spiritual reality not shared with animals.

In a conference paper published in Lights of Irfán, Ian Kluge makes no attempt to reconcile 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on evolution with current scientific thought; on the contrary, he holds that they should be accepted as stated, while waiting for scientific research and thinking to catch up. This position, however, precludes any nuanced interpretation of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements.

In his master's thesis, Salman Oskooi takes the position that 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on evolution must be taken simply at face value, and that,

regarding the uniqueness of the human station should not be interpreted to mean that humans emerged through a separate, parallel evolutionary pathway.

In 2001, Keven Brown and Eberhard von Kitzing produced a monograph, Evolution and Bahá'í Belief, that systematically surveys the philosophical (as opposed to strictly scientific) concepts of evolution, both in Western (i.e., European) and Eastern (i.e., Islamic) traditions leading up to, and current with, the time when 'Abdu'l-Bahá made His major comments related to evolution.

In 2003, Courosh Mehanian and Stephen Friberg published an article

to 'Abdu'l-Bahá (Universal House of Justice, Messages 545–46).

In 2023, Bryan Donaldson published a monograph, On the Originality of Species, which propounds that 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statement, "man is not animal" ('Abdu'l-Bahá, Promulgation

since they are at odds with current evolutionary science, 'Abdu'l-Bahá's comments are simply wrong. Oskooi does assert the infallibility of 'Abdu'l-Bahá on spiritual matters, but claims that this infallibility does not extend to scientific or other subjects. However, Oskooi's position is founded on a letter written on behalf of Shoghi Effendi regarding his own infallibility as being confined to matters relating to the Cause, which Oskooi extends to apply to 'Abdu'l-Bahá as well. In contradiction to this position, a letter on behalf of the Universal House of Justice to an individual believer states that this limitation of infallibility does not apply

modern evolutionary biology into dialogue with 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on evolution. There are many ways to accomplish this. I choose to approach this subject through the path of phylogenetics and cladistics, which have been foundational to

evolutionary bi-
359) should be taken as literally true in ology since the 1960s (Henning), and
a biological sense, and proposes that have since been well substantiated by
this can be explained by a “parallel research as explained further in this
evolution” by which humans evolved paper.
separately from animals (including pri- In taking this new approach, my in-
mates). Criticism of this position can tention is not to re-interpret the state-
be found elsewhere (Perry). ments of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, nor to “prove”
Bahman Nadimi’s article “Bahá’í any particular interpretation of His
View on Biological Evolution” posits statements, but rather to demonstrate
that the evolution of humans did not how incorporating current evolution-
start at the inception of life on Earth ary science enriches the discourse on
but rather began with some unknown, this subject, which is at the nexus of
specialized biological structure at a any discussion of one of the central
later stage, suggesting that humans tenets of the Bahá’í Faith, that of the
and animals evolved on completely harmony between science and religion.
separate paths. There is no scientific
evidence for this conjecture. P

T G B ’ S The premises of this paper are derived
E from the overarching themes expound-
ed by ‘Abdu’l-Bahá in His science- and
For all the valuable perspectives found evolution-related talks, as identified by
in this prior scholarship, these contri- Friberg and Mehanian. These premises
butions all come from the perspective are:
of the philosophy of evolution, not 1. In terms of biological evo-
the science of evolutionary biology. lution, humans have progressive-
Moreover, this discussion has been ly evolved from a simpler form
confined to Darwinian and neo-Dar- (‘Abdu’l-Bahá, Some Answered
winian concepts, which are rooted in Questions 210). This is

consistent
the nineteenth and twentieth centu- with current evolutionary theory.
ries, and limited by the knowledge 2. The essential nature of hu-
and understanding of those times. As mans has always existed in poten-
we are now well into the twenty-first tiality, regardless of the
outward
century, the time has come to bring organismic form at any point of

evolution (223). This declaration Some of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's
comments
challenges the very concept, im- on evolution have been seen as
enig-
plicit in the mainstream scientific matic, initiating attempts—as the
ear-
discourse since Darwin, that what lier literature review shows—at
resolu-
it means to be human can be de- tion. For example, I draw the
reader's
scribed in strictly taxonomic (i.e. attention to one statement by
'Abdu'l-
biological classification) terms. Bahá that seems so directly
literal in
3. The feature that distinguishes meaning that some feel challenged to
humans from animals is not the understand it in light of
evolutionary
biological organism, but the hu- theory. Specifically:
man spirit, also referred to as the
rational soul (241). This does not The lost link of Darwinian theory
deny that genus Homo can prop- is itself a proof that man is not
an
erly be viewed as a taxon3 in tribe animal. How is it possible to
have
Hominini, family Hominidae, and all the links present and that
im-
order Primates, but it challenges portant link absent? Its absence
is
the notion that this classification an indication that man has never
fully explains what a human being been an animal. It will never be
is. In other words, the human is, found. (Promulgation 355; em-
but not simply, a primate. phasis added)

AD D In his book, On the
Originality
of Species, Bryan Donaldson holds
Within the Bahá'í community at large, the position that this
statement must
the questions and discussions regard- be taken in its most literal

sense, and
ing human evolution are not settled, therefore posits that human evolution
nor must they be, nor even should they was parallel to, not colinear with, pri-
be. The intersections of science and re- mate evolution. This goes against over-
ligion will always be dynamic because whelming scientific evidence (White et
they are subject to both changes in al.), and, although Donaldson makes a
scientific theory and in human under- valiant effort to reinterpret these find-
standing of scripture; in other words, ings, his effort ultimately fails not only
the questions and discussions unfold as on evidence but on first principles: the
our comprehension of reality evolves. concept that humans have always been
human throughout evolutionary history
3 Taxon (plural taxa) is a general by reason of latent potential cannot be
term for any group of organisms that bi- explained by parallel evolution because
ologists classify together based on shared the problem of instantiation—when
characteristics such as types of locomotion and how humans became human—re-
or reproduction. Species, genera, families, mains. The theory of parallel human
and higher classifications are all examples evolution merely pushes the problem
of taxa.

of instantiation back to an earlier, and W U
entirely speculative, time in evolution- E R
ary history (Perry).

For any ongoing discussion on the There are several ways of viewing
subject of human evolution, the fol- evolution, all of which are scientifical-
lowing excerpt from a letter written ly valid within the limits of the scope
on behalf of the Universal House of and quality of the underlying data they
Justice can be regarded as a grounding draw from and the inherent restrictions
statement: of the analytic methods on which

they are based. It is important to understand that these different presentations of evolutionary data are not contradictory; rather, they view the same phenomena from different perspectives, and, therefore, are complementary. With the exception of the naturalistic tree model commonly used in popular culture, all methods mentioned in this paper are fully accepted within the scientific community. Different methods are chosen for varied reasons. The fact that each of these is simply a distinct perspective that does not contradict other perspectives is evidenced by occasional variations in the terminology by which they are invoked in the literature. A dendrogram, for example, may be referred to as a phylogenetic tree because it really is a phylogenetic tree viewed from a different perspective. While variable terminology can occasionally be problematic for the outside inquirer, it does not interfere with a crucial point of this paper, which is that the findings of modern evolutionary biology have a reciprocity and complementarity with ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on evolution.

The Bahá’í view of evolution is more complex and nuanced than that put forward today by those who present evolution and creation in dichotomous terms.

