Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 24 Issue 9 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info June 2020

Buffaloes, Birds, Bass, and Bees

Despite not sharing a close common ancestor, all know how to move in harmony.

Many animals move rapidly in large groups (herds, flocks, schools, swarms) without bumping into each other, so it may seem like it isn't hard to do. But, if you have ever tried to write software that simulates troop movements for war games (or tried to leave a stadium quickly after a football game) you might appreciate how hard it was to program 300 drones to fly in close formation at Lady Gaga's Super Bowl LI half-time show in 2017. [1] To better appreciate the problem, you can find videos on-line describing the technology that was necessary. [2] You no doubt have seen flocks of birds, schools of fish, swarms of insects, or even stampeding animals change directions in unison so quickly as to make any marching band envious. It looks so easy to do—but it isn't.

Collision Avoidance

Because flying without colliding isn't easy to do, it was the topic of two articles in the journal *Science* last month. The editors introduced the subject this way:

> Evolutionary pressures in the animal kingdom have, over the course of several hundred million years, produced a diverse array of creatures highly adapted to survival within their own niche environments. Such adaptations coincide with optimized and efficient materials, body structure, and behavior. Humans have long drawn inspiration from nature in the creation of new technologies—for example, the earliest attempts at flight based on emulation of birds—and many benefits stem from the study of processes, materials, methods, and organizational structures of living organisms. On page 634 of this issue, Nakata *et al.* exemplify the bioinspired design methodology through their investigation of the sound- and airflow-sensing capabilities of the southern house mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* and subsequent creation of a small quad-copter drone with an autonomous collision avoidance system based on the same sensing principles. The sensor displays compelling advantages in weight, power, and deployability over existing technology. [3]

If the editors had said, "God created a diverse array of creatures … ," that statement would have been pure speculation which could have been dismissed without a second thought. Instead, they said, "evolutionary pressures" did it, which is equally speculative, but undeniably true. ☺

Seriously, evolutionists believe these diverse creatures don't have a close common ancestor. They have assigned mammals, birds, fish, and insects to four different classes. If evolutionary pressures gave them the ability to move rapidly in synchronism, it either had to evolve at least four different times, or it evolved in the animal kingdom before these classes evolved from a higher phylum. If this capability evolved at the base of the evolutionary tree, and it is clearly

[1] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Super_Bowl_LI#Halftime_show

[2] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mk7TsDNuhs0, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQlg6i4IdjU, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K-NWKttIh14

[3] John Young, Matthew Garratt, *Science*, 08 May 2020, "Drones become even more insect-like", pp. 586-587, https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6491/586

advantageous, why don't all animals have this capability? Why don't humans (as highly evolved as we are) have it?

Scientists have long watched flocks of birds and schools of fish instantly change directions in unison with no apparent leader, and have been amazed at how they do it. If one individual changes direction suddenly, it should take some time for the individuals closest to him to notice the change and turn the same way. Then the next closest individuals would have to change direction to avoid a collision. There would be a visible wave of motion in the school of fish or flock of birds as the change of direction propagates throughout the group. But no wave motion has been observed. The change of direction seems to happen instantaneously.

The Red Light Problem

For years (probably even decades or centuries) scientists have pondered this problem. You have no doubt experienced it when you were stopped at a traffic light behind several other cars. The first car moved, then shortly thereafter the next car moved, and the next, until you can finally go. Wouldn't it be great if every car was signaled at once, and all started moving at the same time?

But wait! All the cars ahead of you can see the light turn green at the same time. So, why don't all drivers step on the gas at the same time and start moving simultaneously? Theoretically, they could. But it just doesn't work that way in real traffic.

It does work in a real swarm of mosquitoes. Why? How do all the mosquitoes know when to turn the wheel or step on the gas? There isn't any traffic light for them to see, signaling them to start at the same time.

Mental Telepathy

It is possible that mosquitoes have Extrasensory Perception (ESP)—but that possibility is too incredible to be taken seriously because of our human arrogance. I don't believe in ESP, but just because we can't read other people's minds, we should not think it is inconceivable that mosquitoes can.

Imagine you have a friend who was born without a sense of smell. You go to a house where an apple pie has just been baked. As soon as you open the door, you say, "Somebody baked an apple pie!" There's no way your friend could understand how you know that. The pie didn't make a sound. The pie wasn't in sight. How could you possibly know an apple pie had been baked?

