

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 16 Issue 12 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org September 2012

HOMO MYSTERIOUS

An evolutionist makes a compelling case against human evolution.

We encourage everyone to read *Homo Mysterious*, by Dr. David P. Barash, published by Oxford University Press. Its subtitle is, "Evolutionary puzzles of Human Nature." The real mystery is how an evolutionist could write a book filled with scientific evidence against evolution, and still believe in evolution. In the first chapter, Dr. Barash writes,

In *Homo Mysterious*, you will be introduced to the ocean of unknowns, as well as the major hypotheses that currently occupy scientists who are attempting to unravel each puzzle (including some proposed here for the first time). Like science courses, nearly all science books describe what we know, thereby giving the impression that we know nearly everything, whereas the reality is exactly the opposite: We know very little compared to how much we don't. *Homo Mysterious* is designed for readers likely to be challenged by the blank spots on the human evolutionary map, the *terra incognita* of our own species.¹

Rather than leave blank spots on the map, most other evolutionists seem compelled to draw roads that aren't there. It is our belief that an incomplete map is better than an incorrect one. Dr. Barash apparently agrees with us because, in subsequent chapters, he presents evolutionary puzzle after evolutionary puzzle, all the proposed evolutionary explanations for those puzzles, and compelling arguments why all those evolutionary explanations are wrong, leaving blank spots on the evolutionary map.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS

We aren't going to repeat the details of all his scientific arguments against evolution because we

really want you to read them for yourself. Besides, that would take us hundreds of pages. Instead, we will briefly summarize his arguments, hoping to tease you into buy the book.

SEX

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with human sexuality. They are essential a two semester high school course in sex education, only raunchier. These chapters tell you more than you really need to know about the female body, unless you are a gynecologist.

The first notable mystery begins when a girl becomes a woman: menstruation. Although a few other species bleed slightly at mid-cycle, no other organism does so as prominently as *Homo sapiens*.²

He explains why, from an evolutionary perspective, menstruation is disadvantageous (as if women didn't already know). He goes through several evolutionary explanations, and proves them all wrong.

The only explanation he doesn't think worth exploring is the "especially foolish ... theological assertion that it constitutes part of the punishment inflicted by a vengeful deity upon a disobedient Eve."³ Throughout the book, he never misses an opportunity to say something nasty about religion. In fact, he devotes two entire chapters to explaining why religion doesn't make any sense; but let's not get ahead of ourselves.

A recurrent theme throughout the book is that there is nothing more important than sex. Evolution is all about producing more offspring than competing organisms do, so every aspect of a creature should have something to do with

¹ *Homo Mysterious*, Dr. David P. Barash, 2012, Oxford University Press, page 7

² *ibid.*, page 11

³ *ibid.*, page 14

improved reproduction.

Given this mindset, Dr. Barash is puzzled by concealed ovulation. Other species overtly advertise when they are most fertile, encouraging sexual intercourse at the optimum time. Why don't humans? There is no good evolutionary explanation.

Why do men have nipples? Why do women have large breasts when they aren't lactating? Since breast size really has nothing to do with fertility or vitality, why are men attracted to female breasts? We will demurely allow you to find out for yourself what he says about orgasm.

Menopause makes the least sense of all from an evolutionary perspective. Other species are fertile as long as they live. Why aren't humans?

Given the assumption that the first living things were asexual, how and why did sex evolve in the first place? There is neither a mechanism nor a reason for it.

Chapter 4 is devoted to homosexuality. If there is a "gay gene," the theory of evolution would predict that it would quickly be eliminated from the gene pool for the obvious reason. He spent 52 pages trying (unsuccessfully) to find an evolutionary explanation for homosexuality.

ART AND MUSIC

Chapters 5 and 6 deal with the arts. Why did humans evolve a love of music? How do fine arts improve our fitness for survival and increase our reproductive success? How does strawberry cheesecake benefit our species?