Evolution may be understood as the means set in motion by God through which life changes and unfolds. A Bahá’í can strive to reconcile contemporary scientific views with the published statements of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, which need not be understood to imply a kind of parallel evolution. Rather, ‘Abdu’l-Bahá has explained that human life came into existence when the appropriate conditions were established. (5 July 2010)

In the spirit of this statement, I seek to take a holistic approach towards human evolution by viewing it through a different lens (as will be explained in this article) than has heretofore been used in Bahá’í discussions of evolution, one that may help us see ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s explanations as harmonious with mainstream scientific consensus.

What follows, then, is a brief discussion of phylogenetics—the broad discipline concerned with the evolutionary

relationships between organisms—in order to frame an exploration of two distinct ways of presenting those relationships. The technical details in this section are given to provide context for the overall point that two equally valid and accurate ways of looking at evolution can each highlight aspects of this phenomenon that the other obscures.

P

The discipline of phylogenetics (from the Greek phylon for “race” or “tribe” and geneia for “origin”) is the study of the evolutionary relationships that form the basis of taxonomic[4] classification (Haque). First emerging in the mid-twentieth century, phylogenetics now forms the core of evolutionary biology (Losos et al.).

A phylogenetic tree (figure 1) is the diagrammatic representation of these relationships. By common convention, the beginning of the tree represents the last common universal ancestor (LUCA) for all subsequent forms of life. Consistent with its descriptive designation, a phylogenetic tree arborizes according to divergent evolution, with the point of divergence (called the node) being the most recent common ancestor (MRCA). The tree in figure 1, for instance, depicts the three taxonomic domains (a domain being the highest level category of classification of life): Bacteria, Archaea, and Eukaryota (or Eukarya). Each domain contains a number of kingdoms—the domain Eukaryota, for instance, contains the kingdoms Protista (a term now being used less formally), Fungi, Plantae, and Animalia.

While the first systematic efforts at taxonomy, beginning with Linneus, relied on visual appraisal of shared and

4 Taxonomy (from the Greek taxis for “order” and nomos for “law”) is the discipline of naming life forms based on evolutionary relationships. The naming of organisms is as old as language itself, but

the systematization of biological naming began with Carl Linnaeus in the eighteenth century. Taxonomic hierarchies are based on the range of evolutionary commonalities (i.e. biological characteristics), with species being the unit with the greatest specificity for these characteristics. The progression from most specific (the least commonality) to most general (the greatest commonality) is species -> genus -> family -> order -> class -> phylum -> kingdom -> domain. This hierarchical system makes taxonomy more than "a glorified form of filing"; the taxonomic classification of an organism expresses our current understanding (or theory) about its relationship to all other life (Gould 98).

homologies; behavioral data (MacLean et al.)—migration, mating, etc.; and statistical analysis (Gavryushkina et al.)—Bayesian inference, maximum likelihood. The phylogenetic tree is a true and accurate representation of currently available scientific data

different characteristics—bats and birds, for example, both have wings with homologous bone structures, but have completely different modes of reproduction, and so we conclude that bats are flying mammals rather than birds—modern phylogenetics has a wider range of ways to assess how organisms are related. In addition to phenetic (i.e., morphological) data (Panchen 132–68)—physical traits such as limbs, gills, and feathers—a phylogenetic tree can be generated using genomic (i.e. molecular) data (Fuellen)—DNA, RNA, and protein sequence

Before proceeding, it is worth noting that the contention that a number of perspectives on evolutionary relationships are equally valid does not mean that any method of visualizing those relationships is valid. For example, in contrast to phylogenetic

bearing on evolutionary relationships. However, it is only a qualitative (or at best semi-quantitative) representation, and new data can sometimes lead to changes in the tree.5

Figure 1. Phylogenetic Tree of Life (after https://www.greennature.ca/tree-of-life/)

5 For example, it was long disputed whether the giant panda is most closely related to raccoons or bears, due to its sharing morphological characteristics with both. Only once genomic data was available was it determined that the giant panda is, in fact, a true bear. Interestingly, genomic data also showed that the red panda was not in fact a close relative of the giant panda, despite their geographical proximity and several shared morphological features (O'Brien et al.).

trees, and to cladograms that we will review later, the common image of a naturalistic tree to represent evolution is misleading in important respects (figure 2). The innate appeal of using a naturalistic tree to describe evolution is understandable. The "tree of life" concept predates Darwin, and a contemporary of Darwin, Ernst Haeckel, used a naturalistic tree to describe evolution as it was then understood. It has remained a popular image ever since, and is what is commonly envisioned when thinking of evolution. However, this representation is not used in the scientific community. The naturalistic tree image obscures and misrepresents actual evolutionary features and relationships in ways that a true phylogenetic tree does not. For example, in figure 2, the placement of Protista at the

For one, the trunk's ramification into branches—in the manner of a natural tree—falsely implies some kind of diminution, as of biological information or

complexity,
roots of the tree is problematic. To the when in fact the opposite is true. It also
layperson, this placement would seem falsely implies derivation, as if a later
to suggest that all other life evolved form of life is merely derived from an
from Protista, when in actuality all earlier form, when in fact new forms of
modern members of Protista share a life can emerge with novel properties.
common ancestor (LUCA) with the Finally, the naturalistic tree shown in
rest of living organisms. The figure figure 2 obscures the true evolutionary
gives no position for LUCA, but if it pathways of, and relationships be-
did, it would have to be at some point tween, taxa.
of the thick trunk—which would fur- The use of a naturalistic tree to pres-
ther confuse the layperson, for whom ent scientific findings is a good exam-
the tree image intuitively suggests a ple of how the way we represent data
linear progression from roots to trunk can profoundly influence—and in this
to branches. The use of a literal tree case, impair—what we can perceive
image presents further difficulties. about the data.

Figure 2. Evolution depicted as a naturalistic tree (after https://earthsky.org/earth/new-tree-of-life-doesnt-look-as-youd-imagine/)

D the most recent common ancestor of agnathans (jawless vertebrates) and
Returning to actual scientific practice, Gnathostomata (jawed vertebrates)
phylogenetic trees can be represented lived before the most recent common
in diagrammatic form as dendrograms ancestor of marsupial and placental
to visualize evolutionary relationships mammals. The vertical axis loosely
more easily. In figure 3, taxa belonging represents evolutionary "distance."
to the phylum Chordata are mapped Thus, marsupial and placental mam-
according to their evolutionary rela- mals are more closely related to each

tionships using data, both quantitative (genomic information, carbon dating to determine the age of fossils, etc.) and qualitative (observed phenetic similarities and differences, etc.). The horizontal axis loosely represents evolutionary time, meaning that nodes further towards the left of the dendrogram represent a branching-off between lineages that occurred earlier in time than those further to the right. Thus, however, we may draw inferences from the underlying data that a different visualization would not lead us to, or fail to draw inferences that another (different but equally valid) visualization might suggest. Consider one of the recurring themes in the statements of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá: the directionality and hierarchy of evolution from simpler to more complex organisms, from “lower” to “higher” forms of life, and especially the station of human beings in the order of life; see, for example,

T P E
“P ”

Dendrograms, if constructed faithfully to a sound underlying data set, are one valid way of visualizing evolutionary relationships, and are useful for a number of purposes. If they are the only lens we use for this purpose,

Figure 3. Simple evolutionary dendrogram
(after https://www.instituteofcaninebiology.org/how-to-read-a-dendrogram.html)

as a byproduct of mindless adaptation.

However, there is no scientific basis for this tenet. It is what Richard DeWitt refers to as a philosophical/conceptual “fact” as opposed to an empirical fact; the former are commonly mistaken for the latter even by scientists (31–35).

Because of this position, teleology and progress are terms banned from the literature in evolutionary biology (Kadykalo). Yet it is undeniable that life has evolved from simplicity to higher and higher orders

“Evolution and the Existence of Man” (Some Answered Questions 220–27).

