# Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 24 Issue 3 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info December 2019


# What's the Matter?

## *The unsuccessful search for dark matter disproves evolution.*

This could have been an *Email* column because Al inspired this article with his email to us. It could have been an *Evolution in the News* column because two science tabloids had cover stories about the search for dark matter in their most recent issues. Since we could not decide in which of those two columns to address it, we made it the feature article.

We sometimes get complaints from evolutionists when we include abiogenesis [the spontaneous origin of life from non-life] in our definition of evolution because abiogenesis is, quite literally, dead on arrival. ☺ Without abiogenesis, the theory of evolution is a non-starter.

On the other hand, Al wrote to tell us our definition of evolution doesn't begin soon enough. He wrote,

> In your last newsletter you wrote, "The controversial evolution we are addressing is, 'The doctrine that unguided natural forces caused chemicals to combine in such a way that life resulted; and that all living things have descended from that common ancestral form of life.' "
>
> This skips way too far. The controversial evolution I address is, "The doctrine that the cosmos: space, energy, matter, spontaneously created itself out of nothing. Then it expanded into stars, planets, and butterflies."

Al has a good point. Evolution depends upon more than abiogenesis and descent with modification. It depends upon the Big Bang, too.

### The Big Bang

We haven't written much about the Big Bang over the past 23 years. We tend to stay away from cosmology in general because it is so theoretical and squishy. It changes faster than we can keep up with it. Except for orbital mechanics, astronomy is mostly questionable speculation based on complicated mathematical models which are difficult to discuss with anyone who doesn't have a double major in math and physics.

Because the math doesn't work for things astronomers can see, they postulate the existence of things they can't see and fold them into the equations to match their theory. They postulated "dark matter" to add some gravity to their equations. Then, when dark matter slowed their belief about the expansion of the universe too much, they added "dark energy" to push things apart. Dark matter and dark energy are simply "fudge factors" needed to make the equations support the desired conclusion.

### Dark Matter

Dark matter was controversial when first proposed. Then it was accepted as mainstream. Now it might be on its way out.

Dark matter and Santa Claus are things that evolutionists and children believe—despite the compelling scientific arguments against their existence. These irrational beliefs depend upon mysterious particles, or flying reindeer, which have never been seen. Astronomers and children stay up at night, looking to the sky for confirmation for their fantasies, but they will never see the proof of what they want to believe.

Eventually, children give up and accept reality. Astrophysicists haven't yet reached that point of clarity. They haven't given up on finding dark matter. Their current excuse for failure is that they've been looking for the wrong thing in the wrong place. Instead of looking for a man in a red suit coming down the chimney with a bag of toys, astrophysicists are starting to look for a man wearing brown coming in a panel truck full of packages; but UPS won't deliver the solution they

need, either.[1]

Finally, we are done with the cute analogies! Let's read what two popular science tabloids wrote last month.

## NEW SCIENTIST

The subtitle of the *New Scientist* cover story is:

> We can't find any trace of cosmic dark matter – perhaps because our models of the early universe are missing a crucial piece, says astrophysicist Dan Hooper [2]

The article begins by saying,

> We see its effects in how stars move within galaxies, and how galaxies move within galaxy clusters. Without it, we can't explain how such large collections of matter came to exist, and certainly not how they hang together today. But what it is, we don't know.
>
> Welcome to one of the biggest mysteries in the universe: what makes up most of it. Our best measurements indicate that some 85 per cent of all matter in our universe consists of "dark matter" made of something that isn't atoms. Huge underground experiments built to catch glimpses of dark matter particles as they pass through Earth have seen nothing. Particle-smashing experiments at the Large Hadron Collider, which we hoped would create dark matter, haven't – at least as far as we can tell. The hunt for dark matter was never supposed to be easy. But we didn't expect it to be this hard.
>
> Dark matter's no-show means that many possible explanations for it that people like me favoured just a decade ago have now been ruled out. That is forcing us to radically revisit assumptions not only about the nature of dark matter, but also about the early history of our universe. This is the latest twist in a long-running saga: our failure to detect the particles that make up dark matter suggests that the beginning of the universe may have been very different from what we imagined. [3]

Every high school kid "knows" that the Big Bang created hydrogen, and gravity caused the hydrogen atoms to form clouds which turned into stars and exploded, creating all the heavier elements that make up the universe. The problem is that gravity just isn't strong enough to make hydrogen molecules attract each other.

