

## Holy Hallucinations 43

This is a continued response to PPSimmons' video, "Best Critique of Evolution You Will Ever Hear".

So, Carl, sorry to have kept you waiting, but I hope that the respite has at least afforded you a chance to catch your breath. More importantly, I'm also hopeful that you've been able to recover some of the sphincter control that you lost during our last encounter.

Hmm? What's that? You haven't? Well that's too bad, but perhaps it's just as well, because it's getting pretty crowded up there and so with a bit of luck the extra dilation will make the ramming go just a little easier this time.

Now, as we're about to see, in the second half of your video you opted for a refreshing change of pace and switched from embarrassing yourself publicly by sharing your laughably simple-minded and ignorant opinions on the syntax of science, to making an unmitigated laughing stock of yourself by using Wikipedia to demonstrate your equally feckless ineptitude when it comes to doing any kind of research.

As a result, it pains me to inform you that your most holy of holies is unlikely to find much relief as we get back down to business but luckily for you, while I was looking around for a suitably sturdy plunger, I came across that old coprolite that Carl Baugh had... shall we say... recycled... and I thought it might be the perfect thing for you to bite down on as we play the first clip. Because as the priest said to the last choirboy in the shower, Carl – this is going to get *a lot* worse before it gets *any* better.

**"Alright, now I want to show you something. So you look this up on Wikipedia. Now, I know that some of you are already screaming, 'Wikipedia is not reliable!' Well, that's true in some cases."**

Presumably, Carl, those cases would be any of the ones that happen to run contrary to your psychedelic, Yahweh-fueled delusions about physical reality, right? In any case, you may be surprised to discover that, when it comes to those whose knee-jerk reactions to Wikipedia are as you described them, I actually call bullshit. Because the reality is that Wikipedia can be an extremely useful resource *if* you know how to use it. Unfortunately for you, Carl, it will soon become more than abundantly clear that *you* know how to use it about as well a nun knows how to use a bucket of dildos.

**"But what I look for in a Wikipedia arti... Wikipedia article... first of all, is it extensive? And this is very extensive. Second of all, is it balanced? And it is. The other thing that I look for is... is it heavily, um, referenced? And of course, you can see *all* the references. I mean, just, just, all the way through the article. Ev... Almost every statement that's made... here's one with three references... every statement that's made is referenced. So, you know, so we can start there, and we can look at the statements that are made, and then look at the references."**

OK, Carl. So let's break this down piece by piece, shall we? And as we do so, don't be alarmed if you hear an occasional cracking sound immediately followed by a forceful upward thrust and a moment of slight-to-excruciating arsewardly discomfort. Of course, I normally wouldn't have to point this out to someone with your *extensive* experience of ano-didacticism, but since you appear to have developed an immunity to education by means of posterior assaults on the senses, I thought I'd mention it to give you *some* idea of the source of those strangely familiar sensations.

Firstly, what possible relevance does the *extent* of an article have on its *veracity*? After all, shouldn't that be entirely dependent on scope of the subject matter? For example, while Wikipedias' entry on

the Roman Empire consists of 17 sections and requires at least an hour or two of solid reading, I'd posit that Ray Comfort's 2015 abhorrent and disgustingly bigoted videographic abortion, "Audacity", could equally extensively be summarized with just one single word.

So to conflate veracity with mere voluminosity takes a special kind of mentally confused crapsack who could give even Mr. Comfort a run for his money. After all, Carl, Wikipedia's article on Islam is equally as detailed as the one on the Roman Empire, but I hardly think that this would make you pause for even the briefest of moments to reconsider whether you opted correctly when deciding on which collection of fanciful desert fables to base your entire existence on, would it?

And so, as you can see, all it took was just a small modicum of consideration and a large plunger to demonstrate just how laughably facile your first criterion is, and the fact that you couldn't work that out for yourself speaks volumes as to how much thought you put into this video or, for that matter, into anything that you choose to projectile excrete whenever you open your mouth. Now, let's move on to the next one and see whether you can do any better with your second bite of the cherry.

So, when it comes to the question of balance, let's put aside for the moment the fact that you wouldn't know what balance was if it crept up behind you, rammed a set a scales violently up your arse and then twatted you repeatedly across the head with a hardback copy of Daston and Galison's "Objectivity". Instead, let's consider the *actual* meaning of the word "balance", shall we?

