

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 24 Issue 8

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

May 2020

THE COVID-19 RESPONSE

The response to the COVID-19 virus stems from the politics of evolution.

The uncritical way the theory of evolution has been taught in American public schools has established the political foundation for the government's response to the COVID-19 virus.

This article was written during a time when state governments ordered all schools (public and private) closed to mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 virus. The unintended consequence was that because schools were closed, parents were teaching their own children. To liberals, this is unacceptable.

A Harvard University law professor has sparked controversy after calling for a ban on homeschooling.

Elizabeth Bartholet told *Harvard Magazine* that it gives parents "authoritarian" control over their kids — and can even expose them to white supremacy and misogyny.

"The issue is, do we think that parents should have 24/7, essentially authoritarian control over their children from ages zero to 18? I think that's dangerous," Bartholet said. "I think it's always dangerous to put powerful people in charge of the powerless, and to give the powerful ones total authority."¹

The irony of this statement is amazing. Homeschools exist because parents object to their children being indoctrinated by powerful academic authorities. In particular, they object to their children being taught that the Big Bang, abiogenesis, Darwinian evolution, and other aspects of liberal ideology, are unquestionable scientific facts.

¹ Selim Algar, *New York Post*, 23 April, 2020, "Harvard professor wants to ban homeschooling because it's 'authoritarian' ", <https://nypost.com/2020/04/23/harvard-professor-wants-to-ban-authoritarian-homeschooling/>

When local schools have attempted to include a balanced approach by teaching both sides of the evolution/creation controversy, liberals have gone to court to prevent it. When courts decide what should be taught in school, it's not science—it's politics.

THE WEDGE

The teaching of Intelligent Design has been referred to as "the wedge" which opens the door to a fair examination of the theory of evolution. Conversely, the theory of evolution is the wedge that has opened the door to authoritarian mind control. Once you can get children not to question the ridiculous idea that birds not only evolved from dinosaurs, but actually are dinosaurs, you can get them to believe all sorts of other nonsense. For example, you can teach children that driving a gas-guzzling car will destroy the planet, or that his/her/its gender is a matter of choice, and claim that it is an unquestionable scientific fact.

Censorship of the evidence against the theory of evolution has made censorship acceptable, and has made independent thought a crime, even when that independent thought has solid scientific evidence to support it.

CENSORSHIP SPREADS LIKE A VIRUS

The COVID-19 virus has exposed the extent of censorship and authoritarianism that has become prevalent in modern society. Here's an example:

Before COVID-19 was even detected in the United States, Dan Erickson, a former emergency room physician who now co-owns Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, bought as many tests for the virus as he could. He knew it would be here eventually and wanted to be ready to test those who needed and wanted it.

Now, after testing thousands of people, he and his business partner, physician Artin Massihi, say they have enough data to draw some conclusions about COVID-19.

Their message: COVID-19 is more ubiquitous and less deadly than we think. It's similar to influenza and we should therefore reopen society and stop treating the situation like the lethal menace it was initially thought to be.²

This conclusion, based on science, is not politically correct, so it was censored.

The American people are sick and tired of the randomness with which they're being asked to comply with government dictates surrounding COVID-19, and of the ever-changing and outright false numbers on the coronavirus counts coming from hospitals that are then used to justify additional crackdowns on civil liberties. So they've begun to ask questions, challenge the status quo and even, in some cases, in some states, protest. And that is good.

Some doctors, too.

A couple of doctors in particular — Dan Erickson and Artin Massihi, from Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, California — cut a video and outright called the government's ongoing unconstitutional activities, well, unconstitutional. And that is good, as well.

But YouTube just pulled the doctors' video. YouTube just censored the doctors' speech.³

We try to stay away from politics and stick to science, but in this case we have to go there because the theory of evolution has more to do with politics than it does with science. The theory of evolution is what has opened the door to political censorship of free and open debate about how to respond to the COVID-19 virus.

