

# Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 21 Issue 12 [www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info](http://www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info) September 2017

## RACIST STATUES

*If racist statues have to be removed, Darwin's should be the first to go.*

For the past several weeks there have been stories in the news about riots in which statues of Confederate leaders have been vandalized or removed because they inspire uncomfortable memories of racism. Some people even want to remove statues of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson because they owned slaves.

If racist statues should be removed, then statues of Charles Darwin should be the first to go.



Darwin's most famous book is generally called The Origin of Species. The full title, however, is On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. The premise of that book is that climate, diet, and exercise cause inheritable changes which lead to new races which, as they continue to evolve, become new species through natural selection. Furthermore, the more highly-evolved species are superior to the less-highly evolved species, and drive them to extinction. It was published in 1859, just two years before the American Civil War.

Darwin's less famous book is The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. The first edition was published in 1871, six years after the end of the Civil War. The final edition <sup>2</sup> was published in 1874, which is the one from which we will quote.

In The Descent of Man, Darwin addresses general issues, such as how to determine if similar living things are different species or not. With that background, he addresses the issue of whether or not Negro Savages are *Homo sapiens*. He seems to argue both sides of the question by comparing the similarities and differences between various human races and apes, but eventually he takes his stand (sort of).

### HOW TO DETERMINE SPECIES

As we have no record of the lines of descent, the pedigree can be discovered only by observing the degrees of resemblance between the beings which are to be classed. For this object numerous points of resemblance are of much more importance than the amount of

<sup>1</sup> Darwin Statue on Suzzallo Library at University of Washington, Seattle,  
[https://thedispersalofdarwin.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/img\\_3274.jpg](https://thedispersalofdarwin.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/img_3274.jpg)

<sup>2</sup> [http://darwin-online.org.uk/converted/pdf/1882\\_Descent\\_F955.pdf](http://darwin-online.org.uk/converted/pdf/1882_Descent_F955.pdf)

similarity or dissimilarity in a few points.<sup>3</sup>

It was Darwin's opinion that many small differences are much more important than a few big differences when seeking to determine if two beings are of the same species. If Darwin explained why he thinks numerous points of resemblance are of much more importance than the amount of similarity or dissimilarity in a few points, I missed it. Perhaps he thinks that each difference is the result of an evolutionary step, and the more evolutionary steps, the better the justification for classifying two beings as different species. That is a subjective opinion.

One could try to make it more objective by making a rule that three small differences equal one big difference—but that is still subjective. Who is to say that three, not four, small differences equal one big difference? And who defines if a difference is big or small? The important point is, if you think the amount of similarity or difference in a few points is of much more importance than numerous points of resemblance, you are wrong because he is Darwin and you aren't. ☺

### “NATURALISTS SAY”

Man has multiplied so rapidly, that he has necessarily been exposed to struggle for existence, and consequently to natural selection. He has given rise to many races, some of which differ so much from each other, that they have often been ranked by naturalists as distinct species.<sup>4</sup>

Darwin is very careful. He is using the third-person trick TV journalists like to use. (“Mr. President, some people have criticized you for ...”) He says “naturalists” classify the different races as distinct species. This allows him to make the point without saying it is his own view. He is just reporting what other people think. Furthermore, it is the “scientists say” trick. If one claims that scientists say it, it must be true.

### RACIAL DIFFERENCES

Chapter VII is titled, *On the Races of Man*. It begins with these words:

There is, however, no doubt that the various races, when carefully compared and measured, differ much from each other—as in the texture of the hair, the relative proportions of all parts of the body, the capacity of the lungs, the form and capacity of the skull, and even in the convolutions of the brain. But it would be an endless task to specify the numerous points of

difference. The races differ also in constitution, in acclimatization and in liability to certain diseases. Their mental characteristics are likewise very distinct; chiefly as it would appear in their emotional, but partly in their intellectual faculties. Every one who has had the opportunity of comparison, must have been struck with the contrast between the taciturn, even morose, aborigines of S. America and the light-hearted, talkative negroes. There is a nearly similar contrast between the Malays and the Papuans, who live under the same physical conditions, and are separated from each other only by a narrow space of sea.<sup>5</sup>

From his previous statement about lots of small differences being more important than a few big differences, the implication is that all these small differences in races definitely indicate separate species—but he slyly doesn't say so explicitly himself. He has previously stated (without justification) that lots of small differences indicate different species, even if there aren't any big differences. Then he says there are lots of small differences between races. You are supposed to come to the conclusion on your own that Negroes are a different species than Europeans without him specifically saying so.