Most thinking people, Carl – and please bear with me here, as I realize that contemplating this on your part will take a quite astoundingly spectacular leap of the imagination – would consider a piece of scholarly work balanced if it acknowledged and evaluated all the serious opposing views. However, it does *not* mean the mandatory inclusion of the entire collected malodorous cranial effluvia of every delusional crackpot and crank who's ever soiled the subject in question with their particular epileptic epistemology.

This is a concept that appears to have died on the shriveled vine of the main-stream media, who seem to think that "balance" can only be achieved by giving equal air time to every screaming loon and their particular dementia, regardless of their merit. Unfortunately, *this* view of balance has the exact opposite effect of its intent, not only lending unjustified credence to the laughably incredible, but also obfuscating the true facts and arguments by diluting them in a tsunami of unmitigated bullshit. I suspect then, Carl, that it is this latter view to which you subscribe, and in fact as we shall soon discover, it seems that the only reason you considered the extant article "balanced" was because you *thought* it contained some information that you could use to smear the Flores discovery with, and that you jumped onto it as eagerly as a Donald Trump onto a cell phone after an episode of Saturday Night Live.

Unfortunately for you, Carl, you perceived this information through the noxiously pious miasmic haze that permanently shrouds your cognitive faculties. That, coupled to the fact, which I will shortly demonstrate, that you most definitely *do not* know how to use Wikipedia, resulted in you putting your foot so far into your mouth that your toes poked through your anus and displaced all of those inconvenient facts that I've been lovingly ramming up there since I've known you.

So now that we've dispatched your second criterion to join the first in its snug but moderately mephitic new home, let's move onto the last – because, believe it or not, you *almost* got it right this time. I say almost, because there's no question that you'd shrugged off the last defender, dribbled your way

around the keeper, pivoted to face the open goal, deftly tapped the ball in front of your right foot, swung that foot mightily towards its target, and... missed the fucker by a mile and summersaulted arse-over-tit to land face-first in the turf.

And the reason for that immaculate display of utter and unmitigated fail, Carl, is that while you *did* correctly identify the references as the most important aspect of any Wikipedia article, you seem to think that veracity is somehow directly proportional to citation frequency, and that all a fatuous cretin need do in order to ascertain the merit of an entry is count them. Apparently, Carl, it never occurred to you that it might also be important to *actually read the fuckers too*, and that is *exactly* what leads to the unfortunate ano-tarsal encounter I've already alluded to and that I'll be describing in detail presently.

So you see, Carl, *that* is how a legitimate scholar uses a Wikipedia article. By *actually* reading those references you somehow managed to perceive might be significant, and then – and listen very carefully, because this is really important – reading some of the references in those references, and then some of the references in those too. Get the gist, Carl? *That's* what that word you've sometimes heard other people use means. You know the one? *Research*. And *that's* why Wikipedia is a wonderful resource to serve a broad base on which to build a true understanding of any given subject, and *also* why it serves as an extremely poor platform for the puffed-up fundie fucktard who uses it as his *sole* source when strutting arrogantly out into public to criticize legitimate science.

**“By the way, the references, as you will see, almost... well, all of them... come from secular sources, mainstream sources, scientific sources, archeological sources et cetera. So *that's* interesting.”**

*Interesting*, Carl? Apparently you didn't feel the need to elaborate on what exactly so piqued your curiosity, and instead chose to leave it there, basted in a generous slathering of your vile innuendo. Of course, this begs the question as to exactly *where* you expected references from a piece on a scientific subject to come from? Could it be from your good self, or some other self-serving, under-educated, over-confident God-botherer? If so, then might I point out that “Pastor Carl Gallups' anal sphincter” is not generally regarded as a reliable source by anyone other than the small cohort of certifiable cultists who somehow take you seriously? Or could it be that you expect significant insights into such matters to be found within the scrawlings of long-dead anonymous, barbaric camel bangers? If so, and if memory serves, then my recollection is that your Bible makes not one mention of Flores Man, nor for that matter anything else to do with a true scientific understanding of reality, because after all, if it *did*, that *might* actually lend some credence to what it has to say on other matters. Of course, the reality is that it falls dismally short in either of these regards, so why your feverish imagination thinks it, or any other non-secular source, should somehow be included in this list is quite beyond me.