Why does a housefly take off as soon as it sees the fly swatter in my hand? It could not have learned the effects of being swatted first-hand. Nor could it have been warned of the danger by a fly that had been swatted. Once swatted, the fly takes the secret with it to the grave. Perhaps it learned by watching other flies get swatted. Even so, learning by observation requires a significant amount of mental ability. Why assume that behavior just evolved?

The point is that it is good to be curious about things we don't understand, and not to be so quick to dismiss alternative answers without proper consideration. We should not blindly stick with unfounded speculation about evolution.

Active Avoidance

Let's get back to the mosquitoes. The editors summarize the article by saying,

> The work of Nakata *et al.* showcases a simple, reliable, and passive technique for avoiding obstacles at close range, inspired by hearing in mosquitoes. [4]

The editors were wrong. It is an active, not passive, technique. Vision, hearing, and smell are passive techniques because they passively detect signals they did not produce themselves. Radar and sonar are active techniques because they actively produce the signals that are detected. Since the mosquitoes hear the reflection of the sound made by their own wings, it is an active, not passive, sensing technique.

Unlike the article editors, the article authors recognized the difference. In the authors' own words,

> Some flying animals use active sensing to perceive and avoid obstacles. Nocturnal mosquitoes exhibit a behavioral response to divert away from surfaces when vision is unavailable, indicating a short-range, mechano-sensory collision-avoidance mechanism. We suggest that this behavior is mediated by perceiving modulations of their self-induced airflow patterns as they enter a ground or wall effect. We used computational fluid dynamics simulations of low-altitude and near-wall flights based on in vivo high-speed kinematic measurements to quantify changes in the self-generated pressure and velocity cues at the sensitive mechanosensory antennae. We validated the principle that encoding aerodynamic information can enable collision avoidance by developing a quadcopter with a sensory system inspired by the mosquito. Such low-power sensing systems have major potential for future use in safer rotorcraft

[4] *ibid.*

control systems. [5]

Computer Models

They used fluid dynamic simulations to determine how pressure waves change when they get close to walls (as opposed to in the open air). Unlike the models which predict global temperatures decades in advance, and predicted COVID-19 death tolls which are quoted so often on TV, fluid dynamic simulations have been tested and verified many times. Fluid dynamic models aren't just numbers produced by a computer to advance a political agenda. You can trust verified models.

The models show that there is a big enough difference that mosquitoes might be able to hear the difference between the sound of their own wings when they are out in the open, and the sound of their own wings echoing off a nearby surface.

> We took inspiration from such neurophysiological evidence and postulated a sensory mechanism for *C. quinquefasciatus* [mosquitoes] that can explain recent behavioral experiments showing that mosquitoes avoid surfaces invisible to their compound eyes. The absence of visual cues indicates that another source of close-range information exists, and we hypothesized that these alternative cues are manifest within interactions between the fluid and antennae or hair structures. Specifically, we propose that mosquitoes can detect changes to their self-induced flow patterns caused by the proximal physical environment. These changes to the downwash flow patterns initially generated by the flapping wings arise as the jets of air impinge on the obstacle's surface. [6]

Their conclusion is that mosquito wings cause vibrations in the air. Those self-induced vibrations bounce off stationary objects and are detected by sensitive mechanosensory antennae and processed by a collision avoidance algorithm.

They didn't just depend on models. They actually built a drone based on what they learned from observation of mosquitoes and fluid dynamic models. They confirmed their hypothesis with an experiment. They did real science!

Nakata's team was actually working on a simple version of the collision avoidance problem. They were just trying to figure out how a single mosquito avoids running into a stationary object. That's a lot easier than trying to figure out how many mosquitoes avoid colliding with many other moving mosquitoes simultaneously. You have to learn how to crawl before learning how to walk (or fly, in this case).

Engineering Imitates Nature

They suggest the same technique can be used to keep a single drone from running into stationary things. That's not new. Human design is often inspired by nature.

This study of mosquitoes reveals a complex solution to a difficult problem; but there is no proof the solution was discovered accidentally through random mutations and natural selection.

As impressive as their work is, we must remind you that their solution to the one-on-one collision avoidance problem pales in comparison to the many-on-many problem (necessary to create an American flag formation of drones in the sky) that has already been solved by intelligent engineers. The half-time display drones flew in formation on purpose with the same goal. Schools of fish swim in unison with some goal in mind; and that goal is not simply to avoid bumping into each other.