This is contrary to the received opinion of most evolutionary biologists now active in the field. Thus, any exploration of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on evolution must address this issue.

Although scientifically correct and useful for charting evolutionary pathways, dendrograms, like most evolutionary tree models, tend to obscure one important aspect of evolution: the progressive emergence of higher orders of life, and the evolutionary relationships based on this emergence. The current dogma holds that, because much (but not all) evolution occurs by chance mutation and natural selection, it must be purposeless, and, therefore, directionless. By extension of this position, a popular tenet is that biological evolution does not advance, it merely changes.6 Increasing biological complexity, though not denied, is simply dismissed

6 I personally have heard a professor of evolutionary biology proclaim, “Humans are no more advanced than amoe-

of complexity in both functionality and capacity (Lipps et al.). This progressive complexity is, of course, captured in the underlying data upon which evolutionary trees are based; however, the way these data are presented minimizes or even obscures this phenomenon.

For example, dendrograms generally only show evolutionary relationships; information about organismal form and function is entirely missing. A dendrogram is, of course, not incorrect because of this omission; it simply focuses on only one aspect of evolution.

A mathematical equivalent of this operation is to plot the 1-dimensional scalar of a 3-dimensional vector. The scalar can only reflect one aspect of the vector, thereby concealing the deeper, richer information of the vector itself.

In a comparable manner, this dendrogram shows no increasing complexity; indeed, no “progress” at all. Every map or model, of course, must simplify the reality that it seeks to explain. A political map of the globe omits topographical features; if we want to know where the high

and
bas, they just occupy different niches.”

low points of the earth are found, we need a topographical map. This paper therefore now turns to a different kind of “map” of evolutionary relationships: modern cladistics, which can be used to visualize the statements of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá regarding biological hierarchy, and thus help to reconcile (though not re-interpret) His statements with a modern scientific perspective.

C

To bring twenty-first century evolutionary biology into dialogue with ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on evolution, we turn to the field of cladistics, which did not exist in ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s day. The term was coined in the 1950s and cladistics was established as a subdiscipline of biology by the 1960s. Cladistics offers a different way of viewing evolution (Williams and Ebach), and can be described as a method of systematic classification within phylogenetics. It operates by arranging taxa into groups, called called synapomorphies, a term that we will return to later).

Though traditionally based on phenetics (observable similarities), which is a relatively simple methodology, the apparent evolutionary relationships identified by cladistics can be verified with molecular data (Mavrodiev and Madorsky), fossil records (Cracraft), ethological studies (Fentress), and by advanced statistical (Huelsenbeck, Ronquist, et al.) and computational (Brooks et al.) methods. Data acquired by separate, complementary methods allow clades to be defined with increasing rigor (Faith and Cranston).

As with all scientific methodologies, cladistics has strengths and weaknesses. While these are summarized in Appendix A, for our purposes one particular strength stands out: cladistics is particularly good at visualizing evolutionary history in terms of phenetics and evolutionary development (Harrison). In other words, it helps us identify when something new has appeared through the processes of

clades. A clade consists of all taxa that share particular features in common, to the exclusion of all other taxa. For example, Gnathostomes are jawed fish (and their descendants) that diverged from Agnatha, which are jawless chordates such as lampreys. All subsequently evolved creatures with jaws, including all tetrapods (vertebrates with four limbs), are grouped into the clade Gnathostomata, while Agnatha are excluded from this clade. (The shared features that constitute clades—jaws in this example—are

evolution.

C

Cladograms are visual representations of cladistics. They are diagrams that map clades, primarily on evolutionary morphogenesis.

The diagrammatic structure of the cladogram represents both the evolutionary lineage and relatedness of taxa (figure 4). The "root" represents the most recent common ancestor for all the taxa included in a particular

cladogram. As we follow the diagram up from the root, we find "internal nodes"—bifurcations that represent speciation events and common ancestors for subsequent (i.e. above the node) divergent evolutionary lines.

Taxa—which can represent individual species or larger taxonomic groups (i.e., clades)—are represented by "terminal nodes" (such as the letters A through F in figure 4). The evolutionary lineage of a given taxon is thus represented by

evolutionary relationships of the in-group (Huelsenbeck, Bollback, et al.).

To see how cladograms can visualize evolutionary relationships, consider figure 5. Here, the root is the most recent common ancestor for all the taxa shown in the figure, from lampreys (Petromyzon) to lizards (Lacertillia).

Internal nodes indicate the last common ancestor for subgroups of taxa; for example, the rightmost internal node represents the last common ancestor

the straight lines connecting a terminal node back to the root. Taxa sharing the same most recent common ancestor are identified as sister taxa. An outgroup is a species or group of species that is closely related to, but not part of, the other taxa being studied (the ingroup). The function of the outgroup is to serve as a reference point for determining the

Figure 4. Basic cladogram structure

Before proceeding further, it is important to take in some cautionary considerations for using cladograms as representational tools of evolution (Gregory, "Understanding Evolutionary Trees"). First, it is most important to understand cladogram topology. Any internal node can be rotated 180° without changing the topology of the cladogram. For example, in Figure 6, the cladogram on the left (figure 6A) is equivalent to the cladogram on the right (figure 6B). Visually, the internal node for sister taxa E and F (EF) and taxon D, which we

for lizards and birds (Aves). The taxa (terminal nodes) in this diagram are all clades representing many species. This cladogram allows us to see that birds are more closely related to lizards than to lampreys. The validity of any cladogram to depict these relationships is, of course, dependent on the data used to construct the cladogram.

and divergent nodes are still the same.

What's important to note here is that the long "main line" of the cladogram represents the direct evolutionary path for whichever particular taxon is found at the rightmost terminal node. It is quite natural for the viewer to consider this node, and its taxon, the ultimate "destination" and focus of the cladogram. However, because nodes can be rotated about their vertical axis without changing the topology of the cladogram, there is no singular main line; the choice of which taxon is

situated
will call clade D(EF), has been rotated 180° about its vertical axis. The left-to-right order of the taxa was changed from A-B-C-D-E-F (figure 6A) to A-B-C-F-E-D (figure 6B). This gives the appearance that the evolutionary relationships of the taxa have changed, but they have not: when traced in the cladogram, the evolutionary pathways on the main line is made by whoever creates the cladogram. The cladogram can be rearranged such that any of the included taxa can be the terminus of the main line. This is demonstrated in figure 6, where taxon F is the terminus of the main line in figure 6A, and taxon D is the terminus of the main line in figure 6B.

Figure 5. Simple cladogram of vertebrates (after https://biologydictionary.net/cladogram/)

This is not an inherent weakness of the cladogram as a representational model; on the contrary, it shows the ability of the model to represent the underlying data more clearly, depending on subject focus. Indeed, while the same evolutionary pathways depicted in cladograms are also present in dendrograms and other phylogenetic trees, they can be obscured by the visual arborization, the structural complexity, of these models. In cladograms, not only are these pathways readily apparent, is an immutable backbone.

Having been introduced to the structure and properties of cladograms, we can now explore their applications in biology by expanding our understanding of clades. Clades are defined by particular identifying features (synapomorphies) that taxa have in common. For example, as shown in the cladogram in figure 7, the embryos of fish, lizards, rabbits, and humans develop within amniotic sacs (a synapomorphy), and thus belong to the clade

ent, but by transposing taxa along the vertical axis at the proper nodes, the direct lineage of any taxon of interest can be easily visualized. Again, these manipulations do not modify the underlying scientific empirical facts in any way, any more than looking at a sculpture from different angles changes the sculpture itself. However, the viewer needs to be aware of this "polymorphic" property, or they could be misled into thinking that the main line

Amniota. All of these creatures have a vertebral column (another synapomorphy), as do lancelets and lampreys; thus, all belong to the clade Vertebrata. However, lancelets and lampreys do not have amniotic sacs, and so are excluded from the clade Amniota. Note also that the clade Amniota is nested in the clade Vertebrata, i.e., all members of clade Amniota are also members of clade Vertebrata, but not all vertebrates are amniotes.