### THE FERTILITY TEST

Fertility is often used as a test to determine if two individuals are the same species or not. We are surrounded today with mixed-race children, so that should prove beyond any doubt that all people are the same species, *Homo sapiens*. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Darwin wrote this, the cross fertilization of the various races was not yet settled science. It should have been well known because there were many instances of mixed-race children in Darwin's day; but Darwin didn't accept it. Perhaps he was afraid it would prove that Negroes really are humans. Here's how he danced around his problem.

Even if it should hereafter be proved that all the races of men were perfectly fertile together, he who was inclined from other reasons to rank them as distinct species, might with justice argue that fertility and sterility are not safe criterions of specific distinctness. We know that these qualities are easily affected by changed conditions of life, or by close interbreeding, and that they are governed by highly complex laws, for instance, that of the unequal fertility of converse crosses between the same two species.<sup>6</sup>

From these several considerations, it may be

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* page 148

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.* page 146

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* pages 167-168

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.* page 171

justly urged that the perfect fertility of the intercrossed races of man, if established, would not absolutely preclude us from ranking them as distinct species.

Independent of fertility, the characters presented by the offspring from a cross have been thought to indicate whether or not the parent-forms ought to be ranked as species or varieties; but after carefully studying the evidence, I have come to the conclusion that no general rules of this kind can be trusted.<sup>7</sup>

In other words, even if it is true that interracial marriages produce healthy, fertile children (which, of course, they do) it would not prove to Darwin's satisfaction that savages (as he calls them) are the same species as civilized men.

### SCIENTISTS SAY THEY ARE DIFFERENT SPECIES

We have now seen that a naturalist might feel himself fully justified in ranking the races of man as distinct species; for he has found that they are distinguished by many differences in structure and constitution, some being of importance. These differences have, also, remained nearly constant for very long periods of time. Our naturalist will have been in some degree influenced by the enormous range of man, which is a great anomaly in the class of mammals, if mankind be viewed as a single species. He will have been struck with the distribution of the several so-called races, which accords with that of other undoubtedly distinct species of mammals. Finally, he might urge that the mutual fertility of all the races has not as yet been fully proved, and even if proved would not be an absolute proof of their specific identity.<sup>8</sup>

Darwin says that "a naturalist" (not necessarily himself) can't help seeing the overwhelming evidence that the races are different species. If the amount of variation visible among men of different races existed in any other kind of animal, there would be no question that they were separate species. Presumably, the only reason people do question it is political correctness.

Darwin repeats again that even if the mutual fertility of all races turns out to be true, it doesn't really prove anything. He has to do this because, deep down inside, he knows that mixed-race children are fertile.

But the most weighty of all the arguments against treating the races of man as distinct species, is that they graduate into each other,

independently in many cases, as far as we can judge, of their having intercrossed. Man has been studied more carefully than any other animal, and yet there is the greatest possible diversity amongst capable judges whether he should be classed as a single species or race, or as two (Virey), as three (Jacquinot), as four (Kant), five (Blumenbach), six (Buffon), seven (Hunter), eight (Agassiz), eleven (Pickering), fifteen (Bory St. Vincent), sixteen (Desmoulins), twenty-two (Morton), sixty (Crawford), or as sixty-three, according to Burke. This diversity of judgment does not prove that the races ought not to be ranked as species, but it shews that they graduate into each other, and that it is hardly possible to discover clear distinctive characters between them.<sup>9</sup>

Darwin still won't say that the different races of men are different species; but he quotes 13 "capable judges" who say they are. And, as evolutionists often like to say, although none of them agree on the specific details (in this case, they don't agree upon the exact number of different species) the general theory must be true.

### DARWIN DODGES THE QUESTION

What does Darwin really believe? Or perhaps, how politically incorrect is he willing to appear?

Some naturalists have lately employed the term "sub-species" to designate forms which possess many of the characteristics of true species, but which hardly deserve so high a rank. Now if we reflect on the weighty arguments above given, for raising the races of man to the dignity of species, and the insuperable difficulties on the other side in defining them, it seems that the term "sub-species" might here be used with propriety. But from long habit the term "race" will perhaps always be employed.<sup>10</sup>

"Some naturalists" (not necessarily Darwin) think that colored people don't really deserve the dignity of having their own species designation. They are just sub-species which haven't evolved as much as white people.

What did Darwin believe? The following two quotes are as close as I could find of Darwin explicitly stating his belief.

