

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 26 Issue 2

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

November 2021

SCIENCE IS DEAD

It was Darwin who drew first blood.

Many people don't even know what science is. Last month, an Internet troll attacked one of our readers on Facebook by saying,

[Name] you do realize most of science is based on theory, right? Science has never been based on fact. A hypothesis is a guess. None of it has really been "proven".

It isn't surprising she said this because this is what children are being taught in school. "Science has never been based on fact" is as wrong as can be. Science has always been based on fact. From the mass of a carbon atom to the boiling point of water, every aspect of science has been proved through experiment after experiment.

When we sent men to the Moon, we weren't guessing how much thrust would be produced by a 3-second rocket burn, or exactly where the Moon would be by the time we got there. We knew how much fuel and oxygen we would need. We knew how long it would take radio signals to get from Earth to the spacecraft. We knew exactly what had to be done to get there safely because countless experiments had been done to simulate what would happen.

The wonderful thing about science is that everything science says is true. You can trust science because everything has been impartially verified through experimentation. At least, that's how it used to be.

But now science is dead, and has been replaced by philosophy masquerading as science. The word "consensus" is a tell-tale sign. There is no consensus (no majority opinion) in science. If consensus is involved, it means that the truth has not been determined experimentally. Politicians routinely claim that their beliefs are "scientific" in

an attempt to make them unquestionable. It's just a cheap trick.

IT'S DARWIN'S FAULT

What killed science? We put much of the blame on Darwin. Experimental verification had to be removed from the definition of science to make the theory of evolution "scientific."

Darwin suggested that life began in a warm pond, and animals could produce offspring with novel innovations, despite overwhelming experimental evidence to the contrary. Louis Pasteur proved that life cannot originate from non-life. That's real science. But the theory of evolution depends upon dead chemicals organizing themselves into a living cell, which evolved into multicellular organisms capable of unlimited variation. The theory of evolution depends upon the accidental evolution of blood, and a heart to pump it through lungs to the rest of the body. The theory of evolution is as unscientific as it can be.

The theory of evolution is nothing more than wishful thinking by a consensus of scientists. Once that door was opened, anything believed by people with doctoral degrees became "the truth." People have been brainwashed by teachers with a political agenda who told them, "Science is progressive. The truth changes as we learn more." This led to all sorts of nonscientific nonsense being accepted as science. (For example, non-binary sex, the "existential threat" of climate change, and Critical Race Theory.)

THOUGHTLESSNESS

People have become so intimidated by experts that they don't think for themselves. They will believe anything they have been told by an

authority.

Consider this exchange on our Facebook page in which Charles and Hunter claimed we are spreading lies; but when pressed could not come up with a single example.

Charles M. Mashtare III to ScienceAgainstEvolution.info: Jesus doesn't like lies. your errors are obvious and have been pointed out to you many times

ScienceAgainstEvolution.info to Charles M. Mashtare III: Please! Point out our obvious errors in any of our newsletters.

Charles M. Mashtare III to ScienceAgainstEvolution.info: my point is that Many people already have, you said they have not, you lied. you lied. you lied. you are not what you claim you are. good people don't lie. you do.

ScienceAgainstEvolution.info to Charles M. Mashtare III: Please name one person who has pointed out one of our obvious errors.

Hunter McGee to ScienceAgainstEvolution.info: No one who cares about facts bothers to read these kinds of articles, hence why no one cares to point out all the mistakes.

Brändøen Danyels to Hunter McGee: go ahead and point out "all of the mistakes" for me.

Hunter McGee to Brändøen Danyels: All I had to do was barely skim it to see at least 3 claims made with absolutely zero evidence to support what they claim.

ScienceAgainstEvolution.info to Hunter McGee: What were those 3 claims?

Justin Pingle to Hunter McGee: waiting...

Hunter McGee to Justin Pingle: For what? Read the article yourself if you're capable.

Justin Pingle to Hunter McGee: that's what we expected

We sometimes get email asking for advice on what to say to evolutionists. It doesn't matter what you say if they won't listen. Charles and Hunter have not read anything we have written—but they are sure we are lying because experts have told them the theory of evolution is true.