In any case, the main reason I included this clip was to point out that merely reading the reference list is not quite the same thing as reading the *actual fucking references themselves*. For the sake of your quadriplegic cerebral cortex, Carl, I don't think I can make it any clearer than that, and shortly *you'll* be making it equally clear that that's about as much reading as *you* did with the citations.

**“Yeah, Yeah. Here it is: ‘*Scandal over specimen damage*’. *How many times* have we come across a proclaimed archeological, evolutionary find... erm, er, er... missing link... and there's scandal involved. Or damage to the specimen involved. And then later we discover there was all kind of... of hoax attached to it.”**

How many times, Carl? *How many times?* How about almost fucking never? It's interesting that you never took the time to give us *your* estimate. Because while the number is low, an exhaustive list would probably take more than the fingers on two hands to count, which would raise it a substantially above the limits of your computational abilities. Either that, or you were perfectly aware of your non-argument but your positively Pavlovian response to the word "scandal" had you jumping onto it like a horny chihuahua onto a great dane's ankle, as you decided to drop your strides regardless, take a squat and disgorge your loathsome insinuations onto *Homo floresiensis* in the way only you can.

So let me humor you for a moment Carl. Let's pretend, for argument's sake, that every single such find that has a "scandal" associated with it is actually a *bona fide* hoax perpetrated by some evil scientist hell-bent on depriving you and your creationist pals of the warm cuddlies you get from your magical fairyland. Let's pretend that for every single creationist lie you can tell me about these examples I *couldn't* immediately provide you with a comprehensive and conclusive refutation. Or better still, let's pretend that *none* of these examples even existed. Where would that leave us?

Well, are you aware, Carl, of how many millions of fossils have been carefully excavated, painstakingly examined and meticulously cataloged by paleontologists? Probably not, because you evidently have an aversion to facts and the actual scientific literature akin to a vampire's aversion to garlic enemas. In any case, regardless of which precise "hoaxes" you're referring to, they are positively *dwarfed* by the veritable *mountain* of others that have been untainted with even the barest whiff of "scandal", and that form an evolutionary record so convincing that it's been pounding your infantile beliefs up the arse relentlessly for the past century despite you and your kind's insistence on sticking your fingers in your ears and putting down that bloated feeling in your collective recta to constipation.

So, let's put aside your pathetic little attempt at well poisoning and instead get on to your main point.

**"So look at this. In early December 2004, Indonesian paleoanthropologist, and I can't pronounce the guy's name... Teuku Jacob... removed most of the remains from *their repository*, Jakarta's National Research Center of Archeology, with permission of only one of the project team directors and kept them, this dude, kept those remains for three months. And here's *all* the references to that. Some scientists expressed fear that the important scientific evidence would be sequestered by a small group of scientists who neither allowed access by other scientists nor published their own research. In other words, they were hiding them from peer review."**

So that's your thesis, then, is it Carl? That where there's smoke there's fire? Because, if that's the case then I'll soon demonstrate that there really isn't any fire, and so if there is any smoke, the only place it's likely to be coming from is your crack pipe.

At this point though, it's still difficult to respond because, aside from the snide innuendo, you appear to be dancing around your point like a constipated ballerina who's last in the toilet line at a Chippendales extravaganza. I will point out, however, that your outrage at your own accusation that the motive behind this purloinment was to avoid peer review didn't go unnoticed. After all, Carl, if peer review means so much to you, then why on earth do you go so far out of your fucking way to shit on every peer reviewed paper you're presented with that commits violent acts of rampant sodomy to your immutable yet profoundly sad excuse for a world view? Obviously, I don't expect you to respond to that piece of deliberate rhetoric, because I'm going to do it for you. The answer is, Carl, as with all creationists, because you're happy to cherry-pick the living shit out of anything that comes your way in order to

defend the indefensible, because if you had *any* other choice you wouldn't feel the need to continuously demonstrate to the world what an utterly repugnant and dishonest weasel of an excuse for a man you really are.