Figure 6. Cladogram equivalence. In panel B, taxa D-E-F have been rotated 180° to appear as F-E-D, yet the topology—and, therefore, the evolutionary relationship it represents, is unchanged.

Figure 7. Cladogram with two clades (after https://bio.libretexts.org/workbench/general_ecology_ecology/chapter_7%3a_the_history_of_life_systematics_and_phylogeny/7.7%3a_phylogeny_and_cladistics)

Figure 8 depicts a wider spectrum of cladograms in general: 1) By convention, evolution (the development of taxa with new adaptive features) is depicted as proceeding from left to right.

evolutionary line for a particular taxon, the selection of which depends on how the cladogram is configured. This last characteristic is perhaps the most important for the purposes of this paper, which deals with human evolution. Recall that what appears to be the main line is entirely

dependent on how we "rotate" the taxa and clades in a cladogram, the topology of which is determined by true evolutionary relationships based on scientific data, and remains unchanged in that cladogram no matter how we view it. This is a subtle but profound distinction that will be developed in the rest of this paper.

The representative value of cladograms is that, because they are based on the appearance of evolving features, evolutionary progress in complexity and functionality can be easily seen. This property can evoke consternation among systematic biologists who hold

2) The main line has a positive slope to indicate, vaguely at least, the passage of evolutionary time. 3) The horizontal distance between taxa qualitatively reflects their evolutionary distance (biological difference). 4) The emergence of synapomorphies gives rise to new clades. 5) As evolution continues, specialization and complexity tend to increase and, therefore, the resulting clades generally become more focused, having smaller numbers of taxa included. However, there are many exceptions to this, and this characteristic should be taken as phenomenological. 6) The main line shows the direct

Figure 8. Broad spectrum cladogram withlabeled synapomorphies and clades (after https://srsscience.weebly.com/cladograms--dichotomous-key.html)

what has become a central dogma in evolutionary biology: that evolution has no purpose, no direction, and, therefore, no progression. The corollary of this viewpoint is that one form of life is not more "evolved" than another form of life. Taken to its logical extreme,

biocomplexity than their green algal ancestors by having specialized multicellular structures such as roots, stems, leaves, and flowers, which enable advanced nutrient transport, reproduction, and environmental adaptation. They also possess advanced genetic

regula-
paramecia are just as “advanced” as tion and co-evolutionary relationships
humans. Thus, any cladogram that with pollinators, reflecting increased
purports to show evolutionary progress ecological integration and evolution-
is considered to be anthropocentric ary innovation. In this cladogram, each
(Sandvik). Yet, undeniably, evolution- evolutionary step is a synapomorphy
ary progress does occur, in the form of that demarcates a clade. For example,
emerging biocomplexity (Zhang). One the evolution of multicellular embryos,
need not invoke any kind of teleology a synapomorphy that is the hallmark
to accept this fact; it is due to entire- of land plants, places plants ranging
ly natural, evolutionary mechanisms from liverworts to angiosperms in the
(Lenski et al.). clade Embryophyta (Lecointre and
To give an example of how clado- Le Guyader 175). In a similar man-
grams can clearly reveal the emergence ner, evolution of vascular tissue led to
of increasing biocomplexity in evolu- plants belonging to the clade Vasculata,
tion, we can examine a cladogram of and the evolution of seeds gave rise to
land plants (figure 9). This cladogram the clade Spermatophyta. In this clado-
shows some of the evolutionary steps gram, the evolutionary “progress” of
leading to the emergence of angio- plants from simple green algae to bio-
sperms from a green algal evolutionary logically advanced angiosperms can be
ancestor. Angiosperms exhibit greater easily seen.

Figure 9. Cladogram of plant evolution (after
https://www.bartleby.com/solution-answer/
chapter-27-problem-15tyu-biology-mindtap-course-list-11th-edition/9781337392938
/
evaluate-and-synthesize-15-interpret-data-according-to-the-cladogram-in-figure-
27-5-
which-plants/f02fcaab-560e-11e9-8385-02ee952b546e)

U C (pathways and emergence) that are less
U H E apparent with other methods (Ashlock).

As a representational tool, cladograms offer a different—and, as far as I can tell from my review of the Bahá'í-related literature, heretofore unexplored—way of visualizing 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on evolution. I emphasize here that viewing these statements through a cladistic lens is not re-interpreting scientific facts, not proposing a new theory of evolution, not discarding other representations of evolution such as phylogenetic trees, and above all, not re-interpreting the statements of 'Abdu'l-Bahá. Viewing human evolution by means of cladograms is simply using a well-accepted method to perceive evolutionary phenomena

Although it can be argued that there is an inherent anthropocentricism in the use of cladograms, nevertheless we can apply this method of viewing of human evolution if we keep the proper use of cladograms, described above, in mind.

We begin with figure 10, which shows a cladogram of human-related synapomorphies (indicated by dotted lines). In this figure, the term pleiomorphies refers to ancestral traits not shared with humans; synapomorphies refers to those traits shared with humans. The more primitive synapomorphies are lower in the cladogram. Taxa sharing the same synapomorphy are in the same clade. For example, the kangaroo, mouse, and human all have

hair, placing them in the "Hair" clade Mammalia; the kangaroo, however, though possessing a choriovitelline placenta, lacks the more developed chorioallantoic placenta (Themes), and thus does not belong to the "Placenta"

Some synapomorphies, from opposable thumbs to bipedalism, that distinguish primate taxa into smaller and smaller clades are labeled, but many more synapomorphies are not identified. In customary practice, cladograms

clade Placentae. Although the cladogram shown in figure 10 is extremely simplified—indeed, simplistic, showing only a few evolutionary steps—the main line of this cladogram clearly shows the direct evolutionary path for humans along with acquiring more characteristics of the current human species, Homo sapiens. Focusing on the order Primates, the cladogram in figure 11 shows the development of humans within this order.

Figure 10. Cladogram showing synapomorphies
(after https://rainbow.ldeo.columbia.edu/courses/v1001/cladogram1.html)

Figure 11. Primate cladogram
(after https://www.pinterest.com/pin/leventozgul1970-adl-kullancnn-evolution-panosundaki-pin--623678248370219145/)

Using the cladogram as a visualization tool—not to prove anything, but to better comprehend evolutionary relationships—we can now turn to some of the statements made by ‘Abdu’l-Bahá about human evolution. In so doing, the intention is not to advance a new interpretation of His statements, but rather to stimulate the reader to revisit ra-

U ‘A ’-B ’ S L C

encompasses all things and as far as human capacity permits, discovers their realities and becomes aware of the properties and effects, the characteristics and conditions of earthly things. (Some Answered Questions 241)

In approaching human evolution from a Bahá’í perspective, the fundamental tenet is: humans are separate from animals by reason of having

and deepen their own understanding of these statements.