We don't need complicated math to prove that gravity isn't strong enough to make hydrogen gas coalesce into a solid. The Moon (which is a lot heavier than a single hydrogen gas molecule) doesn't have enough gravity to hold on to oxygen gas molecules (which are 8 times heavier than hydrogen gas molecules). That's why there is no atmosphere on the Moon.

Hooper explained,

> As galaxies and galaxy clusters were built up, dark matter played the role of scaffolding: it gathered into enormous clouds whose gravity attracted and pulled together the atomic matter that would ultimately form the luminous bit of galaxies. Without the gravity of dark matter holding stars in place, they would fly outwards, in some cases escaping into intergalactic space. Many galaxies would simply disintegrate.
>
> The model of what happened after the Big Bang depends upon dark matter to provide enough gravity to pull it all together. If dark matter doesn't exist, then the story about how stars and planets formed is mathematically impossible because there isn't enough gravity to do the job. If there isn't any dark matter, it disproves the Big Bang cosmology.
>
> A decade or more ago, many physicists, including me, thought we knew what dark matter was likely to consist of: weakly interacting massive particles, or WIMPs. … But that story now seems rather a fairy tale. If dark matter does consist of WIMPs, we can estimate how much it should interact with ordinary atomic matter via the weak force, and so design experiments to detect it. … Over the past two decades, the size and sophistication of these experiments has hugely increased. The latest iterations are enormous, deploying anything up to tonnes of liquid xenon as their detectors. … But they too have failed to turn up WIMPs. The only experiment that even claims to have detected anything resembling dark matter goes by the name of DAMA. Most researchers think the signal it picked up is almost certainly produced by something else: a long list of other experiments have searched for the kinds of WIMPs that could have made it, but have seen nothing. [4]

A pull-quote in a large font to the side of the main text of the article says,

> "The longer we go without finding WIMPs,

---

[1] Note to readers outside the United States. The trademark of the United Parcel Service (UPS) is the color brown, and their slogan is, "What can brown do for you?"

[2] Dan Hooper, *New Scientist*, 13 November 2019, "Why dark matter's no-show could mean a big bang rethink", https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg24432560-600-why-dark-matters-no-show-could-mean-a-big-bang-rethink/

[3] *ibid.*

[4] *ibid.*

the more we must confront the possibility they aren't there" [5]

A shaded box next to the main text says,

**A disturbance in the force**

Despite dark matter's long-standing refusal to reveal itself, most physicists remain confident that it exists – the evidence in its favour is just too great. [6]

The main point of the article, as stated in the first part of that sentence, is that dark matter has never been detected—despite really expensive, elaborate experiments to find it. Attempt after attempt to find any dark matter has failed, and yet they say "the evidence in its favour [British spelling] is just too great!" Most astronomers remain confident it exists. Countless children have stayed awake on Christmas Eve watching for flying reindeer, without seeing a single one, but the evidence in their favor [American spelling] is just too great! ☺ Most children remain confident that they exist.

After presenting several fanciful possibilities, Hooper concludes his article by saying,

> It is too early to say whether the right answer is one, some or none of the above possibilities. Perhaps an experimental breakthrough will change the game yet again. But the stubborn elusiveness of dark matter has left many physicists and cosmologists surprised and confused. In droves, we are returning to our chalkboards, revisiting and revising our assumptions – and with bruised egos and a bit more humility, desperately attempting to find new ways to make sense of a very dark and hidden universe. [7]

## *Discover*

Coincidentally, *Discover* magazine also had a similar article about the failure to find any evidence for the existence of dark matter. "Coincidence" means "happening at the same time;" but not necessarily by chance. I suspect there is a reason why *New Scientist* and *Discover* both chose to write about dark matter at the same time. They both ran the same picture supplied by the XENON collaboration.