SOURCE MATERIAL

On the other hand, last year I spent \$268.99 on subscriptions to professional science journals (*Nature*, *Science*) and \$302.95 on subscriptions to science tabloids (*National Geographic*, *Scientific American*, *Discover*, *New Scientist*, and *Science News*) and more on books. Over the past 25 years, I've spent about \$14,000 to learn the latest thinking about the theory of evolution because I want to know what evolutionists think. Our critics can't be bothered to read a single issue of our

newsletter for free.

Internet trolls have criticized me for "carefully" picking which articles to discuss. Should I pick the articles carelessly instead? ☺ Last week's issue (4 November 2021) of *Nature* contained an article titled, "Signatures of bosonic Landau levels in a finite-momentum superconductor." I admit that I didn't read that article because I assumed it didn't have anything to do with evolution. I may have missed some articles about evolution because I misjudged the article by its title; but I read every article that seemed to be relevant to the theory of evolution. If I missed one, I'm sorry.

In the early years, I tore all the evolution articles out of those magazines each month, and had a hard time choosing which ones to discuss in our newsletter because there were too many to address them all. These days, it is much harder to find articles about evolution to review. That's partly because magazines are so full of COVID articles there aren't many pages left for other articles. But even before COVID, there were fewer evolution articles in the literature.

Research isn't as pure and noble as academics would like you to believe. Research follows the money. There is more money in research grants for COVID, climate change, gender studies, and other things politicians would rather fund in order to advance their agenda than there is money for the theory of evolution.

The evolution money is drying up, so there aren't as many evolution articles in the literature. There are probably two reasons for that. First, evolutionists have drilled too many dry holes. The more they study evolution, the more evidence against the theory they find because real science is against evolution.

The second reason is that the theory of evolution has always been about religion, not science. The theory of evolution is the atheists' best weapon against Christianity. Since Christianity has become increasingly irrelevant in recent years, it isn't the threat to atheism it once was. (But, as is clearly seen from the vitriolic attacks by Internet trolls, there are still a few atheists who are terribly frightened by the possibility of a god.)

LIES

We are not affected in the slightest by accusations that what we write is "all lies" because we know everything we write is true, and has not been twisted or distorted in any way to reach a false conclusion. If we lied, we would feel guilty about it, regardless of whether or not anyone called us liars. Furthermore, none of the people who have called us "liars" have given a

specific example of anything we have written that isn't true.

It is easy to prove when a politician lies—just play the video tape of him telling the lie. **If we had ever lied, it would be easy to prove** it by noting, “On page X of Volume Y, Issue Z, of *Disclosure* it says [something untrue].” Nobody has done that because there aren't any lies in a single one of the more than 820 articles we have published over the past 25 years.

On the other hand, the statement, “All I had to do was barely skim it to see at least 3 claims made with absolutely zero evidence to support what they claim,” seems to be untrue because the person making the statement was unable to answer the question, “What were those 3 claims?” **The inability to give specific examples is evidence that the accusation is false.**

MISTAKES

On rare occasions, we have made mistakes which we corrected as soon as they were detected. In one instance, the data in an article in *Science* was mislabeled. When an alert reader questioned the numbers, we found the error (in the *Science* article) and published a correction.¹

AMBIGUITY

Groucho Marx famously said, “Last night I shot an elephant in my pajamas. (Why it was wearing my pajamas, I'll never know.)” If we said that, a critic might say that even a baby elephant could not possibly fit in my pajamas to discredit us. They try to misinterpret us on purpose. So, we try to be as unambiguous as possible. If there are cases where we have failed to explain our position clearly, we welcome questions which alert us to the fact that our position might be misinterpreted, and we will correct the misunderstanding immediately. I, not the elephant, was wearing my pajamas when the shooting occurred.

ASSUMPTIONS

Creationists' sites have their standard talking points, and evolutionists' sites have their standard responses. It appears that our critics assume that we make the same points as the creationists do, and simply parrot the evolutionary responses without even bothering to read our articles. Their rebuttals are irrelevant because they try to refute arguments we didn't make.

This suggests two things to us. First, our critics think they know what we are going to say

¹ *Disclosure*, August 2012, “U-Series Correction”, <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v16i11f.htm>

without reading it. They are ignorant of our position, and intentionally choose to remain ignorant by refusing to read what we have written.