S O The human spirit, which distinguishes man from the animal, is the rational soul, and these two terms—the human spirit and the rational soul—designate one and the same thing. This spirit, which in the terminology of the philosophers is called the rational soul, of its nobility and distinction that it encompasses them all. (Some Answered Questions 250)

The defining feature of the human being—the human essence, in the sense that ‘Abdu’l-Bahá discusses it—is spiritual, not physical. This should be borne in mind: while a cladogram can clarify the nature of human beings’ biological relationship to animals in a way that helps us view some of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on evolution in a new light—as I hope to demonstrate here—it does not directly speak to the core of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s argument, which focuses on the spiritual

tional souls. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá declares that

[T]he foremost degree of comprehension in the world of nature is that of the rational soul. This power and comprehension is shared in common by all men, whether they be heedless or aware, wayward or faithful. In the creation of God, the rational soul of man encompasses and is distinguished above all other created things: It is by virtue

that it is obscured by the structures of those models. The cladogram helps us see more clearly when specific synapomorphies appeared in human ancestors—including those synapomorphies alluded to in this statement by ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, namely the vertebral structure, the development of four limbs with bony digits that characterizes tetrapods and enabled vertebrates to live on land, and bipedalism. As a distinct clade in these cladograms, the question of whether the human being is an animal becomes essentially semantic. Consider that from a certain perspective, we can call all tetrapods—all amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and

birds—fish,
essence of the human being. since their last common ancestor with
modern fish was a creature we would
S T categorize as a fish or fish-like creature.
However, the development of the de-
The forms assumed by the human fining tetrapod synapomorphy, and the
embryo in its successive changes further development of the synapomor-
do not prove that it is animal in its phies that characterize each of those
essential character. . . . Realizing animal groups, make it more mean-
this we may acknowledge the fact ingful in most contexts to call a reptile
that at one time man was an in- a reptile, a mammal a mammal, etc.,
mate of the sea, at another period rather than thinking of them as "fish."
an invertebrate, then a vertebrate It is similarly reasonable to argue that
and finally a human being stand- humans are both within Animalia and
ing erect. Though we admit these yet defined by distinguishing features
changes, we cannot say man is an that set them apart. And while some of
animal . . . (Promulgation 359) these are synapomorphies of the kind
considered by evolutionary biology
The straightforward meaning of this (morphological features such as biped-
statement can be easily visualized by the alism and large brain size), the most
main line depicting human evolution in distinguishing "synapomorphy" from a
figures 10, 11, and 12. I re-emphasize Bahá'í perspective is the actualization
that this direct lineage is also evidenced and appearance of the human spirit. We
in phylogenetic trees and other rep- will examine this more closely in the
resentations of human evolution, but concluding remarks.

Figure 12. Human evolutionary line from anancestor common to other life forms (after https://www.pinterest.com/pin/189573465546096403/)

S T in 'Abdu'l-Bahá's time. A missing link
would imply direct descent from the
The lost link of Darwinian theory other primates: chimpanzees, gorillas,
is itself a proof that man is not an etc. Rather than a missing link, humans
animal. How is it possible to have shared a MRCA at earlier points in

evo-
all the links present and that im- lutionary history with each of the other
portant link absent? Its absence is primates shown in figure 13. This is a
an indication that man has never subtle but profound distinction. Rather
been an animal. It will never be than “direct descent” as it was under-
found. (Promulgation 359). stood in ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s time, what
really occurred was successive diver-
Figure 13 is a simplified primate gence: the splitting off of preceeding
cladogram showing the evolutionary taxa over time. The notion of a “miss-
relationships between humans and oth- ing link” has been dismissed in modern
er primates. The bifurcations along the evolutionary biology (Williams and
backbone indicate the points at which Ebach 1), just as ‘Abdu’l-Bahá predict-
other primates diverged from the hu- ed that it would be.
man evolutionary line. Each node of Now, what of the evolutionary line
these bifurcations represents the most prior to each of the MRCAs shown
recent common ancestor (MRCA) of in figure 13? We may consider some
all clades above the node. The clado- of these evolutionary predecessors
gram clearly shows that, indeed, there as having the potential of evolving
is no “missing link” in the sense held into higher organisms, even though

in actual form and function these from the chemical combination of hy-
predecessors possessed none of the drogen and oxygen.
outward characteristics of the higher This concept can be applied to the
organisms. This potentiality is indi- emergence of humans, although in this
cated ipso facto by the subsequent case the emergence is more gradual
emergence of more advanced spe- and, therefore, not as obvious at any
cies. A mystery of the phenomenon given step. This potential for emer-
of emergence is that the properties of gence existed in the evolutionary line

an emergent entity, whether physical (e.g., a mineral) or biological (e.g., a species) are not found in its predecessor entities; in other words, the predecessors will not themselves display the newly emergent properties. To use a physicochemical example, a molecule of water, H2O, is composed of two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen, yet neither elemental hydrogen nor oxygen have any of the physical properties of water: its fluidity, viscosity, boiling point, etc. The potential characteristics of water are only realized when water "emerges"

preceding the MRCAs of humans, chimpanzees, and other primates. 'Abdu'l-Bahá alludes to this emergence when He states, "from the beginning the embryo possesses all perfections, such as the spirit, the mind, sight, smell, and taste—in a word, all the powers—but they are invisible and become apparent only gradually" (Some Answered Questions 229). The gradual emergence of the human line with the successive divergence of each subsequent MRCA supports the concept of the potentiality of humans in evolutionary deep time.

Figure 13. Simplified primate cladogram (after https://www.researchgate.net/figure/cladogram-depicting-the-phylogenetic-relations-among-seven-primates-adapted-from_fig1_279854352)

There is, of course, a point in evolutionary history when early humans (in biology, hominins) physically appeared on the earth. This appearance may be considered an inflection point between human "potentiality" and human "actuality" in the evolutionary sense used here. This biological emergence

S F

[T]he antecedence of animals to man is not a proof that the essence of the human species was altered or transformed or that man came from the animal kingdom. For so long as it is acknowledged that

gence conceivably could have been after the divergence of the last primate/human MRCA. This would be in accord with a statement of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá that “…it is possible that man simply came into existence after the animal” (Some Answered Questions 221).

This concept is developed further in Statement Four.

these different beings have appeared in time, it is possible that man simply came into existence after the animal. Thus we observe that the in the vegetable kingdom fruits of different trees do not appear all at once; on the contrary, some appear earlier in the season and others later. This priority is not a proof that the later fruit of one tree was produced from the earlier fruit of another. (Some Answered Questions 221)

Figure 14. Cladogram showing evolutionary divergence between humans and other primates (Ma = megaannum = millions of years ago) (after https://www.researchgate.net/figure/phylogenetic-tree-of-primates-cladogram-showing-the-evolutionary-divergence-between_fig1_336892351)

The cladograms shown in figures 11, 12, 13, and 14 express this phenomenon. To see this, it is important to note that each of the non-human groups (chimpanzees, gorillas, etc.) did not appear at the evolutionary time of the related MRCA; these groups gradually evolved into their present state just as humans did. (This is why, prosimians.

all past and present existing entities in the physical creation are “fruits” of the one “tree” of creation—and consonant with Statement Four, the prior appearance of these “fruits” is not a proof that the later fruit of one tree was produced from the earlier fruit of another: humans did not directly descend from chimpanzees, monkeys, or

for example, it is incorrect to say that "humans descended from chimpanzees"; rather, both chimpanzees and humans evolved from a MRCA.) Thus, the topmost horizontal row of each cladogram represents the "fruits" of and transthe different evolutionary "trees" (i.e., the different evolutionary pathways shown in the cladograms). For exambe ple, the cladogram in Figure 14 cleartransly shows that prosimians represent an "earlier fruit" appearing earlier in the evolutionary "season" from a "differmaturity, as was ent tree."(The cladogram in Figure 14 exmay appear as a single tree, but this is once only because each evolutionary pathtail: way for chimpanzees, gorillas, etc. is is simplified to a single line; if mapped at the a higher resolution that included more evolutionary ancestors and their taxonomic branches, each line in Figure 14 would appear as a tree in its own from right.) Alternatively, 'Abdu'l-Bahá's to a disstatement makes sense if we consider the "main line" of Figure 14 to be like the soil from which a number of trees (portrayed as simple lines in the parcladogram) grew, with each species in those trees being "fruits." This in no recapitulates phy-