The American aborigines, Negroes and Europeans are as different from each other in mind as any three races that can be named; yet I was incessantly struck, whilst living with the Fuegians on board the "Beagle," with the many

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.* page 172

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.* page 173

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.* pages 174-175

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.* page 175

little traits of character, shewing how similar their minds were to ours; and so it was with a full-blooded negro with whom I happened once to be intimate. <sup>11</sup>

Darwin became acquainted with Native Americans and Negroes on the “Beagle,” and was struck with how surprisingly human they seemed to be. Could they possibly be human? ☺

... the term “man” ought to be used. But this is a matter of very little importance. So again, it is almost a matter of indifference whether the so-called races of man are thus designated, or are ranked as species or sub-species; but the latter term appears the more appropriate. <sup>12</sup>

So Darwin believed that the colored races actually were sub-species of human beings. Well, isn't that damn white of him! ☺

Classifying the savage races as sub-species allows Darwin to make this claim:

But since he attained to the rank of manhood, he has diverged into distinct races, or as they may be more fitly called, sub-species. Some of these, such as the Negro and European, are so distinct that, if specimens had been brought to a naturalist without any further information, they would undoubtedly have been considered by him as good and true species. Nevertheless all the races agree in so many important details of structure and in so many mental peculiarities, that these can be accounted for only by inheritance from a common progenitor; and a progenitor thus characterised would probably deserve to rank as man. <sup>13</sup>

Although Darwin seems to make the stronger case that Negroes are a different species distinct from Europeans, he eventually comes to the conclusion that Negroes are probably just a less highly evolved subspecies of humans which no doubt evolved from a common ancestor.

## OUR STATUE POSITION

So, if statues of Washington and Jefferson have to come down because they owned slaves (which is no longer legal) shouldn't statues of Darwin come down because of his racist theory of evolution (which is still, by law, being taught in American public schools)?

We don't want anybody's statue to be vandalized or removed. We are just making the point that if one wants to attack racists, Darwin would be a more appropriate target than George

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* page 178

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* page 180

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.* page 608

Washington or Thomas Jefferson.

## P.S. DARWIN WAS A SEXIST, TOO.

*Summary:*—We may conclude that the greater size, strength, courage, pugnacity, and energy of man, in comparison with woman, were acquired during primeval times, and have subsequently been augmented, chiefly through the contests of rival males for the possession of the females. The greater intellectual vigour and power of invention in man is probably due to natural selection, combined with the inherited effects of habit, for the most able men will have succeeded best in defending and providing for themselves and for their wives and offspring. <sup>14</sup>

## Evolution in the News

# TURTLE EVOLUTION

*Turtles are slow—but did they evolve slowly?*

Turtles are strange creatures unlike any other reptile or amphibian. They are sandwiched between two shells like a clam that has come unhinged. Despite that obvious similarity, no evolutionist thinks turtles evolved directly from a mollusk. That might be the only point of agreement about turtle evolution.

## GRADUAL OR BY JUMPS

Some evolutionists, Richard Dawkins for example, believe that evolution proceeded gradually through a number of small steps. Other evolutionists, like Stephen J. Gould, believe in punctuated equilibrium—that is, that evolution happened in short bursts separated by long periods of time without any change. These evolutionary jumps are called, “saltations.”

The fossil record is incompatible with gradual evolution. If turtles evolved gradually, then one should find fossils of primitive turtles with partially formed shells which begin a sequence of fossils culminating in modern turtles with fully-formed shells. This isn't what is found in the fossil record.

Furthermore, a partial shell would not provide much of a survival advantage, so it is hard to argue that natural selection caused bigger and better shells to evolve. That's why some evolutionists are forced to believe that full-blown turtle shells evolved suddenly in one shot.

The German geneticist, Richard Goldschmidt, used the term “hopeful monster” in his 1940 book, The Material Basis of Evolution. Creationists love to mock this term because it invokes the image of

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* page 605

a reptile laying an egg, and a bird hatching from it. Many evolutionists do not take the hopeful monster theory seriously—and for good reason.

But some who have attempted to find an evolutionary explanation for the origin of turtles think that the hopeful monster theory is the least stupid explanation. That brings us to the new book, *Turtles as Hopeful Monsters*, by Olivier Rieppel,<sup>15</sup> and the resulting reviews of it.

The fossil record has yielded some remarkable examples where a slow transformation has occurred over time, such as the development of hooves in horses. But equally, there are many examples where no such continuous chain exists in the fossil record. Turtles are one such example, as they just suddenly appear in the fossil record, shell and all. Darwin himself attributed this to ‘*the extreme imperfection of the fossil record*’. This lack of transitional fossils has of course been eagerly exploited by the creationist / intelligent design movement for their own ends.

But ever since Darwin, biologists have argued, and still do, that there exist mechanisms that allow for rapid innovation and saltatory evolution (i.e. evolution by leaps and bounds). This is the emergentist paradigm.<sup>16</sup>

Ironically, the example of horse hoof evolution has been discredited by evolutionists since 1951, as we reported 15 years ago<sup>17</sup>; but it is the best example they’ve got (despite it not being true). ☺

At least they are honest enough to admit that there are many evolutionary sequences which should exist in the fossil record if gradual evolution were true, and they just aren’t there. That’s why they have to believe that turtles are hopeful monsters.