> The XENON experiment is a collaboration of 160 scientists, representing 24 different nationalities, and 27 institutions across the world. [8]

Perhaps the XENON collaboration is worried about funding and needs some publicity to increase support for their fool's errand.

*Discover* chose to present the issue as a horse race, perhaps because every race has to have a winner, no matter how slow the winner is.

> In the annals of science, it will go down as a contest for the ages: the race to discover dark matter. This elusive substance has mystified us since the 1930s, when astronomers first realized galaxies needed some kind of invisible gravitational glue to hold them together. No one knew what it was, so the name *dark matter* stuck. Beggaring belief, the universe seems to hold more than five times as much dark matter as it does "normal" matter. This means it should literally lurk right under our noses, permeating and penetrating Earth as our solar system swings through our galaxy, which (like most massive galaxies) is brimming with the stuff.
>
> Yet for all that seeming ubiquity, scientists know shockingly little about the universe's dominant material. Dark matter could be made of one kind of particle or many. Those particles might be massively heavy or wispily light. We think it only interacts with other matter (and itself) via gravity, but dark matter could turn out to have interactions with any force of nature — known or unknown.
>
> Addressing all these possibilities, physicists have conjured up quite the stable of dark matter candidates. And like race horses, these proposed particle types are vying to win what you might call the Dark Matter Derby, competing through theories, experiments and observations. [9]

*Discover* goes into detail about many competing theories. Since they are all wrong, and since we are limited by space, we won't waste too much space on them. We encourage you to read

[5] *ibid.*
[6] *ibid.*
[7] *ibid.*
[8] https://science.purdue.edu/xenon1t/?page_id=27

[9] Adam Hadhazy, *Discover*, November 15, 2019, "What is Dark Matter Made Of? These Are the Top Candidates", https://www.discovermagazine.com/the-sciences/what-is-dark-matter-made-of-these-are-the-top-candidates

the *Discover* article for yourself for more details. Here are a few summary statements, starting with mythical WIMPs and MACHOs:

> The odds-on favorite, called a WIMP (for weakly interacting massive particle), has been a no-show despite intensive search efforts. Meanwhile, a once highly touted competitor called the massive compact halo object, or MACHO — cheekily named in opposition to the WIMP — has fallen out of contention, its very existence debunked. Some newer long shots, meanwhile, are poised to give the dark matter thoroughbreds a run for their money. [10]
>
> Despite multiple big-budget experiments in 2016 and 2017, WIMPs have disappointed. And in May 2018, the XENON1T instrument in Italy — the biggest WIMP search to date — likewise reported finding nothing. [11]
>
> And many physicists expected that the Large Hadron Collider — the most powerful particle accelerator ever built — would produce heavy, novel particles, including WIMPs. But a decade of operations with no heavy partners to show for it has instead made some physicists question the whole notion of supersymmetry. [12]
>
> In the late 1980s, scientists got their hopes up that MACHOs — gobs of normal matter that were simply dim and tough to detect — could answer the dark matter question. These objects would range from planets to failed stars to black holes. Unfortunately, well-supported Big Bang models struggle to produce anywhere near enough regular matter for MACHOs to fill the cosmic ledger. More damningly, observations have consistently ruled out any vast populations of clandestine black holes, which should give themselves away when their gravity bends background starlight. An October 2018 study took out the last leg for MACHOs to stand on, putting serious constraints on the possibility of primordial black holes — hypothetical monsters born in the early universe — being the last plausible reservoir of significant unaccounted-for matter. Whatever the bulk of dark matter may be, MACHOs ain't it. [13]

They have been looking for other particles called "axions" since 1977.