S F

Let us suppose that man once bore a resemblance to the animal and that he has since evolved and transformed. Accepting this statement does not prove the transformation of species, but could instead be likened to the changes and formations that the human embryo undergoes before reaching its full development and earlier mentioned. To be more explicit, let us suppose that man once walked on all fours or had a tail:

This change and transformation is similar to that of the fetus in the womb of the mother. Even though the fetus develops and evolves in every possible way before it reaches its full development, from the beginning it belongs to a distinct species. (Some Answered Questions 223)

Here, 'Abdu'l-Bahá draws a parallel between human embryogenesis, wherein "ontogeny recapitulates phy-

way contradicts, or is contradicted by, other statements in the Writings that all of creation is essentially one—clearly, the long evolutionary history leading to the appearance of species Homo sapiens, humans have always been human in potentiality. A human embryo is always human regardless of how it may transiently appear in utero. It takes time for the embryo to develop into a baby to enter the extrauterine world. In similar fashion, it took time for human form and capacity to be realized in the natural world, allowing the human spirit, the rational soul, to manifest. The MRCA of humans and any other species—be it chimpanzee, gorilla, or shark—gave rise to divergent lineages through its offspring, one eventually leading to humans and the other to another species. While this ancestor was not human in the taxonomic sense, it can be metaphorically viewed as an embryonic stage in humanity's development, representing a form oriented toward the eventual

logeny"[7] and human phylogenesis.

[7] The concept that "ontogeny

a cladogram—culminating in a biological structure capable of manifesting the human spirit or rational soul.

Stepping back from all interpretations and speculations on the meaning of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements on human evolution, there is, I believe, a fundamental grounding principle, formulated by William Whewell and quoted by Darwin himself in the preface of On the Origin of Species, that we must keep in mind:

> But with regard to the material world, we can at least go so far as this—we can perceive that events are brought about not by insulated interpositions of Divine power, exerted in each particular case, but by

emergence of human-specific traits.

This perspective rejects the notion of a separate, non-animal lineage evolving into humans, and instead affirms that the human form arose from a continuous line of "proto-human" ancestors—traceable along the backbone of recapitulates phylogeny" was first formulated by Étienne Serres in the 1820s, based on the work of Johann Friedrich Meckel, and is known as the Meckel-Serres Law (Dupont). Championed by Ernst Haeckel in his General Morphology of Organisms in 1866, it was widely accepted up through the time of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's statements. Since then, this concept has been largely discredited (Linhard). However, the point that 'Abdu'l-Bahá was making still applies.

the establishment of general laws.

Bahá'ís are in full agreement with this statement. The fundamental position in Bahá'í belief is that the natural universe, together with its underlying physical laws, were created by God ('Abdu'l-Bahá, Promulgation 462–63). They believe that the natural world and its laws are the manifestations of God's creative power, and that nature reflects God's will. Moreover, Bahá'ís understand that physical reality is not a fixed and static creation, but a dynamic and ongoing emanation from God, who sustains it by His will:

> God the Creator is God the Creating (J. Hatcher, Purpose 48).

Furthermore,

> Bahá'ís accept that evolution operates according to consistent and universal natural laws that never deviate from their course; science can therefore investigate these universal laws without need of invoking divine "tinkering" in

about the thing that it represents, we can say that when given the necessary data and when properly applied, cladograms can clearly reveal emergent biocomplexity and the evolutionary pathways of any species, genus, fam-

a mechanistic sense. Based on these premises, we can infer that human evolution is coherent and compatible with scientific investigation—it can be fully explained by natural mechanisms, both deterministic and stochastic—and yet still is purposeful and progressive, and reveals the signs of God. Yet the central dogma of current biology is that evolution is purposeless and directionless, that progressive evolution is an illusion, that there is no hierarchical order to life, and—especially—that humankind occupies no special station in life (Kadykalo). Cladograms cannot disprove this belief—or any philosophical interpretation of evolution, theistic or atheistic. Indeed, in spite of their having been criticized as being inherently anthropocentric, introducing an unintended bias in their presentation (Sandvik), we have seen that a cladogram can be arranged so as to give to the unwary reader the appearance that any species—from the human to the

ily, order, etc., efflorescing into the majestic diversity of life—including Homo sapiens.

Returning to the definition of a clade: a group of taxa that 1) share a common ancestor, and, therefore, 2) have an exclusive evolutionary history; and 3) possess one or more synapomorphies composed of characteristics, traits, and functional capabilities from molecular to organismal levels. Clades are established by genetics and other molecular studies, paleontology and paleobiology, systematic morphology, and ethology. Thus, cladistics is grounded in scientific research that is current, rigorous, and well accepted. This grounding allows us to use cladistics as a valid technique to help us consider human evolution in light of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on the subject.

Archaic species of genus Homo evolved after the advent of bipedalism include H. habilis, H. erectus, H. hei-

hagfish—was the main driving purpose of evolution. So what can cladograms do, and why have I suggested that they can help reveal that the apparent tension between some of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s statements on evolution and contemporary science is illusory?

Remembering that every model or map has a particular function, and draws out a particular, partial truth

delbergensis, H. neanderthalensis, and H. floresiensis. Along with H. sapiens, these taxa are assigned to the tribe Hominini, which includes chimpanzees and bonobos. Archaic and modern humans are further classified in subtribe Hominina, and chimpanzees and bonobos are classified in subtribe Panina, genus Pan. The last common ancestor between Pan and Homo lived

at least five, and perhaps as early as seven, million years ago (Tocheri et al.).

Within this taxonomic structure, genus Homo could be assigned to its own clade based on these established synapomorphies: bipedalism (Leutenegger), genetic homology (Coleman), a significantly larger cranial capacity (Stanyon et al.), complex linguistics (Tattersall; Corballis), and culture formation employing fire, tools, and art (Lake). Current scientific evidence suggests that differences in mental abilities between apes and humans are gradual (Penny). This is consistent with evolutionary development as a whole: ethological studies repeatedly demonstrate rudimentary thought and feeling in lower mammals, suggesting that this distinction is

Answered Questions 250). An appropriate designation for this clade might include be: Rationalis.

Some advantages of cladistics (Ashlock):

1. It is grounded in evolutionary theory and is complementary to, not incompatible with, other methodologies in phylogenetics.
2. It is based on empirical data with diverse properties, obtained from separate methods and sources, which improves classification validity.
3. It is quite useful for

studying
in degree, not kind. Others, however, such as the biological anthropologist and linguist Terrence Deacon, see this in a different light. In Deacon's words,

"Biologically, we are just another ape. Mentally, we are a new phylum of organisms" (23). In biological taxonomy, Phylum is a classification rank positioned just below Kingdom, representing a significantly different evolutionary category (Williams and Ebach 31). For humans, therefore, perhaps a more exclusive clade could be derived based on the one "synapomorphy" that is unique, 'Abdu'l-Bahá attests, among the entire range of life: the rational soul, which He describes as possessing moral will and a consciousness capable of transcending nature and perceiving the Light of God (Some

evolutionary relationships in all the major specialties of biology from botany to zoology.