The book makes it clear that the two things Dr. Barash hates the most are strawberry cheesecake and religion—not necessarily in that order; and for the same reason. Humans crave both but, in his opinion, they aren't good for us.

We don't want to give away too much of the book, so you will have to read his thoughts on how music might make you more successful with the ladies (or not).

RELIGION

Chapters 7 and 8 deal with the "problem" of religion. Why did humans evolve such "irrational" beliefs? Here's the fundamental paradox that puzzles him: If the theory of evolution were true, then religion would not have evolved! The mere existence of religion argues against the fundamental principles of evolution. That's why he spends 74 pages trying (unsuccessfully) to explain it.

Let us remind you that it is not our belief that he was unsuccessful explaining these things—he

is the one who says there are no good evolutionary explanations.

THE HUMAN BRAIN

Perhaps our favorite chapter was chapter 9, in which he contemplates the human brain.

Accordingly, here is a paradox along with mystery: As clever as we are, we aren't smart enough to figure out why we became so clever!
4

In past newsletters we have examined the evolutionists' speculative connection between tool use and brain development, fire and brain development, bipedality and brain development, and social interaction and brain development. Evolutionists have come up with all sorts of fanciful stories about how and why humans evolved big brains. Dr. Barash examines them all, and debunks them all even more rigorously than we have.

Other evolutionists have previously noted how "costly," and thermodynamically improbable, a big brain is. Dr. Barash explains the problem this way:

And a big brain is very, very costly. Its 100 billion nerve cells are highly nonrandom, hooked together via perhaps 100 trillion carefully orchestrated connections. Such a device is devilishly difficult to encode, requiring more than its fair share of precious DNA. Moreover, even after it is constructed, the human brain is extraordinarily expensive to maintain. It uses up an inordinate amount of metabolic energy. Although it occupies only about 2% of the body's weight, it accounts for roughly 20% of our total metabolism, compared to 10% or so for most mammals, including chimpanzees. ... For an animal like ourselves, a product of natural selection like all other living things, to have evolved a brain like this, we must have needed it very, very badly. But for what?⁵

In a word, his answer is, "sex."

We have already noted that the human mind did not develop as a calculator designed to solve logical problems. Rather it evolved for a very limited purpose, one that is ultimately no different from that of the heart, lungs, or kidneys; the job of the brain is simply to enhance the reproductive success of the body within which it resides ...⁶

⁴ *ibid.*, page 267

⁵ *ibid.*, page 271

⁶ *ibid.*, page 289

THE MEANING OF LIFE

One theme that is repeated over and over in his book is the notion that **there is no meaning to life other than to procreate.** It totally dominates his thoughts. Every mystery is answered in terms of how it will increase reproductive success. **Sex isn't the answer to every question, so he has lots of unanswered questions.**

Stay tuned. (Note to my editor at Oxford University Press: Maybe we should start thinking about a follow-up book, *Homo Mysterious v. 2.0*, to cover the “missing link,” crying, laughing, yawning, blushing, suicide, morality and ethics, the unconscious, the evolution of emotions, and our evolutionary future, as well as some of the other mysteries that must, for now, remain especially mysterious.)⁷

How does blushing increase reproductive success? How does suicide increase reproductive success? He can't find answers to his questions because he is looking for evolutionary answers. **There aren't any evolutionary answers because the theory of evolution isn't true.**

THE RELIGION OF EVOLUTION

It is evident in his book is that evolution isn't just a theory, it is his religion. He proudly claims to be an atheist.

I don't think I could eliminate religion by scientific argument or ridicule (although frankly, I would do so if I could.)⁸

He mocks those people who look beyond sex for the answers to the bigger questions of life saying,

For any belief, it is always possible to come up with a seemingly unlimited amount of supporting evidence.⁹

“It is undesirable,” wrote philosopher and mathematician Bertrand Russell, “to believe a proposition when there is no ground whatever for it to be true.”¹⁰

The irony is that it wasn't possible for him to come up with an unlimited amount of supporting evidence for the religion of evolution. In fact, he came up with about 300 pages of solid scientific evidence against it. But, as “undesirable” as it is, **he believes in evolution when there is no ground whatever for it to be true.**

⁷ *ibid.*, page 311

⁸ *ibid.*, page 199

⁹ *ibid.*, page 312

¹⁰ *ibid.*, page 199

Email

SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS, AND RHETORIC

When we said that evolutionists are philosophers, not scientists, we unintentionally insulted a philosopher.