A PUZZLING SITUATION

Because so many people are stuck at home, many people are working jigsaw puzzles. Consequently, WalMart is currently sold out of them. There is a wonderful little gift shop here in

² Stacey Shepard, *Bakersfield Californian*, 23 April, 2020, "Two Bakersfield doctors cite their testing data to urge reopening", https://www.bakersfield.com/news/two-bakersfield-doctors-cite-their-testing-data-to-urge-reopening/article_eb1959e0-84fa-11ea-9a07-2f2bea880bf9.html

³ Cheryl K. Chumley, *The Washington Times*, 30 April, 2020, "YouTube yanks doctors' warning of constitutional crisis of COVID-19", <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/apr/30/youtube-censorship-of-doctors-bucking-covid-19-cra/>

Ridgecrest, Toboco Traders, where I have bought puzzles in the past. I'm sure they probably have many in stock, but I can't buy one because the governor of California has ordered Toboco Traders closed, even though WalMart has been allowed to remain open.

Allegedly, the business closures are to stop the spread of the virus—but I've never been in Toboco Traders when there has been more than one other customer. Usually it is just Richard (the owner) and me inside the store. You can't get much more socially distant. I've never been in WalMart when there has only been one other customer.

As of May 15, there have only been 3 cases of COVID-19 in Ridgecrest (population 29,000). Just 1 in 9,666 people in Ridgecrest was infected, and not one has died from it. It is likely that some businesses will close permanently because of the authoritarian response to COVID-19, not because 0.01% of us actually got the virus. (Casey's Steaks & BBQ has already closed permanently.) Businesses all over America are dying because they did not get the Mark of the Beast, and could not buy or sell.⁴ Please forgive the religious analogy; there is no plainer way to make the point. The acceptance of the "fact" of evolution has enabled "expert" opinion to pose as science, justifying suppression of freedom (freedom of thought and freedom of action). Bad decisions are being made because "science demands it."

EVOLUTION IS A POLITICAL TOOL

The theory of evolution is a tool liberals use to advance their socialist agenda. They disguise their political ideology as science.

The theory of evolution justifies the Law of the Jungle because we are all the result of survival of the fittest. The Law of the Jungle made us. The most fit, the most highly evolved people, naturally deserve to be the elites who should rule over the rest of us.

Elizabeth Bartholet thinks elites should control education because they received advanced degrees from Ivy League schools. Liberals believe we need a Department of Education to control education because there is no telling what the states or local school boards would teach children if left to decide the curriculum on their own. The thought of parents teaching their own children is frightening to authoritarian liberals!

EVOLUTION CAN'T ABIDE RELIGION

All religions define morality, in one way or another. They establish right and wrong,

⁴ Revelation 13:17

acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Every religion has some concept of an unchangeable moral law. The theory of evolution is incompatible with religion of any kind because evolution is change, by definition. There can't be an unchangeable changing moral law. It's an obvious paradox.

If you accept the notion that morality can change (evolve) with the times, it leads to the question of who should be in charge of that change. The liberal elites feel like they have the right to define morality because they are more highly evolved than the rest of us, who aren't as "woke" as they are. They believe our lives should be directed by their current consensus—not by any unchanging religious teachings.

For example, not long ago the ruling elites said reusable grocery bags had to be used to save the planet from plastic pollution. You were an immoral, bad person who was destroying the planet if you used a single-use plastic grocery bag. Now reusable grocery bags can't be used because they might spread the COVID-19 virus. Now you are a bad, immoral person spreading the pandemic if you don't use a single-use plastic grocery bag.

You must not question the authority of human leaders who know better than you about how you should live your life. All religions undermine political authority. The Soviet Union was atheistic because the Communist Party knew they could not share their authority with religious leaders. The theory of evolution is falsely presented as irrefutable science which proves there is no god who should be obeyed rather than man. The theory of evolution is necessary for socialists/communists to retain political power.

FEAR AND MIND CONTROL

The theory of evolution isn't logical. It isn't supported by experimental science. It depends upon emotion, not facts. People don't believe in evolution because of the facts. They believe in evolution in spite of the facts. They believe in evolution because they fear the alternative.