4. It is particularly good at visualizing evolutionary history in terms of phenetics and evolutionary development (Harrison).

Taken collectively, these advantages make cladistics an ideal approach to understanding evolution in general and, for our interests, human evolution in particular. More importantly, this approach offers a platform for higher discourse with wider communities, lay and scientific alike.

David Williams and Malte Ebach, co-authors of the standard textbook on cladistics have said, "cladistics is classification" (403, original emphasis). In

biology, classification in general can be problematic for several reasons that apply to cladistics:

1. Cladistics isn't well suited to accommodate reticulate evolution (Sneath), i.e., evolution that occurs from the lateral exchange of genetic information by horizon-

———. The Promulgation of Universal Peace. Edited by Howard MacNutt, 2nd ed., US Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1982.

Arnold, Brian J., et al. "Horizontal Gene Transfer and Adaptive Evolution in Bacteria." Nature Reviews Microbiology, vol. 20, no. 4, Apr. 2022, pp.

206–
tal gene transfer, etc. (Belal and 18.
doi.org/10.1038/s41579-
Heath). Horizontal gene transfer 021-00650-4.
can occur in bacteria, for example, Ashlock, Peter D. “The Uses of
Cladis-
by generalized transduction from tics.” Annual Review of
Ecol-
viral infection (Arnold et al.). ogy and Systematics, vol. 5,
2. Cladistics is better at incor- 1974, pp. 81–99.
porating some types of data than Belal, Nahla A., and Lenwood S.
others. For example, it is not an Heath. “A Complete Theoret-
ideal classification system for fos- ical Framework for Inferring
sil records that are incomplete and Horizontal Gene Transfers
lacking information about evolu- Using Partial Order Sets.”
tionary relationships (Grantham). PLOS ONE, edited by Vladi-
3. Cladistics can be restrictive, mir Makarenkov, vol. 18, no.
limiting the inclusion of subtly di- 3, Mar. 2023, p. e0281824.
verse taxa (Christoffersen). This is d o i .o r g /10.1371/ j o u
r n a l .
a criticism of taxonomy in general. pone.0281824.
Brooks, Daniel R., et al. “Charac-
Cladistics is focused on the classi- ter-Based Cladistics and An-
fication of known taxa rather than the swer Set Programming.”
Prac-
discovery of unknown taxa (Williams tical Aspects of Declarative
and Ebach 396). This is not a disadvan- Languages, edited by Manuel
tage per se, it merely reflects the focus V. Hermenegildo and Daniel
of any classification methodology. Cabeza, vol. 3350, Springer
Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, pp.
37–51. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-
W C 540-30557-6_5.
Brown, Keven, and Eberhard von
‘Abdu’l-Bahá. Some Answered Ques- Kitzing. Evolution and
Bahá’í
tions. Edited by Laura Drey- Belief: ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s Re-
fus-Barney, Newly revised sponse to Nineteenth-Century
ed., Bahá’í World Centre, Darwinism. Kalimát Press,
2014. 2001.

Christoffersen, Martin L. “Cladistic Taxonomy, Phylogenetic Systematics, and Evolutionary Ranking.” Systematic Biology, vol. 44, no. 3, Sept. 1995, p. 440. doi.org/10.2307/2413605.
Coleman, Jude. “Human-Evolution Story Rewritten by Fresh Data and More Computing Power.” Nature, May 2023, pp. d41586-023-01664-z. doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01664-z.

Corballis, Michael. “The Giant Leap to Humankind.” New Zealand Science Review,
vol. 67, no. 2, Dec. 2023, pp. 60–62. doi.org/10.26686/nzsr.v67.8899.
Cracraft, Joel. “Pattern and Process in Paleobiology: The Role of Cladistic Analysis
in Systematic Paleontology.” Paleobiology, vol. 7, no. 4, 1981, pp. 456–68.
Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species: By Means of Natural Selection of the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. Royal Collector’s edition, Royal Classics, 2020.
Deacon, Terrence William. The Symbolic Species: The Co-Evolution of Language and the Brain. Norton, 1998.
DeWitt, Richard. Worldviews: An Introduction to the History and Philosophy of Science. 3rd ed, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2018.
Donaldson, Bryan. On the Originality of Species: The Convergence of Evolutionary Science and the Baha’i Teachings. Akka Publishing House, 2023.
Dupont, Jean-Claude. “Historical Perspective on Neuroembryology: Wilhelm His
and His Contemporaries.” Genesis, vol. 56, no. 6–7, June 2018, p. e23218. doi.org/10.1002/dvg.23218.
Faith, Daniel P., and Peter S. Cranston. “Could a Cladogram This Short Have Arisen
by Chance Alone?: On Permutation Tests for Cladistic Structure.” Cladistics, vol. 7, no. 1, 1991, pp. 1–28. doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-0031.1991.tb00020.x.
Fentress, John C. “Ethological Models of Hierarchy and Patterning of Species-Specific Behavior.” Motivation, edited by Evelyn Satinoff and Philip Teitelbaum, Springer US, 1983, pp. 185–234. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-4286-1_5.
Fuellen, Georg. “Homology and Phylogeny and Their Automated Inference.” Naturwissenschaften, vol. 95, no. 6, June 2008, pp. 469–81. doi.org/10.1007/s00114-008-0348-1.
Gavryushkina, Alexandra, et al. “Bayesian Inference of Sampled Ancestor Trees for Epidemiology and Fossil Calibration.” PLoS Computational Biology, edited by Katia Koelle, vol. 10, no. 12, Dec. 2014, p. e1003919. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003919.
Gould, Stephen Jay. Wonderful Life: The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History.
Norton & Co, 1990.
Grantham, Todd. “The Role of Fossils in Phylogeny Reconstruction: Why Is It So Difficult to Integrate Paleobiological and Neontological Evolutionary Biology?” Biology & Philosophy, vol. 19, no. 5, Nov. 2004, pp. 687–720. doi.org/10.1007/s10539-005-0370-z.

Gregory, T. Ryan. “Understanding Evolutionary Trees.” Evolution: Education and
Outreach, vol. 1, no. 2, Apr. 2008, pp. 121–37. doi.org/10.1007/s12052-008-0035-x.

———. “Understanding Natural Selection: Essential Concepts and Common Misconceptions.” Evolution: Education and Outreach, vol. 2, no. 2, 2, June 2009, pp. 156–75. doi.org/10.1007/s12052-009-0128-1.
Haeckel, Ernst. “The History of Creation, Vol. 1.” The Project Gutenberg eBook of the History of Creation, www.gutenberg.org/files/40472/40472-h/40472-h.htm. Accessed 8 Feb. 2024.
Haque, Omar. Phylogenetics: Evolutionary Relationships and Classification. Britannica. www.britannica.com/science/phylogenetics. Accessed 8 Feb. 2024.
Harrison, Terry. “Cladistic Concepts and the Species Problem in Hominoid Evolution.” Species, Species Concepts and Primate Evolution, edited by William H. Kimbel and Lawrence B. Martin, Springer US, 1993, pp. 345–71. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-3745-2_14.
Hatcher, John S. Close Connections: The Bridge Between Spiritual and Physical Reality. US Bahá’í Publishing, 2005.
———. The Purpose of Physical Reality: The Kingdom of Names. Bahá’í Publishing Trust, 1987.
Hatcher, William S. “A Scientific Proof of the Existence of God.” The Journal of Bahá’í Studies, vol. 5, no. 4, Dec. 1993, pp. 1–16. doi.org/10.31581/jbs-5.4.1(1993).
———. “Epilogue on Neo-Darwinian Theory.” William S. Hatcher Library, 2008, william.hatcher.org/media/articles/epilogue-on-neo-darwinian-theory. Accessed 8 Feb. 2024.
Henning, Willi. Phylogenetic Systematics 1966. 1966. Internet Archive, archive.org/details/hennig-phylogenetic-systematics-1966.
Huelsenbeck, John P., Fredrik Ronquist, et al. “Bayesian Inference of Phylogeny and Its Impact on Evolutionary Biology.” Science, vol. 294, no. 5550, Dec. 2001, pp. 2310–14. doi.org/10.1126/science.1065889.
Huelsenbeck, John P., Jonathan P. Bollback, et al. “Inferring the Root of a Phylogenetic Tree.” Systematic Biology, edited by R. Olmstead, vol. 51, no. 1, Jan. 2002, pp. 32–43. doi.org/10.1080/106351502753475862.
Kadykalo, Andrii. “Scientific and Theological Responses for Evolution and Biological Complexity.” Scientia et Fides, vol. 8, no. 2, Oct. 2020, pp. 351–69. doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2020.025.
Khursheed, Anjam. Science and Religion: Towards the Restoration of an Ancient Harmony. Oneworld Publications, 1987.
Kluge, Ian. “Some Answered Questions: A Philosophical Perspective.” Lights of Irfán, vol. 10, Irfán Colloquia, 2009, pp. 149–274, bahai-library.com/kluge_saq_philosophical_perspective.