The larger problem still remains. How do herds of buffaloes, flocks of birds, schools of fish, or swarms of bees move together with a common goal and no discernable leader? The evolutionists' answer is, "It is an ability that evolved naturally." That's merely an assertion without any factual basis. It isn't a scientific fact. They just accept the notion that it happened by accident because they aren't open to any other explanation.

Almost Pure Science

Nakata's team observed collision avoidance in mosquitoes. They hypothesized that the mosquitoes could hear echoes of their wings off a nearby surface. They used a model to verify the plausibility of their hypothesis. They did an experiment to confirm their hypothesis. They didn't mention the word "evolution" anywhere in their paper. That's real science.

The editors of the journal *Science* (who don't know the difference between active and passive) introduced the article by attributing collision avoidance to "evolutionary pressure." That isn't true, and it isn't science.

---

[5] Toshiyuki Nakata, *et al*., *Science*, 08 May 2020, "Aerodynamic imaging by mosquitoes inspires a surface detector for autonomous flying vehicles", pp. 634-637, https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6491/634?intcmp=trendmd-sci

[6] *ibid.*

Email

Open Systems

Yet another evolutionist misunderstands why the Second Law of Thermodynamics is a valid argument against the theory of evolution.

JB recently sent us this email:

My friend is at it again. He said this:

"The Second Law of Thermodynamics applies ONLY to closed systems. The Earth is not a closed system, since it receives abundant energy from the sun, which is used to fuel all life processes. The fact that a single cell can multiply into an adult human being is an example of that. If a single cell had no energy input from an external source, it would simply die. But human beings are open systems and thus the SLOT [Second Law of Thermodynamics] doesn't apply. Evolution occurs in the same open system as all life processes, and so would have abiogenesis."

I showed him this article that you did: http://www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v7i1f.htm . In response to that article, he said this:

"It's the same site by the guy whose [*sic*] demonstrated he doesn't understand abiogenesis, evolutionary theory or even the scientific process. He claims to not be making the same mistake as biologists and physicists (you know…the actual experts in evolutionary theory and the laws of thermodynamics who devote their careers to learning and studying the actual evidence), yet he provides no credible arguments to support his claims.

"If you can find a coherent and relevant argument in his articles and present it, that would be great, but he seems to only be fixated on aspects of thermodynamics that aren't relevant. Entropy is a measure of disorder or randomness of a system. Energy input can decrease that disorder. All life DEPENDS on that fact, and it's why life can grow from a single cell into a multicellular entity with specialized organs. We take in food and convert it into useful energy to allow us to grow-in effect, becoming more and more ordered. That would be impossible if we ourselves were closed systems. That exact same argument works for both abiogenesis and evolution, since they occur in open systems, using the energy from the sun (mostly), which is converted into biomass (and which itself is consumed). Selective forces work within that dynamic, resulting in chemical, biochemical and species evolution. Thus, his whole argument is invalidated."

I know that you don't like getting into arguments, but it seemed that you were starting to get less and less material to review, so I figured I would help you out.

It is true that we haven't gotten any email from evolutionists lately, and are grateful to get this secondhand email.

Some of what JB's friend says about thermodynamics is actually true—but misapplied. The Second Law says that energy will even out in a closed system. The energy is usually expressed in terms of heat and heat flow, which is why the study of it is called "thermodynamics."

Heat Flow

The general concept is that when ice cubes are placed in a cup of hot water, heat will flow from the hot water into the cold ice until all the molecules are the same temperature. Left to itself, warm water will not spontaneously organize itself into ice cubes and hot water.

A "closed" system is one in which energy (heat) does not enter or exit. An "open" system is one in which external energy enters, or in which heat escapes.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics says the water in a closed system will not organize itself into ice cubes and hot water—but, as JB's friend correctly observes, the Second Law does not apply to open systems. So, let's open the system by placing a cup of water on a hotplate. Adding energy will warm all the water uniformly. It will not cause the water to separate into hot water and ice cubes. That's the point that JB's friend misses.

On the other hand, if you stick some refrigeration coils in the cup, and use some energy to force refrigerant through those coils, the water around the coils will freeze while the rest of the water remains liquid. External energy must be intelligently applied to cause heat to organize itself into hot and cold areas in an open system. The refrigerating coils deliberately cause heat to flow unnaturally from a cold place to a hot place.