So, with that said, we're finally coming to the part I think everyone's been waiting for. And that's where your toenails finally break through and you demonstrate just how much difficulty you have in distinguishing your posterior sphincter from a hole in the ground.

**"In 2005, Indonesian officials forbade access to the cave where it was all found. Some news media, such as BBC, expressed the opinion... listen to this... that the reason for the restriction was to protect Jacob, who was considered Indonesia's king of paleanthropology.... paleanthropology... from being proven to be wrong."**

And there we have it Carl. That's what you get when your research skills are less advanced than a dyslexic fourth-grader who's forgotten to take his ADHD medication. And that's because it seems you're laboring under the impression that Jacob was trying to hide the fossils to prevent others from concluding that he had been mistaken and that they weren't really from an early hominin.

Well, Carl, had you done more with those references that you took such delight in counting – and by more I mean *actually fucking read some of them* – you would have discovered that while Jacob might indeed have been mistaken, it wasn't in the way you seem to think he was. No Carl, you see Jacob was one of a small group who think that HB1 wasn't really an early hominin but a deformed *modern human!* Thus, if the BBC's opinion as to his and his government's motivations is true, and to be clear their *actual* motivations are far from established, then it wasn't because he was protecting "evolution science", as some dumbfuck dipshits might call it, but rather because he was trying to *suppress* additional evidence for hominin evolution.

So why would he do that, Carl? Was he some kind of daring undercover creationist operative, risking his skin to infiltrate the inner circle of the evil commie-pinko Darwinist pig-dogs? While that might be a technical possibility, though I'd warrant a bit of a long shot, might I suggest that you would find a somewhat more plausible explanation if you had actually done your research properly, or at all for that matter, instead of stumbling onto Wikipedia and flailing around aimlessly like a drunken blind man who'd just stepped off the Waltzers at the county fair.

You see, Carl, all it would have taken was an arseward injection of ten ccs of intellectual honesty for you to also have discovered that, broadly speaking, there are two main school of thought regarding human evolution. Both agree that *Homo erectus* migrated out of Africa and into Europe and Asia approximately 1 million years ago, but then differ as to whether modern humans evolved outside of Africa, or did so in Africa followed by a second outward migration one hundred thousand years ago.

All this would be familiar you Carl had you been able to get over your chronic fact-myopia by taking off those "biblical glasses" that Ken Ham gave you in exchange for Kirk Cameron's phone number. It also would have become clear that Jacob was a proponent of the Multiregional Model, and that HB1 provided supporting evidence for the Out Of Africa hypothesis instead, because it appears to be more closely related to the more ancient *Homo habilis* than to *erectus*. This gives Jacob motives for both supporting the "deformed human" interpretation and for sequestering the fossils in the "scandal" that you've attached so much significance to. And, just in case you're having trouble keeping up, Carl, neither

of those motives have anything to do with your psychedelic fantasy that this “scandal” was a coverup to protect evolutionary theory from the vicious and unrelenting onslaught of your preferred alternative.

And before you even think about giving me any of your hackneyed old bullshit about “scientists being dishonest” or “they don’t really know anything”, let me shove a plug in that right now. Firstly, no one has ever claimed that scientists are unfailingly honest, don’t have their own personal biases or never make mistakes. It is the very fact that they are very much human that has resulted in the development of the scientific method which compensates for these deficiencies.

Thus, unlike the delusional loon on the street corner who says he knows *exactly* what’s going to happen to you when you die, and whose claims can’t be tested in any way, science provides specific mechanisms to root out errors, malfeasance and delusional cretins. You remember those other “scandals” you alluded to, Carl? Well, if you took the time to actually crack open something other than your Bible or your bank book, you would discover that *all* of them were exposed by *scientists*, and not by intrepid creationist intellectuals whose respect for knowledge and the truth has been so extensively documented.

Secondly, just because the exact path of human evolution has not been convincingly established, that doesn’t mean that the current scientific models aren’t infinitely more plausible than some other ones I could mention. The fact that two competing hypotheses exist simply means that there is currently insufficient evidence to distinguish between the two with sufficient statistical confidence, but that does not mean that as more evidence is discovered that one of these alternatives won’t eventually become untenable and fall by the wayside. Neither does it mean that that it is not as established as any fact can be in science, that modern humans can trace their lineage back millions of years to hominids that first took to two feet on the savannahs of Africa.

