

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 20 Issue 7

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

April 2016

WE COME CLEAN

At last we finally admit what we really believe.

Our long-time readers know that we typically celebrate the National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1) with some sort of satire, usually a musical parody by Death Valley Dave. This year we are going to break with tradition by making a confession, and cop to the truth.

We have received countless emails saying, "So, you don't believe in evolution. What is your alternative?" Until now, we have never answered that question. But since so many people want to know, we confess we believe in the multiverse theory, and here's why.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE MULTIVERSE

First of all, it isn't religious. Second, some famous scientists believe it. Third, it has never been disproved. What more can we say?

For those of you who are educationally deficient, and don't know,

The **multiverse** (or **meta-universe**) is the hypothetical set of finite and infinite possible universes, including the universe we live in. Together, these universes comprise everything that exists: the entirety of space, time, matter, energy, and the physical laws and constants that describe them.

The various universes within the multiverse are called "parallel universes" or "alternate universes."¹

EVOLUTION IN THE GAPS

Universes are popping into existence all the time due to quantum fluctuations. No evolution is necessary because they arise fully formed. We don't have to explain how reptiles evolved into mammals because they all came into being by the

same roll of some quantum dice.

Evolution happens in the gaps between the creation of these universes. That's why there isn't any evidence of evolution in our universe. It all happened before our universe popped into existence.

NEW SCIENTIST SAYS SO

We became fully convinced of this when the text across the bottom of the cover of the January 16-22, 2016, *New Scientist* magazine said, "UNIVERSE IN REVERSE The parallel worlds where time flows backwards". If you read it in *New Scientist* magazine it must be true! (It's true even if you read it backwards!)

In the multiverse, pocket universes could be born with clashing directions of time – the evolving future of one could happen in the rewinding past of another. ... In 2004, Sean Carroll, now at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, showed it could apply, but only if complex and unlikely physics was involved.

Now Carroll and cosmologist Alan Guth of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have shown how time itself can arise organically from simpler principles, then flow in opposite directions in adjacent universes.²

This is NEW science, which is so much superior to OLD science. Old science needed experimental proof. New science doesn't. If you think it, it is true, even if it is "complex and

¹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiverse>

² Joshua Sokol, *New Scientist*, 13 January 2016, "Time might flow backwards as well as forwards from the big bang", <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22930564-100-time-might-flow-backwards-as-well-as-forwards-from-the-big-bang/>

unlikely.” Especially if it is “complex and unlikely!”

Scientists disagree about the details, but that doesn't matter (as our critics so often tell us). They all agree that multiuniverses do exist, so it doesn't matter if the multiuniverses they believe exist are different. Whether it's Max Tegmark's four levels, or Brian Greene's nine types, or M-theory, or Black-hole cosmology, all “real scientists” agree there must be many other universes besides our own, so it must be true.

Proponents of one of the multiverse hypotheses include Stephen Hawking, Brian Greene, Max Tegmark, Alan Guth, Andrei Linde, Michio Kaku, David Deutsch, Leonard Susskind, Alexander Vilenkin, Yasunori Nomura, Raj Pathria, Laura Mersini-Houghton, Neil deGrasse Tyson, and Sean Carroll.³

If Stephen Hawking and Neil deGrasse Tyson believe it, it must be true because they are theoretical scientists, not just practical scientists. Theoretical scientists are far superior to practical scientists.

Thomas Edison couldn't hold a candle to Neil deGrasse Tyson's ability to tell fantastic stories, so he actually had to invent the light bulb to prove it. It takes real talent to convince people of things they've never seen (like what happens inside a black hole, and what kind of life there is under the frozen surface of one of Jupiter's moons) without any proof whatsoever. Less talented scientists, like Thomas Edison, Benjamin Franklin, and Alexander Graham Bell, just cheapened science by using science to invent things and then sell those things to people who wanted to buy them.

Old Science was based on the scientific method, which involved experimental verification. New Science eliminates that unnecessary nuisance.

IT HASN'T BEEN DISPROVED

We know there's no proof of any kind that multiple universes exist. But people who understand quantum physics and string theory believe it, and that's good enough for us. Besides, there's no proof that the multiverse isn't real. There's DNA evidence against the theory of evolution; but no DNA evidence against the multiverse. Since there are only two non-religious explanations for how we got here, and since the preponderance of scientific evidence is against the theory of evolution, the multiverse theory wins by default.

The origin of the universe and true meaning of life can be found in the inscrutable laws of quantum physics! It deserves to be celebrated in

³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiverse>

song. If this magnificent song⁴ (sung by Death Valley Dave to a midi background sequenced by Neil Strawbridge) doesn't convince you that we are an accident in one of the infinite number of universes created by a poorly understood aspect of quantum physics, then nothing will.

Quantum's the Word

(to the tune of “Grease is the Word”)

I solved my problems when I saw the light
The multi-universe is the theory that's right
It's not a foolish notion gone too far
Just start believing now it made us all who we are
Quantum's the word.

Physical proof is a colossal pain
What they don't understand is just a crying shame
Who needs a fact to show our theory's real
We're gonna fight right now because we know
what we feel
Quantum's the word

Quantum's the word, is the word that you heard
It's got groove, it's got meaning
Quantum made time, it made space, it's a notion
Quantum's the way we are feeling

Take evolution and just throw it away
Conventionality belongs to yesterday
Each multi-universe has different stars
Just start believing now it made us all who we are
Quantum's the word

Quantum's the word, is the word that you heard
It's got groove, it's got meaning
Quantum made time, it made space, it's a notion
Quantum's the way we are feeling

One universe is an illusion
Wrapped up in trouble
Laced with confusion
What are we doing here?