As long as power is supplied, it continues to be a cleverly designed open system, and the coils, ice, and water will be different temperatures. If you turn off the power, it becomes a closed system. Heat will flow from the hottest place to the coldest place. The temperature of refrigerating coils, ice, and water will equalize, in accordance with the Second Law.

The point is that skillfully applied energy can cause energy to be organized into hot and cold areas in an open system, but energy alone won't produce organization. The energy has to be skillfully directed.

JB's friend said, "Energy input can decrease that disorder," and he was right—as far as he went. What he failed to recognize is that energy has to be purposely directed for that to happen.

He was also correct when he said, "All life DEPENDS on that fact, and it's why life can grow from a single cell into a multicellular entity with specialized organs. We take in food and convert it into useful energy to allow us to grow–in effect, becoming more and more ordered. That would be impossible if we ourselves were closed systems." That was the point we made three months ago when we wrote about an apple seed growing into an apple tree that produces apples. [7] We will come back to that in a moment.

But first, remember JB's friend said, "That exact same argument works for both abiogenesis and evolution, since they occur in open systems, using the energy from the sun (mostly), which is converted into biomass (and which itself is consumed)." That's where he went wrong. The same argument doesn't work for abiogenesis or evolution. Sun shining on a chemical broth does not cause it to organize itself and come to life. Energy does not make one living thing evolve into another living thing. That's the fallacy in the argument advanced by evolutionists.

We were interested in how JB's friend would react to our argument about an apple seed on the ground growing into an apple on the branch of an apple tree, thus increasing its potential energy, apparently defying the laws of physics. So, we asked JB to ask his friend what he thought about our article, Food For Thought. [8] This was his response:

> Again, this is from the SAME website. I would recommend you read what the scientists who actually study the evidence conclude. When well over 99% of relevant scientists (biologists, paleontologists, and scientists from related fields) agree that evolutionary theory is accurate, consider that they may know something that this website author doesn't.
>
> Having said that, there are a number of problems with the article, but I'll point out two simple ones:
>
> The author claims "Was burying his poop a random behavior that gave him a survival advantage? I can't imagine what the advantage would be." This is called an argument from ignorance fallacy. Just because one may not know of a natural answer to something does not mean there isn't a natural answer. In this case various predators hide their feces to hide their presence from other predators or to avoid challenging more dominant rivals. Dogs, however, don't actually bury there feces but instead kick grass or dirt to spread pheromones: https://www.petmd.com/dog/behavior/dog-behavior-why-do-dogs-kick-their-feet-after-pooping. It has nothing to do with any intent to bury seeds. Plants take advantage of EXISTING vectors and can become dependent upon them as they evolve (in other words, the original seeds weren't dependent on animals for seed dispersal originally, but after animals began dispersing seeds after consuming them, natural selection optimized that more efficient method).
>
> The second problem is his assumption that there was ever a "first" apple tree. That's not how evolution works. Every species can only ever give birth to its own species, but the accumulation of slight genetic variation over time results in a new species. For a helpful analogy, We know Italian, French, Spanish, etc. evolved from ancient Latin, right? Did a Roman suddenly wake up one day speaking Italian? No, little changes to spelling, grammar and vocabulary were gradually introduced to Latin that eventually led to modern Italian and the other Romance languages. Evolution works similarly. Modern apple trees have been heavily modified by humans using artificial selection, but the ancestral trees had no problems reproducing traditionally.

When JB forwarded this response to me, JB added this comment:

> I like how he uses that term "Relevant scientists". Who are these people? He doesn't seem to mention who they are.

JB is on the right track—but let's not get ahead of ourselves. Let's analyze the response carefully. It began with a personal attack. He began, "Again, this is from the SAME website." The implication is that the source makes the argument invalid. People who don't have facts on their side often resort to personal attacks.

Then he makes this false claim: "Well over 99% of relevant scientists (biologists, paleontologists, and scientists from related fields) agree that evolutionary theory is accurate." He doesn't cite the source for this outrageous claim because there is none. He probably believes it is true, but he has no proof that it is true. Perhaps he thinks any scientist who doesn't believe in evolution isn't a "relevant scientist." If you exclude everyone who doesn't believe from the survey, then 100% of the people left do believe. ☺

In our Food For Thought essay, we questioned why my dog buried his poop in the desert. The evolutionist replied,

> The author claims "Was burying his poop a random behavior that gave him a survival advantage? I can't imagine what the advantage would be." This is called an argument from ignorance fallacy. Just because one may not know of a natural answer to something does not mean there isn't a natural answer.