This week's email comes from Brian.

Hello, there, I must say I'm an avid reader of your website and share your views about evolution. One quail I have is your accusation that **evolutionary scientists** employ philosophy rather than science. As a philosophy major, I must say that they **do not employ philosophy, they employ rhetoric.** Philosophy is about arriving at the truth through logical proof based on logical principles. **The arguments presented by evolutionary enthusiasts smudge facts or mislead a potential audience through the use of persuasive language.** Rhetorical technique is not the methodology of a philosopher, it's the method of a sophist.

Sincerely,

Brian

Philosophy Undergraduate

Brian is absolutely correct. It is insulting to philosophers to call evolutionists, “philosophers.” **It was not our intention to belittle philosophy by association with evolution.** So, we sincerely apologize to any philosophers we have offended.

The goal of philosophy is to discover truth. The goal of rhetoric is to win an argument, regardless of whether it is true or not. Philosophy is an honorable pursuit. Rhetoric isn't.

THE CHAIN OF RELATIONSHIPS

Brian's email shines some light on an important issue that warrants deeper examination—specifically the relationships between science, philosophy, politics, and rhetoric.

Science deals with facts discovered by observation and experimentation. Philosophy deals with beliefs derived by inference from facts. Politics deal with actions based upon beliefs. Rhetoric is often used to achieve political goals.

SCIENCE

Science is untainted by opinion. An apple accelerates towards Earth at 32.2 feet per second squared regardless of whether or not one shares Isaac Newton's religious beliefs. Science is 100% factual. There is no place for faith in science. Science is quantitative—that is, it is all about numbers, measurements, accuracy, and precision. The measurements are always the

same (within specified limits) regardless of who does the experiment. Science is all about things that are measurable, dependable, and repeatable.

Chemical engineers depend upon science to manufacture products with consistent quality. Electrical engineers use science to insure that communication devices will operate reliably. Civil engineers depend upon science to tell them the maximum load a bridge will bear. The scientific method reveals facts that one might literally stake one's life upon.

But as powerful as science is, there are some questions that science just can't answer. For example, "What is the meaning of life?" Are we here because God created us to be the object of His love? Or is this life just one revolution of the wheel of reincarnation rolling us toward ultimate bliss? Or is life just a meaningless accident of nature? Science can't answer these questions because they can't be tested experimentally by some process that produces a numerical result with specified certainty.

PHILOSOPHY

Philosophers use logic to analyze facts in an attempt to answer questions that are outside the realm of science. Scientific observation tells us that a particular caterpillar will turn into a particular species of butterfly after a certain number of days (plus or minus a known number of days); but science can't tell us why. Evolutionists speculate about how natural selection must have caused this process to evolve. Christians speculate about how God must have done this to illustrate His miraculous transforming power. In either case, it is just speculation. Both make inferences based on the same facts, but come to different conclusions.

MIXED SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

Modern biology is a mixture of science and philosophy. Gregor Mendel's famous experiments with pea plants were scientific; and there are plenty of modern genetic experiments that carry on that great scientific tradition. Modern medicine is based on biological experiments that quantify the reaction of biological systems to various chemical compounds. For the most part, biology is as legitimate a science as physics or chemistry—but there are parts that are not. Some parts are just foolish speculation. For example, the "scientific study" that showed zebra embryos start with dark skin but develop narrow, alternating black and white stripes before they're born because horseflies are most attracted to solid-colored hides, is just speculation.¹¹

RHETORIC

In March of 2005, we received the first of a series of emails from someone we nicknamed, "Argumentative Alex." After a while, he stopped writing to us. But last month, he started emailing us again. He even signed his emails, "Argumentative Alex." We will share one of those emails with you below because it illustrates Brian's point about the difference between philosophy and rhetoric. Argumentative Alex isn't a philosopher. He isn't interested in dealing with issues. He just wants to satisfy his own ego by winning an argument through a dishonest trick.