Second, It is also possible that they are incapable of independent thought. They have been told the proper evolutionary statements and simply repeat them whether they understand them or not.

For example, evolutionists have posted these statements on our Facebook page.

Science has never been based on fact.

Science cannot deny evolution. In this case perhaps its explanations are not found valid by some, but remember there are facts and there are theories. Some of our facts may be found wrong later as we discover more. But evolution is a reality and any science saying otherwise is not science.

We will probably find out the origin of life may be some form of physics that may not even exist any longer, given the billions of years the universe has been around. Given that physics itself may be "evolving". We may not be able to observe how life began any longer.

Real science is based on experimental verification, not “some form of physics that may not even exist any longer.” Children mindlessly repeat things like these which they have been taught not to question in school.

Science, as it was in the late 20th Century, is dead. It was replaced by statements posing as scientific truth because the theory of evolution isn't scientific.

Evolution in the News

TUSK CONFUSION

War didn't cause elephants to evolve.

The theme of this newsletter is that science has been so poorly taught that science isn't really science anymore. **People confuse philosophy with science. They don't recognize the difference between what they think and what they know.** As an example, we share with you this article in last month's *Science* journal with a headline that claimed,

Civil war drove these elephants to lose their tusks—through evolution²

That dubious statement of fact is puzzling.

² Erik Stokstad, *Science*, 21 October, 2021, “Civil war drove these elephants to lose their tusks—through evolution”, <https://www.science.org/content/article/civil-war-drove-these-elephants-lose-their-tusks-through-evolution>

Were the elephants in a civil war? And how did fighting with each other cause them to lose tusks through evolution? That's silly—but maybe the authors were intentionally ambiguous because they wanted an outrageous headline that would be click-bait. Unfortunately, some people don't read past the headline, and might think there is a connection between civil war and evolution.

The subtitle clears things up a little bit.

As ivory poachers wiped out herds, tuskless elephants became more common³

Let's examine the article to see how the authors confused what they know with what they think.

The subtitle is a factual statement which is certainly true. There is statistical evidence to back it up.

[Campbell-Staton] and his colleagues analyzed videos, taken before the civil war, of elephants in the park. At that time, about 18% of females there were born without tusks. But in the generation born after the war, the rate was 33%, according to decades of observations by the nonprofit group ElephantVoices.⁴

That's good science based on actual observation. They know that to be true.

It is also true that poachers have killed elephants for their tusks.

Mozambique's civil war from 1977 to 1992 had a grim outcome for elephants: During that time, some 90% were killed for the ivory in their tusks, which were sold to finance the war.⁵

That's also known because it was observed to be true, and documented with statistics.

But what about the conclusion that poachers caused the ratio of tuskless to tusked elephants to change? Just because the facts are true, it doesn't guarantee that a conclusion drawn from those facts is true. The conclusion has to be verified, too.

In this case, the conclusion is probably true. It is based on a plausible cause and effect which does not violate any scientific laws. If you kill elephants with tusks and don't kill elephants without tusks, of course the proportion of tusked elephants will decrease. That's a mathematical fact which would explain the observation.

Because it is a known fact that the ratio of female elephants without tusks has increased, and it is known that poachers kill elephants for

their tusks, and because it is consistent with mathematics, in the absence of any other plausible explanation we can believe with a high degree of confidence that poaching has changed the demographics of the elephant population in Mozambique.

Compare this with the common evolutionary conclusion that since animals have eyes, they must have evolved from light-sensitive cells, which accidentally grew an optic nerve to a brain that stumbled upon an image-processing algorithm. The fact that eyes exist does not prove the conclusion that they evolved by some method contrary to logic and science. The evolutionary conclusion is just wishful thinking.

AN UNWARRANTED CONCLUSION

The title of the article said that evolution caused elephants to lose their tusks. That's an unwarranted conclusion that is false for two reasons.

First, the title confuses evolution with devolution. The theory of evolution depends upon natural processes to create new features with new functionality. Devolution results in loss of existing functionality. Since it was the loss of tusks which was observed (not something like the sudden appearance of wings or echolocation in elephants) it was devolution, not evolution.