We take all logic and we throw it away
New universes now just happen every day
It's just by chance that we have made it so far
Just start believing now it made us all who we are
Quantum's is the word

Quantum's the word, is the word that you heard
It's got groove, it's got meaning
Quantum made time, it made space, it's a notion
Quantum's the way we are feeling
Quantum's the word, is the word, is the word, ...

⁴ You can hear it performed at

<http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/music/Quantum.mp3>.

EVOLUTION-SAFE ZONES

Do students need to be protected from hearing the truth about evolution?

We are going to talk about the growing trend at colleges to provide “safe places” where students are shielded from things they don’t want to hear, but first we want to set the stage for that discussion with yet another email from Sam regarding our last newsletter. It is very much like the emails he has sent us over the past two years.⁵

More lies and stupidity from the classic YEC [Young Earth Creationist] Dunning-Kruger effect engineer YEC, Pogge.

Why do YEC engineers think they can understand biology? because [sic] here is some news for you, pops, you don't.

Notice that he didn’t challenge any facts from our essay about the ENCODE project. He did not claim the ENCODE project did not find functions for more than 80% of the human genome. How could he? We cited a peer-reviewed article which not only said that they did, but also listed the functions they found. If he had claimed they didn’t find all the functionality they claimed, why should we believe him instead of the authors? The fact that he doesn’t want to believe they discovered functionality for so much of the human genome doesn’t make it untrue. Facts are facts, which can’t be denied.

He didn’t challenge our analysis of why the ENCODE project is controversial. He certainly could have done that. We gave our explanation of why we think the ENCODE project is controversial in evolutionary circles, and cited a comment from an evolutionist to back up our analysis. It is certainly possible that we were wrong. Maybe the results of the ENCODE project are disturbing to evolutionists for some other reason than the one we postulated. If he thinks there is another reason, let’s hear it. We will listen.

Sam didn’t dispute the indisputable facts, or disagree with our brilliant analysis. He just tried to bully us.

BULLY POWER

Bullies have evolved considerably in my lifetime. When I was in grade school, a bully was someone who beat you up and took your lunch

money. After that, he just threatened to beat you up, and you gave him your lunch money. This went on until you finally stood up to the bully and made him stop. No anger management classes. No conflict resolution seminars. No sensitivity training. You just stood up to the bully. Things were so much simpler back then.

These days any violation of political correctness, or disrespect posted on Facebook, is bullying. If what you say makes someone feel uncomfortable, you are a bully. This is terrible (unless you are a liberal and insult a conservative, because conservatives deserve to be insulted).

Judith Shulevitz, writing in the *New York Times*,⁶ reports that infantilized college students are indulging their need for insulation by demanding “safe spaces” where any speech that could hurt their feelings would be forbidden.⁷

Today the offending speech usually has something to do with wolf-whistles, homosexuality, or Islam; but its roots go back to the theory of evolution. For years, American public school students have been “protected” from any scientific criticism of the theory of evolution which might make them feel uncomfortable.

SAM’S IMAGINARY POWER

The really puzzling thing is why Sam would think that bullying me would have any effect at all. Sam apparently really believes that insults from someone I don’t even know would cause me to take down our website just because the truth makes him feel uncomfortable and unsafe.

It really is disturbing to realize that American society has evolved to the point where some people believe free speech needs to be prohibited.

Sam can insult us all he wants. It makes no difference. If he had any substantive criticism, that could make a difference; but he’s been writing to us for nearly two years, expecting us to believe in evolution just because he says it is true.

We now live in the 1984 World, where the Thought Police tell us what we can and cannot say and believe. And it all started with political censorship of science against evolution in the public schools.

⁶ Judith Shulevitz, *New York Times*, 21 March 2015, “In College and Hiding From Scary Ideas”, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/22/opinion/sunday/judith-shulevitz-hiding-from-scary-ideas.html?_r=1

⁷ *Breitbart.com*, 23 March 2015, “‘Infantilized’ College Students Need ‘Safe Spaces’ to Avoid Scary Free Speech”, <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/03/23/infantilized-college-students-need-safe-spaces-to-avoid-scary-free-speech/>

⁵ *Disclosure*, February, 2015, “Intentional Ignorance”

OKAY, WE GIVE UP

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/okay-we-give-up/>

Scientific American gives up on evolution.

This month's website review looks at an article written by the editors of *Scientific American*. Since April 1st is a day commonly referred to as April Fools' Day, I decided to search the Internet for interesting articles covering the topic of creation and evolution and April Fools' jokes. I came across this article which was just one of many that try to portray creationists as being gullible for April Fools' jokes.

How the editors of *Scientific American* describe their coverage of "so-called evolution" is really quite funny, but also informative regarding their views of science. "In retrospect, this magazine's coverage of so-called evolution has been hideously one-sided. For decades, we published articles in every issue that endorsed the ideas of Charles Darwin and his cronies. True, the theory of common descent through natural selection has been called the unifying concept for all of biology and one of the greatest scientific ideas of all time, but that was no excuse to be fanatics about it."

Although the article is really just meant to be an April Fools' joke, it really is easy to detect the bias the editors have regarding evolution. "Why were we so unwilling to suggest that dinosaurs lived 6,000 years ago or that a cataclysmic flood carved the Grand Canyon? Blame the scientists. They dazzled us with their fancy fossils, their radiocarbon dating and their tens of thousands of peer-reviewed journal articles."

The topic of Intelligent Design really is shamefully mistreated by the editors. They also make the common criticism that because creationists believe that God designed all life that creationism is a religious idea and not science.

The general tone of the article shows that the editors really are elitist, which they claim as being wrong.

I think it would really be great if *Scientific American* would "be dedicated purely to science, fair and balanced science, and not just the science that scientists say is science."

If you are interested in April Fools' jokes and pranks you will find many just by searching the Internet.



**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.