Before we look at Alex's email, let's look at the big picture with emphasis on the scientific, philosophical, political, and rhetorical aspects.

SEPARATING SCIENCE FROM PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS, AND RHETORIC

It is a scientific fact that all species exhibit some variations to a greater or lesser extent. It is also a scientific fact that selective breeding can cause particular variations to occur with greater frequency in an isolated population. One philosophical inference is that natural selection has caused one primitive, unknown living thing to evolve into every living thing on the planet. (We believe that is an incorrect inference; but that's beside the point now.) This is the basis for the political belief that students should be taught in American public schools that a single cell originated spontaneously, came to life, and diversified into every species that has ever existed (including man) through an unguided process of evolution that has been going on for hundreds of millions of years. (Of course, Christians object to their tax dollars being used to indoctrinate their children into rejecting their parent's religion; but that also is beside the point.) People like Alex use rhetorical tricks to enforce their political agenda.

Here's Alex's email.

Subject: 75 theses errors
Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 3:28 AM
Hi David

I've just been reading your essay entitled '75 Theses' and I'm afraid you've made a basic error at the start.

If you read the 'TalkOrigins' reference, it doesn't use the 6-point statement as a definition for evolution as you imply but as a definition for evolution and related topics. The reference actually reads:-

"(b) "Evolution-science" means the scientific evidences for evolution and inferences from those scientific evidences. " and goes on to make clear, in section IVb :-

"The emphasis on origins as an aspect of

¹¹ Disclosure, April 2012, "Zebra Stripes",

the theory of evolution is peculiar to the creationist literature. Although the subject of origins of life is within the province of biology, the scientific community does not consider origins of life a part of evolutionary theory. The theory of evolution assumes the existence of life and is directed to an explanation of how life evolved."

So points 1, 5 and 6 do not form any part of an accepted definition of evolution. This means that, of your theses, 3, 4, 5, 9 -17 (especially 17, which is a real 'straw-man!'), 19 - 21, 28 - 35, 37 - 42, 47 (which is factually wrong - look up nylonase and Cit+ functions in bacteria), 54 (which uses the non-scientific term 'proof'), and pretty much all the rest, in fact, are irrelevant to any discussion of evolution.

I hope you will amend your essay accordingly
Best wishes
Argumentative Alex

As we have so often pointed out over the years, the trick is to change the definition of "evolution" depending upon the circumstances. First, "evolution" is defined to be "a small variation caused by natural selection," which is unquestionably true. But then it is argued that children should be taught that life originated spontaneously and diversified over millions of years because "evolution is true."

Alex argues that our definition is not "an accepted definition of evolution." Who gave TalkOrigins the authority to define words?

In the case of a word like "evolution," which has multiple meanings, it is important to specify which meaning is under discussion. Another meaning of "evolution" is, "any kind of change over time." Cars have "evolved" from the Ford Model-T to the Ford Mustang, but that has nothing to do with what we are talking about. The fact that cars have evolved does not prove that new biological orders evolved from older ones.

This definition trick has also been used in the "fixity of species" straw man. In this trick, evolutionists claim that anyone who doesn't believe in evolution doesn't believe species ever change in any way. So, the fact that new varieties of agricultural crops produce better yields, and are more resistant to pests or diseases, is proof that fixity of species is wrong.

That's a different kind of evolution. We aren't talking about that. Nobody objects to teaching that kind of evolution in school. That's why we are careful to distinguish the scientifically incorrect doctrine that should not be taught in public schools from the kind of evolution that is true.