He's right. Just because I don't know something doesn't mean it isn't true. Arguments from ignorance aren't valid. But this wasn't an argument from ignorance—it was really a rhetorical question. It was designed to get the

[7] *Disclosure*, March, 2020, "Food For Thought", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v24i6f.htm
[8] *ibid.*

reader to wonder, “Can you think of a reason why dogs bury their poop?” It had the desired effect because the evolutionist wrote,

> In this case various predators hide their feces to hide their presence from other predators or to avoid challenging more dominant rivals.

How does he know that? Does he communicate with animals, and ask them their innermost thoughts? (Those are rhetorical questions, not arguments from ignorance. ☺)

> Dogs, however, don’t actually bury there feces but instead kick grass or dirt to spread pheromones: https://www.petmd.com/dog/behavior/dog-behavior-why-do-dogs-kick-their-feet-after-pooping. It has nothing to do with any intent to bury seeds.

It’s true, my dog did not do a very good job of burying his business. There’s no grass in the desert; but what he did could be described as kicking sand. That is an observable fact. The claim that he did it to spread his pheromones is merely an opinion. Regardless of whether he did it to spread pheromones or bury seeds, the question remains, “What made him think to do that?” Was it an instinct or a learned behavior? As I said in the original article, I didn’t teach my dog to do that. Apparently it was instinctual. This raises the general question, “Where does instinct come from?”

JB’s friend went on to say, very confidently,

> Plants take advantage of EXISTING vectors and can become dependent upon them as they evolve (in other words, the original seeds weren’t dependent on animals for seed dispersal originally, but after animals began dispersing seeds after consuming them, natural selection optimized that more efficient method).

“Plants take advantage.” Plants must be smarter than most people give them credit for. ☺

He said, “The original seeds weren’t dependent on animals for seed dispersal originally.” How does he know that? Then, “after animals began dispersing seeds after consuming them, natural selection optimized that more efficient method.” What is the experimental data that proves that assertion?

He said, “The second problem is his assumption that there was ever a ‘first’ apple tree.” No, that’s not my assumption. It is the paradoxical premise that the theory of evolution is based upon. There weren’t any of that kind, and then there was one. It was the first one, which produced more of them. Notice how he tried to finesse the problem.

> That’s not how evolution works. Every species can only ever give birth to its own species, but the accumulation of slight genetic variation over time results in a new species.

Did he listen to what he said? “Every species can only ever give birth to its own species.” That’s what every creationist will tell you. Then he contradicted himself in the second half of the sentence when he said, “the accumulation of slight genetic variation over time results in a new species.” The issue really isn’t about the origin of species. The problem evolutionists have is the origin of phyla. Species don’t produce new phyla.

He then said,

> For a helpful analogy, We know Italian, French, Spanish, etc. evolved from ancient Latin, right? Did a Roman suddenly wake up one day speaking Italian? No, little changes to spelling, grammar and vocabulary were gradually introduced to Latin that eventually led to modern Italian and the other Romance languages. Evolution works similarly.

That’s not really a helpful analogy because it isn’t true that every language can only ever give birth to its own language. Latin did give birth to Italian, French, and Spanish.

A better analogy might involve the evolution of the automobile. When did the Ford Model T become the Ford Mustang? It was a gradual change over many years. The Ford Mustang became a Mustang when somebody gave it that name. Mustangs, Appaloosas, and Clydesdales gained those designations when somebody gave horses those names after selective breeding produced those varieties. They are all just horses with distinctive characteristics.

Even that analogy isn’t good enough because the real question should be, “When did the Ford Mustang become the P-51 Mustang fighter plane?” The answer to that question is, “It didn’t.” When did *Tyrannosaurus rex* become a humming bird? It didn’t.

He claimed,

> Modern apple trees have been heavily modified by humans using artificial selection, but the ancestral trees had no problems reproducing traditionally.

Yes, modern apple trees have been modified by artificial selection, which was one of the main points in our Food For Thought essay. Furthermore, the essay was inspired by an article which pointed out that apple trees do have problems reproducing naturally. Why should one believe that apple trees used to be able to reproduce traditionally, but evolved and lost that ability?

The problem JB’s friend has is that he just doesn’t think. He blindly accepts whatever he is told.

Young Experts

If you can't believe a 15-year-old, who can you believe?