> After a humble start, the axion is now surging in the race. Physicists originally came up with this particle to help fix a problem with the strong nuclear force, one of nature's four fundamental forces. … Although the individual particles have a ridiculously low mass, the universe-forming Big Bang could have churned out axions in dizzying abundance — enough, in fact, to constitute all the dark matter in the cosmos. "A whole lot of the early universe's energy gets dumped into these particles," says University of Washington physicist Gray Rybka. "And because they don't interact very much with anything else, you'd have all this leftover matter kicking about the universe." Presto: dark matter! … Researchers are presently "tuning" ADMX through millions of frequencies representing possible axion masses, rather like travelers driving out in the sticks, trying to alight upon the right radio station to catch a snippet of song. "We just keep turning the knob," says Rybka. "It's exciting because an axion discovery could come at any time." The search is slated to continue for at least a few more years.
>
> As for this dark matter dark horse's name, credit MIT physicist Frank Wilczek. He coined it in the 1970s after randomly seeing Axion detergent — still manufactured today — on a store shelf. Like a sort of talisman, the ADMX team has ordered a bunch of the suds online. "We wash our hands with it for good luck," says Rybka. [14]

They must be lucky because they are funded for at least a few more years! ☺ They need that much time because there are millions of places to look, and the mythical axions don't interact much with anything else (because they don't exist). They already have their excuses for failure!

Let's not forget the sterile neutrino!

> Once left in the dust as a dark matter candidate, the sterile neutrino has roared back into the race. It's a hypothesized new type, or flavor, of neutrino. These ubiquitous particles currently come in three flavors and are all but oblivious to matter, passing clear through our bodies (and everything else) by the hundreds of trillions every second. But while everyday neutrinos will very occasionally touch matter via the weak nuclear force, the sterile neutrino would be even more hands-off; a clean freak, it never deigns to dirty itself with any interactions beyond gravity. … Theorists postulated that the flavor skew arose because some neutrinos were temporarily morphing into a fourth, sterile flavor before "returning" as garden variety electron neutrinos. … Assuming sterile neutrinos prove legit, they are still likely neither sufficient in mass nor number to constitute the bulk of dark matter. … Researchers have high

[10] *ibid.*
[11] *ibid.*
[12] *ibid.*
[13] *ibid.*
[14] *ibid.*

hopes, in fact, that landing the sterile neutrino will crack the door open into a realm of new physics beyond the standard model, dramatically dubbed the dark sector.

This shadow realm could be an entire "unstandard model," full of particle types that invisibly interact with each other, all around us. Dark photons, dark gluons, dark quarks and more would be on the table. All could be repositories of the extra stuff in the universe we standard model-centric beings perceive as dark matter. "There has to be a connection somewhere between the dark sector and the standard model," says Van de Water, "and sterile neutrinos could be it." [15]

Physicists could be "SIMP-ly" wrong. ☺

Could physicists be wagering on all the wrong dark matter horses? Hitoshi Murayama, a theoretical physicist at the University of California, Berkeley, thinks so. "There is actually something wrong with the traditional thinking about dark matter," he says. Along with Yonit Hochberg at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Murayama recently helped develop the SIMP (or strongly interacting massive particles), a whole new breed of dark matter particle. [16]

Remember, the front-runner in *Discover*'s horse race is the weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP); but there are two astronomical observations which require strongly, not weakly, interacting particles.

Dark matter behaving in this boisterous manner would help explain two key astronomical observations that buck against WIMPs. The first concerns some colliding galaxies: In one example, astronomers inferred that a great amount of dark matter had detached from its host galaxies in a celestial smashup happening some 1.4 billion light-years away. This suggests the dark stuff pushes against itself and cannot readily flow together with the visible stars and gas as WIMPs should. However, a second analysis using more accurate measurements now suggests perhaps the dark matter may not have separated from its galaxies after all — nothing can ever be simple in the dark matter business.