Alex may not accept it, but our definition is an accurate description of what is being taught in public schools. If all that is being taught in public schools is natural selection, there would not be any opposition to it.

By the way, Theses 47, "No mutation has ever been observed that provides a new function (sight, hearing, smell, lactation, etc.) in a living organism that did not previously have that function," is not factually wrong. Bacteria did have the digestive function before nylon was invented. The fact that they could not digest nylon before nylon was invented is simply because there wasn't any nylon to digest.

Nit-picking about definitions, and obvious attempts to misunderstand arguments, are hallmarks of rhetoric.

PROOF IN THE PUDDING

Perhaps it is my engineering background that makes rhetoric so foreign and offensive to me. Whenever I had a dispute with another engineer about how to design something, we always tried to understand each other's position to determine who was right. We never tried to convince each other to accept our design using a rhetorical trick. It is foolish to use rhetoric to prove that a bad design will work because we will actually build something using that design. If the design is faulty, the product won't work, and we will be proved to be wrong, no matter how clever the rhetoric is. It is better to learn the truth before we commit the time and resources to building a failure.

Evolutionists, on the other hand, never build anything that proves or disproves their idea. So, if a rhetorical trick advances their political agenda, they win.

WHY ARGUE?

The doctrine that life originated spontaneously, and that all life evolved from that original life form, is false, and should not be taught in school. If that doctrine isn't being taught in school, why does anyone object to prohibiting it? If we objected to children being taught that there is a pot of gold at the end of every rainbow, nobody would argue with us because (1) they don't believe there is a pot of gold at the end of every rainbow, and (2) they don't teach that in school. But people do argue with us when we say that the spontaneous origin of life and subsequent evolution shouldn't be taught in school because (1) they do believe in the spontaneous origin of life and subsequent evolution, and (2) it is being taught in schools, and they want it to continue to be taught as fact to impressionable children in school.

Evolutionists use rhetorical tricks (not science or philosophy) to advance their political agenda. We again apologize to any philosophers we offended.

BIBLICAL CREATION VS. EVOLUTION

VIDEOS & SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE & FACTS

<http://www.embracinghome.com/biblical-creation-against-evolution/>

Videos that show scientific evidence against evolution

This month's web site review looks at a site that provides links to five Creation Videos to watch online for free. As mentioned on the site, "you can watch a few minutes each day so that the amount of information doesn't overwhelm you."

On the webpage you will find a Table of Contents which contains a simple table with links to the five videos which show scientific evidence against evolution. The five videos, their lengths and descriptions, are as follows: 1) *The Privileged Planet*, 1 hour long, Excellent deep teaching on mathematical probability of our Earth having all its features by chance; 2) *Fingerprints of Creation*, 28 minutes, Polonium Halos – detailing the evidence that the Earth was rapidly formed; 3) *Intelligent Design – Unlocking the Mysteries of Life*, 1 hour and 7 minutes, This film explains the theory of evolution and then counters it with the evidence that they have found; 4) *A Question of Origins*, 1 hour and 1 minute, This film starts explaining what the theory of evolution teaches and then analyzes if it's based on scientific plausible facts; 5) *Plate Tectonics – Failed Earth Puzzle*, 14 minutes.

As you can tell from this Table of Contents, many different topics are presented in these videos. So far I have viewed three of the videos and I have found them to be very interesting.

The first video, *The Privileged Planet*, is based on the book with the same title written by Guillermo Gonzalez and Jay W. Richards. The video points out how our place in the cosmos is designed for discovery. It is interesting to learn how important solar eclipses are in our understanding about our own sun and how the relative sizes of the moon and the sun make the viewing of total solar eclipses possible. If you are interested in learning more about this book, a search using Bing yields 10,800,000 results.

At the bottom of the web site you will find comments that various individuals have made regarding these videos. As a web reader, you are also encouraged to add your own comments.

So, as time permits, I encourage you to watch these videos to learn more about how scientific evidence points to a special creation rather than what the theory of evolution teaches.



**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.org**.