Science used to be a reliable way to determine the truth. Now science has been corrupted to be nothing more than the opinion of people who claim to be intellectually superior. This change was precipitated by the theory of evolution because the theory of evolution doesn't meet the traditional definition of science. There is no experimental or observational evidence for the theory of evolution. The theory of evolution is merely speculation about what happened in the unobservable past through an imaginary method that cannot be demonstrated in the laboratory. This has opened the door for credibility to be given to all sorts of false ideas simply because "scientists say" they are correct, without any real science to back up the claims.

The Evidence

Here is some evidence we believe supports our claim.

This month's Email column contains an argument by JB's evolutionist friend in which he confuses evolutionary speculation with science. Although his email is an actual example of evolutionary delusion, one might try to write him off as unrepresentative because we don't know his name or his background; but we believe him to be typical because we have heard similar arguments from so many other evolutionists, and we believe you have probably heard similar things from evolutionists, too.

Brilliant Young People

A friend of mine has a daughter who graduated at the top of her class from a prestigious Bay Area university in California. When my friend introduced his daughter to an older woman, his daughter was highly offended because the woman told my friend, "I can see she is a very special young lady." His daughter had never heard the term "special" used in any other context than Special Olympics or special education. She thought the woman was calling her "gifted" (which is another politically correct term for "retarded"). The word "special" has lost its meaning through intentional misuse. In the same way, the word "scientist" has become a politically correct synonym for "lackey."

There have been many brilliant young people in the past and present. Wikipedia lists 24 musical prodigies who accomplished great things before the age of ten [9] and 39 competitors who became chess grandmasters before fifteen. [10] There have been some brilliant young scientists, too.

> Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) was a French mathematician, physicist, and religious philosopher who wrote a treatise on vibrating bodies at the age of nine; he wrote his first proof, on a wall with a piece of coal, at the age of 11 years, and a theorem by the age of 16 years. He is famous for Pascal's theorem and many other contributions in mathematics, philosophy, and physics.
>
> Srinivasa Ramanujan (1887–1920), was an Indian mathematician and autodidact who, with almost no formal training in pure mathematics, learned college-level mathematics by age 11, and generated his own theorems in number theory and Bernoulli numbers by age 13 (including independently re-discovering Euler's identity). [11]

Today's foremost climate scientist, who has the ear of some world leaders, is young Greta Thunberg. In case you haven't heard of her, here are some excerpts from the Wikipedia article about her.

Greta Thunberg

> In August 2018, at age 15, she started spending her school days outside the Swedish parliament to call for stronger action on climate change by holding up a sign reading *Skolstrejk för klimatet* (School strike for climate).
>
> …
>
> She has received numerous honours and awards including: honorary Fellowship of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society; Time magazine's 100 most influential people and the youngest Time Person of the Year; inclusion in the Forbes list of The World's 100 Most Powerful Women (2019) and two consecutive nominations for the Nobel Peace Prize (2019 and 2020).
>
> …
>
> Thunberg says she first heard about climate change in 2011, when she was eight years old, and could not understand why so little was being done about it. The situation made her depressed. She stopped talking and eating, and lost ten kilograms (22 lb) in two months. Eventually, she was diagnosed with Asperger syndrome, obsessive–compulsive disorder

[9] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_child_music_prodigies
[10] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chess_prodigy
[11] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_child_prodigies

(OCD), and selective mutism. In one of her first speeches demanding climate action, Thunberg described the selective mutism aspect of her condition as meaning she "only speaks when necessary".

Greta struggled with depression for three or four years before she began her school strike. When she started protesting, her parents did not support her activism. Her father said he does not like her missing school but said: "[We] respect that she wants to make a stand. She can either sit at home and be really unhappy, or protest, and be happy".

…

In May 2018, Thunberg won a climate change essay competition held by Swedish newspaper *Svenska Dagbladet*. In part, she wrote "I want to feel safe. How can I feel safe when I know we are in the greatest crisis in human history?"

…

Her speech during the plenary session of the 2018 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP24) went viral. [12] She commented that the world leaders present were "not mature enough to tell it like it is". [13]

Greta Thunberg is considered to be an expert on the danger of climate change, worthy of numerous awards and two nominations for the Nobel Peace Prize. But she has done no original research. She doesn't know anything. All she has done is repeat what she has been told by people with a political agenda.

She is a "special" little girl who is being passed off by liberal politicians as a "scientist." She hasn't done anything except to be frightened to death by some fear mongers. But this little girl, who hadn't even graduated from high school, wasn't afraid to tell world leaders at the United Nations that they were "not mature enough to tell it like it is".