The second puzzling observation involves the screwy distribution of dark matter within smaller galaxies. Computer simulations show that due to gravity, WIMPs should glom together, forming dense clumps of dark matter in the centers of galaxies; they should also coalesce into chunks out in space. Yet observations clash with those predictions. Galactically, dark matter seems too evenly spread out, and astronomers have never found the chunks the WIMP model predicts. The findings better support a dark matter that doesn't play nicely: the SIMP model.

One more thing points to SIMPs. There should be enough of them to explain away all of the universe's dark matter, unlike the more complicated theories other particles require. "SIMPs can be 100 percent of dark matter without any problems," says Murayama. [17]

The only force definitely felt by both matter and dark matter is gravity. Accordingly, some researchers have created gravity-only models of the dark stuff, dubbed GIMPs: gravitationally interacting massive particles. … Alternatively, physicists have conjured GIMPs as elementary particles required by theories of our universe that include an extra fifth spatial dimension. Best we can tell, though, there's still just the three, plus time. [18]

Finally, there is the PIDM.

Perhaps the wildest horse in this herd, though, is Planckian interacting dark matter (PIDM). It consists of individual particles that each could weigh as much as 10 quadrillion protons. PIDM that spawned in the early universe should have left an indelible imprint on the Big Bang's relic afterglow, called the cosmic microwave background, which researchers study for clues about the universe's origins. Next-generation instruments could be sensitive enough to answer whether this dark matter horse wins it all — or needs to be put out to pasture. [19]

Next-generation instruments could be sensitive enough to detect Santa's sleigh as he travels from house to house; but we doubt that, too, because no matter how sensitive instruments become, they can't detect something that isn't there.

People who believe in dark matter don't believe in it because of overwhelming scientific evidence—they believe in it in spite of overwhelming scientific evidence. People who believe in Darwinian evolution don't believe in it because of overwhelming evidence in the fossil record—they believe in it despite the overwhelming abundance of fossils that should be there but can't be found.

As Al pointed out, what people are really interested in is the larger question, "How did we

[15] *ibid.*
[16] *ibid.*
[17] *ibid.*
[18] *ibid.*
[19] *ibid.*

get here?" This question includes not just people, but plants, animals, and the universe itself. You can't separate evolution from the Big Bang and abiogenesis.

## Big Bang, Abiogenesis, and Evolution Falsified

The Big Bang theory depends upon the universe having an overwhelming amount of dark matter. Many sophisticated experiments have been performed to try to detect dark matter. They all failed. The number of people who have tried to confirm the existence of dark matter is roughly equal to the number of children who have tried to confirm the existence of flying reindeer on Christmas Eve. They have all failed for the same reason: Dark matter and flying reindeer don't exist! A reasonable scientist would accept the experimental proof that dark matter doesn't exist and conclude the Big Bang theory is false.

For decades, evolutionists have tried to create life from non-life on purpose, and have failed. But they still believe it happened by accident. For decades, evolutionists have tried to prove descent with modification can produce fundamentally different forms of life, and have failed. But they still believe it. They don't believe because of scientific evidence. They believe in spite of scientific evidence.

Evolutionists like to frame the question as if you have to choose between science and faith. They ask, "Are you going to be rational, and accept a scientifically verified explanation?–or are you going to believe a silly, superstitious fairy tale?" The truth is that there is no scientific explanation. You either have to have faith in a theory which depends upon dark matter and unknown forces which defy the verifiable laws of physics, or you have to have faith in a supernatural explanation. It isn't a case of science versus faith—it is a question of faith versus faith. In fact, any origin theory built on the Big Bang, abiogenesis, and evolution is not scientific.

Evolutionists are absolutely certain that dark matter exists, despite the fact that for decades every attempt to detect any dark matter has failed. When an experiment disproves a scientist's theory, a real scientist rejects the theory. Evolutionists aren't real scientists because their faith in evolution trumps the truth revealed by the scientific method. Experiment after experiment has failed to prove the dark matter conjecture. A reasonable person would accept the results of all these experiments and admit that dark matter doesn't exist. Since dark matter is fundamental to the Big Bang theory, the theory must be wrong!