Loss of functionality is commonly observed. It is a natural consequence of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Things naturally fall apart—but that doesn't prove they naturally fall together. In fact, they don't. The radio in my old truck doesn't work anymore, perhaps because a bump jiggled a wire loose. That's natural. It would be unnatural for a bump to cause a loose wire to connect itself and turn the radio into a DVD player.

For a population of elephants which had tusks to lose them would be perfectly natural. An imperfect reproduction of a gene could cause it to lose functionality. That's consistent with scientific observation. In fact, by comparing genes, scientists have figured out which genes produce tusks in elephants.

To look for genes that might be involved, the team took blood from 18 female elephants in the park and sequenced their genomes. Two genes stood out: *MEP1a* and *AMELX*, which are active in tooth development in other mammals, were present in seven elephants with tusks, but had unique mutations in 11 tuskless elephants. ... The results suggest that by killing elephants for their tusks, poachers selected for mutated versions of *AMELX* and *MEP1a*, which spread in the population and made tuskless elephants more common.⁶

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

In other words, the *MEP1a* and *AMELX* genes in tuskless elephants DEVOLVED, and lost functionality. Devolution, not evolution, caused the elephants to lose their tusks.

DEMOGRAPHICS DO CHANGE

Second, the civil war (and the poaching to fund it) did not cause tuskless elephants to evolve. There were tuskless elephants before the war began. All that changed was the ratio of tusked and tuskless elephants.

This is the same as the famous debunked peppered moth argument evolutionists loved to use. Ignoring the arguments about the staged photographs and the release-and-count-later methodology used in the study, the soot did not cause a new color of peppered moths to evolve. It merely changed the ratio of previously existing light moths to previously existing dark moths.

It is certainly true that the demographics of a population can evolve (that is, the ratios of individuals with certain characteristics can change); but that's a different kind of evolution. It has nothing to do with the origin of new biological characteristics, which does not happen.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The study also found,

In humans, a mutated version of *AMELX* is linked to male death before birth; in females, that version stunts the growth of the upper incisors, the same teeth that become tusks in elephants. It's not clear why a mutated version of *AMELX*—which is located on the x chromosome—would be fatal to males ... It also raises many questions. The biggest is why a dominant gene associated with deadly effects for males would persist in the population during periods without poaching. Such genes ought to disappear, Roca says, because females that lack them would have more offspring. One possibility is that surges of intense hunting have occurred on and off in Gorongosa over millennia, letting the genes occasionally provide a benefit. Wittemyer wonders whether a similar phenomenon happened long ago in Asia,

because both male and female fossil elephants there have tusks, but among living Asian elephants, only males have tusks.⁷

Darwin proposed that individuals with genes that make them better suited for survival should drive inferior variations to extinction in tough times, causing the superior variations to be inherited by the survivors. That's a reasonable proposal—but the fact that it is reasonable doesn't make it true.

It isn't necessarily the slowest gazelle that wanders past the lion hidden in the tall grass. There is a legitimate question regarding the importance of survival of the fittest compared to survival of the luckiest. That's why the unwarranted speculation about "surges of intense hunting" was made. There is no other evidence for surges of hunting. It is a fanciful explanation that was needed to explain why survival of the fittest doesn't seem to apply in this case. It's just a story—not a fact.

Evolutionists like to play the advantageous card, regardless of the situation. Whenever it suits their argument, tusks evolved because they gave elephants a survival advantage. Other times, elephants lost their tusks to give them a survival advantage. Having tusks, and not having tusks, are both advantageous, and both prove evolution. How can you argue with that?

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Here's the point: Just because facts are true doesn't mean that the conclusions are true. It is a fact that poachers have killed elephants for their tusks, increasing the proportion of elephants without tusks in Mozambique. But that doesn't prove that there were surges of intense hunting in Mozambique, or anywhere else.

It's true that genetic mutations can cause females to lose their tusks, and males to die before birth; but that doesn't prove random genetic mutations can cause elephants without tusks to grow tusks.

Just because you like to think it happened doesn't mean it really did happen.



You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter.

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at ScienceAgainstEvolution.info.