The theory of evolution is the tool liberals have used to gain mind control. Once you believe a liberal in a white lab coat who tells you that random changes to the DNA of an amoeba turned it into a fish by creating a heart, gills, eyes, and a brain, you will believe anything a liberal in a white lab coat says. Specifically, you will believe that you will die if you hug anyone, or don't wear a mask to a grocery store.

The actual statistics regarding COVID-19 lethality have been negated by fear. Despite the fact that only 0.01% of the people in Ridgecrest

have been diagnosed with COVID-19, and nobody here has died from it—the snowflakes in control fear that you might die if you dye your hair, so all the beauty shops in Ridgecrest were closed. Their fear trumped logic.

THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIALISM

The socialized medicine we resisted in the 1950's has come to pass—and it is worse than we anticipated. Rules that make sense in New York City were unnecessarily imposed on the Mojave Desert because politicians in white lab coats said everyone has to live by the same rules and suffer equally.

Socialists believe they should be in charge of healthcare because they think they know more than doctors about medicine, and more about business than hospital administrators. They think they (not we) should decide what healthcare we get. The fact that the politicians have had no medical or business experience is inconsequential compared to the fact that they are more highly evolved than the rest of us.

Socialists abhor free speech because it allows people to disagree with them, and prove them to be wrong. Students have been shielded from the science against evolution because it undermines the credibility of politicians who pretend to be omnipotent scientists. Once students doubt that life is the result of natural processes, they might doubt global warming, too. Perish the thought!

Socialism is built upon the illusion of fairness. Socialists feel the need to be in charge because they think they are the only ones who can enforce fairness. The notion that blacks can't compete with whites on a level playing field (presumably because they are not as highly evolved as whites) is the unstated justification for affirmative action. Socialists believe that if they don't take race into account, it won't be fair for the people who are not as fit for survival as others are.

The current experiment with socialism has taken the American economy from record low unemployment to record high unemployment. High unemployment has historically been good for the Democrat Party (the socialists) because they have always promised to give things (free medical care, free college education, guaranteed income, etc.) to unemployed voters if given the power. Now many voters are unemployed because Democrats were given power and took things (jobs, entertainment, sports, freedom, etc.) away from them. That can't be good for the Democrats in next November's elections.

EDUCATION CONTROL

The theory of evolution is the wedge that

allowed censorship of science in the public schools. That opened the door to other forms of political indoctrination.

Now that parents are involved in their children's educations by helping them with distance learning on their home computers, parents are learning what their children are being taught. Some may be shocked to discover the indoctrination their children have been receiving.

Closing public schools has given parents the opportunity to teach their children morality and critical thinking. Despite all the damage the COVID-19 virus (or, more accurately, the political response to the COVID-19 virus) has done, there is a silver lining. People are waking up to the amount of political brainwashing and loss of freedom (both intellectual and physical freedom) that has occurred because of the one-sided teaching of the theory of evolution.

We aren't saying that the one-sided teaching of evolution in the public schools has been totally responsible for the rise of authoritarianism in America (and the world)—but it would be irresponsible of us not to mention the harmful effect the theory of evolution has had on America. The theory of evolution was the wedge that opened the door. The unquestioned acceptance of everything someone in a white lab coat claims to be true, and the immediate rejection of all contrary opinions as “unscientific” has its roots in lawsuits prohibiting teaching both sides of the evolution controversy.

Email

VERITASPHOBIA

Fear of the truth is dangerous.

Aiden wrote,

I'm actually going back and forth with an evolutionist and we're finally getting to the real issue: the invention of brand new genetic information. I've asked this evolutionist to give me the mechanism and observable examples. Maybe you can help. Here is the reply:

“ok [sic], so I don't know all the mechanisms for evolution but I will explain the ones I know. The first is a mutation where 1 amino acid changes into another this can add genetic information because alot [sic] of the DNA is actually just not used, a mutation can change an unused part of DNA to actually code a new protein, this changes the way the cell functions. The second method i [sic] know of is transposition of dna [sic], a sequence of dna [sic] is moved or copied during reproduction again, this can create new proteins because the different position of DNA strands will

create different shapes. As for a case where we've seen this happen, you have the case of rhe [?] the fish in the hudson [sic] river which are not resistant to toxic water, elephants in africa [sic] are beginning to lose therw [sic] tusks to avoid poachers or even just the flu evolving to have a different antigen each year so we're no longer immune to it”

The evolutionist's English isn't good but that's alright. What would be your response?