Email

# Beneficial Mutations

***Here is our answer to the evolutionists' "beneficial mutations" argument about ApoA-1 Milano.***

We are grateful to Aiden for sending us this email:

> Hi Science Against Evolution. Name is Aiden. Love your website and certainly your responses in debunking evolutionists. Recently though I asked a very simple question to see what answers I could get from evolutionists. "Can any evolutionist give a beneficial mutation that results in brand new genetic information?" is all I asked. Finally an evolutionist gave a response. "ApoA-1 Milano? That's one beneficial mutation." And of course the evolutionist had to end his comment with an insult stating "I know very well that you are simply too scared to even google it." FYI. I did google it.
>
> Anyway, I'm an educated layman not a PhD scientist so understanding this mutation (as in the scientific terms surrounding it) and how this directly relates to information-increasing mutations is difficult for me. Mind explaining it as simple as possible and why this mutation doesn't support evolution? Thank you!

Our immediate knee-jerk reaction was, "Why is this evolutionist talking about ApoA-1 Milano instead of sickle-cell disease?" As long as I can remember, the sickle-cell argument has been the evolutionists' go-to argument for beneficial mutations. Since you may have heard the more common sickle-cell argument, let's address that one first before we address ApoA-1 Milano.

## The "Benefits" of Sickle-cell Disease

The impact of sickle cell trait on malaria immunity illustrates some evolutionary trade-offs that have occurred because of endemic malaria. Sickle cell trait causes a change in the hemoglobin molecule in the blood. Normally, red blood cells have a very flexible, biconcave shape that allows them to move through narrow capillaries; however, when the modified hemoglobin S molecules are exposed to low amounts of oxygen, or crowd together due to dehydration, they can stick together forming strands that cause the cell to sickle or distort into a curved shape. In these strands the molecule is not as effective in taking or releasing oxygen, and the cell is not flexible

> enough to circulate freely. In the early stages of malaria, the parasite can cause infected red cells to sickle, and so they are removed from circulation sooner. This reduces the frequency with which malaria parasites complete their life cycle in the cell. Individuals who are homozygous (with two copies of the abnormal hemoglobin beta allele) have sickle-cell anaemia, while those who are heterozygous (with one abnormal allele and one normal allele) experience resistance to malaria without severe anemia. Although the shorter life expectancy for those with the homozygous condition would tend to disfavor the trait's survival, the trait is preserved in malaria-prone regions because of the benefits provided by the heterozygous form. [20]

The saying, "It's an ill wind (that blows no good)" suggests that even when something bad happens, someone else will get an advantage from it. When interest rates go up, it is bad for borrowers—but good for lenders. Although it is bad to suffer from sickle-cell disease, if it keeps you from getting malaria, it might be worth it. That was the evolutionists' traditional example of beneficial mutations.

People with sickle-cell disease have a shorter life expectancy, so it is hard to argue its benefits. Perhaps evolutionists have moved on to the ApoA-1 Milano argument because the sickle-cell mutation isn't beneficial enough to be a compelling argument.

## ApoA-1 Milano

The problem evolutionists have with the ApoA-1 Milano argument is that it is complicated. But, consistent with the notion that every negative might be a positive, if the evolutionists' ApoA-1 Milano argument is too difficult to understand, people might just accept it without question. The disadvantage of being hard to understand might actually be a benefit to evolutionists! ☺

Aiden is not someone who accepts something just because it is hard to understand. That's why Aiden wrote,

> Anyway, I'm an educated layman not a PhD scientist so understanding this mutation (as in the scientific terms surrounding it) and how this directly relates to information-increasing mutations is difficult for me. Mind explaining it as simple as possible and why this mutation doesn't support evolution?

We will try to explain what this has (or doesn't have) to do with increasing information as simply as possible.