Why does anybody listen to what she says? Is it because she has scientific proof of what she says? Or is it because she is a frightened snowflake? By her own admission she is completely dominated by fear of what some "scientists say."

She isn't a real scientist. She didn't solve Fermat's Last Theorem [14] or cure cancer. She is just a frightened little girl who was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize because she is good at frightening other people by repeating what she was told by some fear mongers. That's no reason to listen to her.

[12] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KAJsdgTPJpU

[13] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greta_Thunberg (May 15, 2020)

[14] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fermat%27s_Last_Theorem

During their heyday, evolutionists claimed that teaching creation in public schools would be the end of science as we know it, which would lead to the decline of the United States and the end of civilization. [15] Instead, teaching evolution in the public schools led to substituting speculation for experimentation, which led to accepting nonsense as scientific fact.

Dangerous "Scientists"

In January, 2020, the United States was enjoying remarkable prosperity. The economy collapsed in less than four months—not because people were too sick to go to work, or too sick to leave their homes to go shopping. It wasn't illness that caused the economy to collapse. It was the political response to the fear that resulted from the words of "scientists" (political lackeys).

In James Bond movies, the villain is often a mad scientist who uses technology to rule the world and make it the way he thinks it should be. In real life, "scientists" are the villains who use fear to take away your car, French fries, soft drinks, plastic straws, schools, sporting events and concerts in order to rule the world and make it safe the way they think it should be.

In the 1960's, people thought scientists were never wrong—because they were never wrong. They sent men to the moon. Now so many people claiming to be scientific experts are wrong so often that the public doesn't believe scientists any more. Scientists have earned a bad reputation by selling out and shilling for politicians. The "scientists" who warned us about the coming "snowball earth" were replaced by "scientists" warning us now about global warming (and scaring poor little girls like Greta).

We aren't the only ones who have noticed it. Scott Adams ran this Dilbert cartoon on June 5, just 11 days before this newsletter was published.

Science hasn't been science since the theory of evolution was declared to be scientific. Consensus replaced experimental proof, which allowed opinion to masquerade as fact. The theory of evolution is a "fact" only because all the "real scientists" say it is. ☺ The truth is that science is against evolution.

[15] *Disclosure*, May, 2005, "Desperate Evolutionists", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v9i8f.htm

by Lothar Janetzko

Questioning Evolution: The Push to Change Science Class

https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/19/us/retro-report-evolution-science.html

Raising Doubts about Evolution… in Science Class

The website review for this month looks at a RETRO REPORT published in *The New York Times* in November of 2017. Retro Report consists of essays and documentary videos that re-examine the leading stories of decades past. At the top of the report, you will find a link to a 10-minute video which provides a summary of what is contained in the written report. The video has the following caption: "A growing skepticism of science has seeped into the classroom, and it's revived attacks on one of the most established principles of biology – evolution."

The commentary of the report begins by mentioning the sassy song "Evolution Mama" which dates back many decades and provides a link that allows you to listen to the song found on "JUG BAND SONGS of the Southern MOUNTAINS." You can find the lyrics for the song by searching the Internet.

The line of the song "Evolution mama, don't you make a monkey out of me," serves as the introduction for discussing what the Report believes to be the "enduring strength of the forces that embrace the biblical account of Creation." It is interesting to note that *The New York Times* writer feels it necessary to state that for some creationists (who are called science skeptics) "rejection of broad scientific consensus extends to issues like climate change and stem-cell research." Bringing politics into a discussion about creation and evolution is quite common in our main-stream media.

The commentary of the Report then discusses anti-evolution court cases which are presented in the RETRO REPORT video. Of course, the first case discussed is the so-called Scopes Monkey Trial held in 1925. The case made national headlines when Mr. Scopes was found guilty of violating a state law that prohibited the teaching of human evolution in state-funded schools. His conviction was overturned on a technicality that is not discussed.

The major outcome of anti-evolution court cases is that the courts have ruled that cases involving the teaching of Creationism in public schools are religious in nature and violate the First Amendment's proscription against "an establishment of religion."

The controversy over a Louisiana law is quite interesting in that the law permits public schoolteachers to "use materials critical of established scientific thought." You can read at length both about those who agree or disagree with this law.

At the end of the article, you will find 247 reader comments that present the widely different views of readers of this RETRO REPORT.

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

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