Sadly, our response was incomplete and missed the point. We replied,

Changing one amino acid is like changing one letter in a word. The newly formed word probably won't be found in an English dictionary. Even if the new word does have a definition, it still doesn't contain any information because it doesn't transfer knowledge from a source to a destination. A series of random dots and dashes might create a word in Morse Code, but the word would not mean anything. Changing a single bit in a computer program will probably cause the program to fail--it won't add functional capability.

Copying functional DNA from one part of a gene to another part, or from one species to another, might result in a useful improvement. This is what genetic engineers (“Gene Jockeys”) do. But, they do it on purpose because they have reason to believe it will provide a desired benefit. They don't do it by accident. Furthermore, simply cobbling together existing useful genes doesn't solve the problem of where the useful genes came from in the first place.

I am highly doubtful of the elephant example--but if true, it doesn't solve the problem. Losing the information to make tusks does not answer the question of where the genetic information to make tusks came from in the first place. If true, losing tusks is an example of devolution--not evolution.

As we are seeing now with COVID-19, some people die from it, but most people don't. Some fish might not suffer as much from pollution as others do. That's simply variation--not evolution.

Upon further reflection, we should have said more about the claim, “a lot of the DNA is actually just not used, a mutation can change an unused part of DNA to actually code a new protein, this changes the way the cell functions.” Once upon a time, scientists thought most of the genome was “junk DNA” which had no use. It turned out that the junk DNA actually was useful—but scientists didn't know what it did. Junk DNA was actually evidence of ignorance of the scientists, not evidence of useless DNA created by chance (or the incompetence of a not-so-intelligent designer).

If there actually were some unused sections of DNA, adding useful DNA there would only solve half of the problem. The cell mechanism that reads the information in the DNA would not read

that part of the DNA because it would not expect to find any information there, and would not know what to do with it. It would be like sticking a vinyl record in a CD player. There is music on the vinyl—but the CD player doesn't know how to read it.

Information is the transfer of knowledge from a source to a destination using a transmission method understood by both the source and the destination. Правда! (Our Russian readers know that's the truth! ☺ ☺ ☺ We are sorry most of you won't get the joke; but the point is that Russian isn't an information transfer method we both understand.)

EMOTIONAL MANIPULATION

Our logical refutation of the folly of random changes producing new genetic information missed the most important point. An underlying theme of this month's newsletter has been that when logic fails, unscrupulous people resort to emotional bullying.

There is no scientific evidence that elephants in Africa are beginning to lose their tusks to avoid poachers—but the evolutionist who wrote to Aiden believes it. Fear that elephants may go extinct someday has an emotional foundation.

Thinking that random changes to the DNA molecule will add new functionality is like thinking that randomly adding a flat screen to a radio will turn it into a TV set, or like changing an instruction in a computer program from Multiply to Subtract will make the program work better. Since there is no rational reason to believe these things, there must be an irrational reason.

If you have had many discussions with an evolutionist, you will no doubt have been personally attacked. If you don't believe in evolution, you will be called stupid. You will be called a liar. You will be called "anti-science."

We didn't mention it in this month's feature article, but if you present statistical data that shows (in your area of the country) the risk of catching the COVID-19 virus is too small to justify closing many businesses, you will be accused of not caring about people dying. Closing certain businesses was a purely emotional response based on fear.

Biology professors who have seen what happened to their colleagues who expressed doubt about the validity of the theory of evolution will naturally be afraid to take a public stand against evolutionary nonsense. Students who can't be convinced of the theory of evolution by logic can be made to accept it through fear of getting a bad grade, or fear of ridicule.