[20] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Malaria

## HDL Cholesterol

The ApoA-1 Milano argument has to do with HDL cholesterol.

> There are several types of lipoproteins in the blood. In order of increasing density, they are chylomicrons, very-low-density lipoprotein (VLDL), intermediate-density lipoprotein (IDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL), and high-density lipoprotein (HDL). Lower protein/lipid ratios make for less dense lipoproteins. Cholesterol within different lipoproteins is identical, although some is carried as its native "free" alcohol form (the cholesterol-OH group facing the water surrounding the particles), while others as fatty acyl esters, known also as cholesterol esters, within the particles. [21]

> In 2016, the United States Department of Agriculture Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee recommended that Americans eat as little dietary cholesterol as possible. Increased dietary intake of industrial trans fats is associated with an increased risk in all-cause mortality and cardiovascular diseases. Trans fats have been shown to correlate with reduced levels of HDL and increased levels of LDL. Based on this evidence, along with other claims implicating low HDL and high LDL levels in cardiovascular disease, many health authorities advocate reducing LDL-cholesterol through changes in diet in addition to other lifestyle modifications. [22]

Low levels of HDL are "bad," but higher levels of HDL are "good." This is why HDL is called "good cholesterol" and LDL is called "bad cholesterol."

> HDL particles are thought to transport cholesterol back to the liver, either for excretion or for other tissues that synthesize hormones, in a process known as reverse cholesterol transport (RCT). Large numbers of HDL particles correlates with better health outcomes, whereas low numbers of HDL particles is associated with atheromatous disease progression in the arteries. [23]

ApoA-1 Milano is found in mutated HDL, which does a better job of transporting cholesterol to the liver than normal HDL (even though there is less of it) and reduces heart disease.

> **Apolipoprotein A-1 Milano** (also **ETC-216**, now **MDCO-216**) is a naturally occurring mutated variant of the apolipoprotein A1

[21] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cholesterol
[22] *ibid.*
[23] *ibid.*

> protein found in human HDL, the lipoprotein particle that carries cholesterol from tissues to the liver and is associated with protection against cardiovascular disease. ApoA1 Milano was first identified by Dr. Cesare Sirtori in Milan, who also demonstrated that its presence significantly reduced cardiovascular disease, even though it caused a reduction in HDL levels and an increase in triglyceride levels. … The mutation was traced to one man, Giovanni Pomarelli, who was born in the village in 1780 and passed it on to his offspring. [24]

ApoA-1 Milano is a beneficial mutation with no apparent downsides, which might be why evolutionists prefer it over the sickle-cell argument; but it doesn't address Aiden's question.

## Information, Please

Aiden asked,

> "Can any evolutionist give a beneficial mutation that results in brand new genetic information?"

ApoA-1 Milano mutated HDL doesn't contain any more information than ordinary HDL. It doesn't perform any different function. It just performs the same function better. It is simply a variation, like being stronger or more sexually attractive.

Darwin based his theory upon the observation that not all offspring are identical. There are small differences. That is undeniable. He believed that those differences might provide a survival advantage, and that is probably true—to some extent. It certainly tips the scale a little, which might be significant in some cases. But it isn't necessarily the slowest gazelle that wanders too close to the lion crouching in the tall grass. Sometimes survival of the fittest isn't as important as survival of the luckiest.

Even though evolutionists sometimes debate the importance of natural selection, there is some effect, no matter how small it might be. In most cases, a mutation causes a survival disadvantage, and natural selection is the chlorine in the gene pool which removes the mutation in a generation or two. Natural selection tends to prevent evolution more than cause it.

## New and Improved

I haven't noticed it recently, but when I was young, the TV commercials for laundry detergents often claimed to be "new and improved." Of course, they could not be any better if they weren't changed—but change doesn't necessarily result in improvement.