Here is the rather confusing way a *Scientific American* contributor explained it.

**Who’s on the stem, who’s in the crown?** If you know anything about the geological history of turtles, you’ll be aware that a few anatomically archaic Late Triassic and Early Jurassic turtles have been regarded as the oldest representatives of Cryptodira and Pleurodira, the two great turtle groups that exist today. Most notable among these are the Late Triassic *Proterochersis* (originally described as the oldest known pleurodire) and the Early

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/product\\_info.php?products\\_id=808315](http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/product_info.php?products_id=808315)

<sup>16</sup> “Book Review – *Turtles as Hopeful Monsters*”, <https://blog.nhbs.com/title-information/reviews/book-review-turtles-hopeful-monsters/>

<sup>17</sup> *Disclosure*, February, 2002, “Horses and Peppered Moths”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v6i5f.htm>

Jurassic *Kayentachelys* (originally described as the oldest cryptodire). A Late Triassic pleurodire would mean that the common ancestor of crown turtles was in existence by this time.

But this has been challenged. In a study devoted to phylogenetic analysis of Mesozoic turtles, Joyce (2007) argued that these early turtles are outside the crown group (crown group = the clade that contains living species and all descendants of their most recent common ancestor), and that crown turtles did not, in fact, evolve until considerably later (the Late Jurassic). Joyce (2007) and, later, other authors (Sterli *et al.* 2013) went further, proposing that a large number of additional taxa – among them the remarkable meiolaniids of the Cretaceous and Cenozoic, the fabled *Kallokibotion* of the Late Cretaceous of Romania and the diverse and abundant baenids of the Cretaceous and Paleogene – were stem-turtles too, not archaic cryptodires as long thought. This reallocation of taxa and revised view of turtle history has been accepted by some turtle specialists but not by others, and these two schools of thought currently appear to be at an impasse.

...  
You might be thinking that none of this matters much, and perhaps you’d be right.<sup>18</sup>

## DOES IT MATTER?

In one sense, none of this matters at all. All this speculation about how turtles evolved is pointless because the theory of evolution is just a fairy tale, so it doesn’t really matter how you tell it.

On the other hand, it does matter because it highlights the non-scientific nature of the theory of evolution.

The “model proposed by Joyce” is nothing more than an opinion. That opinion biases how one analyzes data, which affects the conclusions reached.

The reason why different models have been proposed is because the data doesn’t really support any model. There is no evidence of gradual evolution in the fossil record, and no plausible explanation or confirmation of evolutionary saltation.

These various models of turtle evolution are just stories told to get government grants, or to sell books.

<sup>18</sup> Darren Naish, August 17, 2017, “Letters From the World of Turtle Evolution”, <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/tetrapod-zoology/letters-from-the-world-of-turtle-evolution/>

# EVOLUTION IS NOT SCIENCE

<http://members.toast.net/puritan/Articles/EvolutionIsNotScience.htm>

*Learn why the Theory of Evolution fails the test of being scientific.*

This month's website review looks at an article that seeks to present many reasons why the theory of evolution is not really science. If you read articles about evolution on the Internet, you will find that the claim is made that only evolution is scientific and creationist views are considered to be based solely on religion.

The article begins by pointing out that there are "several fundamental characteristics that identify a field of study as being 'Scientific'". The characteristics mentioned are 1) **Genuine science is objective and invites scrutiny and investigation**, 2) **Genuine science seeks the truth that explains the observed evidence** and 3) **Genuine science rejects any hypothesis that consistently fails to fit observed scientific evidence**.

What follows is the observation that "On all three counts, the commonly-accepted 'Theory of Evolution' fails the test of being scientific...Evolution is a doctrine which, (1) from its *unproven philosophical underpinnings*, denies any possibility that God created the living world with purpose and design, (2) whitewashes this philosophical/religious dogma with spurious claims of supporting *scientific evidence*, and then (3) *markets* this lie to the world as though it were a *proven fact*, accepted by all '*reputable scientists*'".

The author expresses his frustration with the attacks that are often made by evolutionists against their critics. These attacks include heaping scorn and ridicule on critics and calling them stupid, insane, or evil.

In the article, you will find quite a lengthy discussion of what the author believes to be genuine science, his views on naturalism, and the artificial dichotomy between Religion and Science. He also presents his ideas about the mechanisms of evolution including 1) *abiogenesis*, 2) *random mutation*, 3) *natural selection* and 4) *vast periods of time*.

At the end of the article you will find recommended resources consisting of books and websites and a total of 65 footnotes, many of which include links to additional articles the reader may find of interest.



**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](http://ScienceAgainstEvolution.info).