Presenting scientific data to Aiden's evolutionist won't change his mind if he is afraid to accept the truth.

DANGER IS REAL. FEAR IS NOT.

This finally brings us to the title of this essay. Veritasphobia is fear of the truth.

There is a difference between fear and danger. Recognition of danger leads to prudent decisions; but not all fear is based on actual danger. There is no danger that the monster under your bed will get you while you sleep, no matter how much fear you feel. Danger is a rational response to an actual threat. Fear is irrational. Therefore, decisions based on fear are irrational, and seldom are wise.

Belief in the theory of evolution is a symptom of veritasphobia. If you accept the theory of evolution because you are afraid other people will make fun of you and call you stupid, that's the first step to letting people manipulate your entire life through emotional blackmail. That's some of the collateral damage resulting from the way evolution is taught in public schools.

Aiden's evolutionist said, "I don't know all the mechanisms for evolution but I will explain the ones I know." In truth, he didn't know any mechanisms. Despite the fact he didn't really know any mechanisms, he felt compelled to share the propaganda he had been told. Since there isn't a logical reason for him to do that, there must be an emotional reason.

It is impossible to convince an evolutionist to admit he is wrong using logic if logic isn't the reason he believes it. There are a few cases where someone has accepted evolution without question because he really hasn't thought much about it. When shown the science against evolution, he will reject it immediately—but those cases are rare. In most cases, especially those cases where someone initiates the discussion in an attempt to get you to accept evolution, logic doesn't matter—it's all about emotion, and that emotion is usually fear.

It could be fear of ridicule. It could be fear of losing a job. It could be fear of God. In these cases you can't convince an evolutionist to change his mind using logic. You need to find out what the evolutionist is afraid of, and address the fear before presenting the science against evolution.

More importantly, you need to recognize when someone is using fear to try to control you.

by Lothar Janetzko

THE GUARDIAN'S CLAIMS

<https://www.theguardian.com/science/head-quarters/2016/mar/31/intelligent-design-popular-evolution-creationism>

“Evolution makes scientific sense.”

The website review for this month looks at an article found in *The Guardian*, a news publication from the UK that also produces a US edition, Australian edition and International edition. The title of the article says “Evolution makes scientific sense. So why do many people reject it?” They answer their own question in the subtitle by saying, “Child psychology studies have identified a natural human bias toward the theory of intelligent design, and pose a solution: teach evolution earlier.”

The article begins with the observation that “Evolution is poorly understood by students and, disturbingly, by many of their science teachers. Although it is part of the compulsory science curriculum in most schools in the UK and the USA, more than a third of people in both countries reject the theory of evolution outright or believe that it is guided by a supreme being.”

The author of the article then expresses the belief that “It is critical that the voting public have a clear understanding of evolution. Adaptation by natural selection, the primary mechanism of evolution, underpins a raft of current social concerns such as antibiotic resistance, the impact of climate change and the relationship between genes and environment.” The author seems puzzled why even with formal scientific education, intelligent design remains intuitively plausible while evolution remains intuitively opaque.

In trying to address this problem, the author says that developmental psychologists have identified two psychological biases in young children. The first is psychological essentialism – belief that species are defined by an internal quality that cannot be changed. The second is promiscuous teleology – all things are designed for a purpose.

What follows next in the article is a general discussion of these two biases and the problems they pose for teaching the theory of evolution to both children and adults.

The author next supports the belief that these psychological biases in children can be overcome by teaching evolution to younger children – 5-8-year olds.

The problem with this kind of thinking is that it is basically supporting mind control for children. I believe it shows how far evolutionists will go to try to force their beliefs on children at even a young age. What is being advocated here is “brainwashing.” You can find a good definition of this term in Wikipedia. “Brainwashing (also known as mind control, menticide, coercive persuasion, thought control, thought reform, and re-education) is the concept that the human mind can be altered or controlled by certain psychological techniques.”



**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.