Even if they did really work better, they still did nothing more than remove dirt. They didn't repair tears in the clothes, or connect your clothes to the Internet so your phone would tell you when they needed to be washed. The detergents didn't provide any new functionality. They just performed the same function, presumably better, which might have caused consumers to buy it. Getting clothes cleaner might have improved sales more than another brand's "fresh, clean scent," or catchy jingle that a competitive detergent's commercial used.

We are belaboring this point because there is an important distinction between beneficial mutations and creative mutations. Beneficial mutations perform the same function better. Creative mutations (if they existed) would perform new functions. Aiden's question about increased information has to do with new functionality, not a marginal improvement in existing functionality.

If people bred reindeer the way they breed horses, then larger, or faster, or stronger reindeer might "evolve" over several generations. Size, speed, and strength are existing reindeer characteristics which selective breeding can increase, up to a limit. Santa can't breed flying reindeer because that would require a creative mutation which increases genetic information.

For a reptile to evolve into a mammal, it has to evolve mammary glands by accident. Reptiles don't have poor mammary glands which were improved slightly by a mutation to create mammals. They would need new genetic information to evolve functioning breasts.

## The Undo Button

The ApoA-1 Milano argument depends upon the assumption that the ApoA-1 Milano variant is a new innovation. That isn't necessarily true.

Every time a DNA molecule gets copied, there is a chance for a mistake. If that mistake is fatal, the organism dies. If it is merely harmful, natural selection will eliminate it in a generation or two. When a mistake is merely suboptimal, natural selection might not be powerful enough to eliminate it. By chance, it might become dominant in the population.

There is a chance that a subsequent mistake might undo the original mistake. Perhaps ApoA-1 Milano was the original version, and the common form of HDL is actually a suboptimal mutation which somehow established itself in the population centuries ago. Perhaps Giovanni Pomarelli was simply a guy who accidentally had a mutation that changed his HDL cholesterol back to the original, uncorrupted form!

[24] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ApoA-1_Milano

*by Lothar Janetzko*

# Searching Amazon for Science vs. Evolution

## https://www.amazon.com

***You can use Amazon.com as a Search Engine.***

When searching for articles about creation and evolution, I often just use a web browser and one of various search engines such as Google, Bing or Yahoo. Looking for an article for this month's website review, I found several search results that provided links to books available on amazon.com. I then decided to just use the amazon.com site to see how this site could be used to find information about the ongoing debate between creation and evolution.

On the main page of the amazon.com website you will find a search bar that allows you to search for books on various topics. By entering "science vs evolution" in the search box, the results are shown by providing 48 results on multiple pages which you can scroll through. Each individual result is shown as an image of the cover of the hardcover, paperback or Kindle book, and the author. Of course, since Amazon is in business to sell you stuff, you will also find the price for purchasing the book. By clicking on the image cover, you receive detailed information about the book. Some books even provide a "Look Inside" link that allows you to view some sample pages of the book.

After entering a search criterion in the search box of the main page of amazon.com, you then will find a list of other categories of books you can search for on the site and from the Kindle Store. The "science vs evolution" search suggests the following book categories: Science & Religion; Creationism; Evolution; History & Philosophy of Science; Christian Theology; Science & Math; Biology; Christian Apologetics; Religion & Philosophy; and Organic Evolution. The Kindle Store list suggests looking for Kindle books from the following categories: Religious Studies – Science & Religion; Christian Theology; Evolution; Science History & Philosophy; Religion & Spirituality; Science & Math; Biology; 30-Minute Science & Math Short Reads; Apologetics Christian Theology; and 45-Minute Religion & Spirituality Short Reads.

It is interesting to see how amazon.com chooses to present results for the "science vs evolution" search. There are indeed many books available that discuss the creation versus evolution controversy. It appears that amazon.com just seeks to provide information about these many books and chooses not to reveal any opinion or bias about which side it believes has the best arguments to support their various positions.

Just scroll through the many search results and explore those you find of interest by using the "science vs evolution" criterion or enter a different search criterion of your own choosing to find books of interest relating to creation and evolution.