Lake, Mark. “Archaeological Inference and the Explanation of Hominid Evolution.” The Archaeology of Human Ancestry: Power, Sex and Tradition, edited by Stephen Shennan and James Steele, Routledge, 2005, pp. 184–201. doi.org/10.4324/9780203974131.
Lample, Paul, editor. Bahá’u’lláh’s Teachings on Spiritual Reality. Palabra Publications, 1996.
Lecointre, Guillaume, and Hervé Le Guyader. The Tree of Life: A Phylogenetic Classification. Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2006.
Lenski, Richard E., et al. “The Evolutionary Origin of Complex Features.” Nature, vol. 423, no. 6936, May 2003, pp. 139–44. doi.org/10.1038/nature01568.
Leutenegger, Walter. “Origin of Hominid Bipedalism.” Nature, vol. 325, no. 6102, Jan. 1987, pp. 305–305. doi.org/10.1038/325305c0.
Linhard, Tina. “Early Embryonic Morphology and Its Changing Forms.” Journal of Prenatal and Perinatal Psychology and Health, vol. 32, no. 2, Winter 2017, pp. 1–15.
Lipps, Jere H., et al. Evolution of Biologic Complexity: Evidence from Geology, Paleontology, and Molecular Biology. Edited by Richard B. Hoover, 1998, pp. 138–48. doi.org/10.1117/12.319851.
Loehle, Craig. “On Human Origins: A Bahá’í Perspective.” The Journal of Bahá’í Studies, vol. 2, no. 4, Dec. 1990, pp. 45–58. doi.org/10.31581/jbs-2.4.3(1990).
Losos, Jonathan B., et al. “Evolutionary Biology for the 21st Century.” PLOS Biology, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan. 2013, p. e1001466. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001466.
MacLean, Evan L., et al. “How Does Cognition Evolve? Phylogenetic Comparative Psychology.” Animal Cognition, vol. 15, no. 2, Mar. 2012, pp. 223–38. doi.org/10.1007/s10071-011-0448-8.
Martincorena, Iñigo, and Nicholas M. Luscombe. “Non-random Mutation: The Evolution of Targeted Hypermutation and Hypomutation.” BioEssays, vol. 35, no. 2, Feb. 2013, pp. 123–30. doi.org/10.1002/bies.201200150.
Matthews, Gary. The Challenge of Bahá’u’lláh. Stonehaven Press, 1993.
Mavrodiev, Evgeny V., and Alexander Madorsky. “On Pattern-Cladistic Analyses Based on Complete Plastid Genome Sequences.” Acta Biotheoretica, vol. 71, no. 4, Dec. 2023, p. 22. doi.org/10.1007/s10441-023-09475-5.
Mehanian, Courosh, and Stephen Friberg. “Religion and Evolution Reconciled: ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s Comments on Evolution.” The Journal of Bahá’í Studies, vol. 13, nos. 1–4, Dec. 2003, pp. 55–93. doi.org/10.31581/jbs-13.1-4.3(2003).
Nadimi, Bahman. Bahá’í View on Biological Evolution. 2023, bahai-library.com/

nadimi_view_biological_evolution.
O'Brien, Stephen J., et al. "A Molecular Solution to the Riddle of the Giant Panda's Phylogeny." Nature, vol. 317, no. 6033, Sept. 1985, pp. 140–44. doi.org/10.1038/317140a0.

Oskooi, Salman. When Science and Religion Merge: A Modern Case Study. 2009. San Diego State University. bahai-library.com/oskooi_disharmony_science_religion.
Panchen, Alec L. Classification, Evolution, and the Nature of Biology. 1st ed., Cambridge UP, 1992. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511565557.
Penny, David. "The Continuity of Mind, from Great Apes to Humans." New Zealand Science Review, vol. 67, no. 2, Dec. 2023, pp. 63–69. doi.org/10.26686/nzsr.v67.8900.
Perry, Douglas. "Review of On the Originality of Species: The Convergence of Evolutionary Science and Baha'i Teachings." The Journal of Bahá'í Studies, vol. 34, no. 1–4, Dec. 2024, pp. 138–48. doi.org/10.31581/jbs-34.1-4.572(2024).
Sandvik, Hanno. "Anthropocentricisms in Cladograms." Biology & Philosophy, vol. 24, no. 4, Sept. 2009, pp. 425–40. doi.org/10.1007/s10539-007-9102-x.
Sneath, P. H. A. "Cladistic Representation of Reticulate Evolution." Systematic Biology, vol. 24, no. 3, Sept. 1975, pp. 360–68. doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/24.3.360.
Stanyon, R., et al. "Cranial Capacity in Hominid Evolution." Human Evolution, vol. 8, no. 3, July 1993, pp. 205–16. doi.org/10.1007/BF02436715.
Tattersall, Ian. "An Evolutionary Framework for the Acquisition of Symbolic Cognition by Homo Sapiens." Comparative Cognition & Behavior Reviews, vol. 3, 2008. doi.org/10.3819/ccbr.2008.30006.
Themes, Ufo. Placentation. May 2017, https://veteriankey.com/placentation-2/.
Tocheri, Matthew W., et al. "The Evolutionary History of the Hominin Hand since the Last Common Ancestor of Pan and Homo." Journal of Anatomy, vol. 212, no. 4, Apr. 2008, pp. 544–62. doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2008.00865.x.
The Universal House of Justice. Messages from the Universal House of Justice 1963-1986: Third Epoch of the Formative Age. Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1996. bahai-library.com/uhj_messages_1963_1986.
———.Letter dated 5 July 2010. In Bryan Donaldson On the Originality of Species, Akka Publishing House, 2023.
White, W. Timothy J., et al. "Beyond Reasonable Doubt: Evolution from DNA Sequences." PLOS ONE, vol. 8, no. 8, Aug. 2013, p. e69924. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0069924.

Williams, David M., and Malte C. Ebach. Cladistics: A Guide to Biological Classification. Third edition, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
Zhang, Zhibin. “Concepts, Measurements and Scientific Problems of Biocomplexity.” Integrative Zoology, vol. 2, no. 2, June 2007, pp. 100–10. doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-4877.2007.00049.x.

— A New Perspective on Human Evolution (Used by permission of the curator)