So, Carl, should you consider continuing to smear your defamatory excrement by conflating the imperfections of individual scientists or the linguistic honesty of science with unreliability or epistemological nihilism, please pause and remember back to this moment where I demonstrated to the world how you’re incapable of learning or knowing anything about anything and, more importantly, what a brainless, useless, clueless, hapless, feckless boob you are.

**“So there you have it folks. They’re afraid that this whole thing... even other scientists were afraid that this thing might turn out to be a bit of junk science. And so the dude that discovered it... or apparently was involved in it... took the remains, broke some, got rid of some other remai... I mean, this is unbelievable.”**

The only thing that was unbelievable in this episode, Carl, was the discovery that you’re apparently still capable of breathing while being so fundamentally stupid. Oh, there I go with my rhetoric again. Of course, I’m exaggerating, because you’re clearly capable of maintaining semi-sentience and so must possess more than a couple of at least partially functional neurons.

Obviously, though, that miserable collection of withered axons and hopelessly jumbled synapses can only provide so much limited functionality, so in case you missed it earlier, Carl – the “junk science” you ineptly think he was afraid would be exposed wasn’t the claim that *Homo floresiensis* is an important evolutionary find, but rather *his* claim that it *wasn’t* an evolutionary find at all.

Fortunately , of course, the damage and losses weren't sufficient to prevent Argue *et al.*, over a decade years later, from providing the most comprehensive evidence to date of Jacob's error – an error you were completely unaware even existed.

And as a happy by-product, of course, your complete obliviousness to all of this, elicited by your inability to learn *anything* about a subject before opening your ignorant yap, not only exposes the emptiness of your abhorrently foul aspersions on the nature of HB1, but also an eye-opening vista of the apparently limitless expanse of your quite astonishingly stupefying self-imposed ignorance.

**“And when you continue to read this Wikipedia article you discover that, er, there was no DNA... DNA extraction. Errr, two teams attempted to extract DNA from a *tooth* discovered in 2003, but they were *unsuccessful*. And then it goes on to say, moreover the heat generated by the high speed of the drill may have denatured the DNA, or... destroyed it. Heh, heh. *How convenient!* So there's no DNA... evidence!”**

Oh – there he is! I thought we'd lost him, but good ole Sumgly finally put in an appearance! Yaaaay! Hopefully the big guy upstairs noticed too and made a mental note to himself, eh Carl?!

That aside, I must confess to having almost shat myself with laughter when I heard you disgorge this. Are you serious, Carl?! *You're* criticizing the conclusion of common decent in this instance because *there's no DNA evidence?! You realize, don't you Carl, that the tacit admission here is that DNA is an acceptable form of evidence to indicate common decent, right? Don't you ever get some of the other witless simians at the PPSimmons channel to vet your videos before you shit them out onto the disinformation superhighway? Of course, we'll never know as I doubt that any of the other clueless fuckwits you keep company with are any more capable of spotting your monumental stupidity than you are.*

So, if DNA evidence is so important to you, Carl – if that really is the clincher that would make you consider the possibility that we're not all related to a single illiterate Middle-Eastern piss-artist – then might I point you in the direction of GenBank? There you'll find *hundreds of billions of base pairs of evidence* that all scream in a unified and deafening voice to the fact that every living thing on this planet is related to the other because of an exquisitely simple yet beautiful bifurcating process of reproduction and diversification in a pattern that is *astonishingly* concordant with the patterns we see upon careful examination of both past and present lifeforms.

And if you have any problems understanding that evidence, Carl, do feel free to give me a bell and I'd be happy to introduce it to you. Of course, there's far too much of it for me to be able to administer it to you alone so, should you want to do so, I would recommend that you first line up all the other oafish dolts at PPSimmons, have them drop their pant and bend over with you, and tell them to grit their teeth and prepare themselves for some *serious* instruction.

**“I just wanted to remind you once again, when you see this sensational stuff, all over the news, proclaiming that there is another piece of evolutionary, quote, evidence... look at it deeply, and you will discover the mushy, magical mystical language of evolutionary *junk* science. And you will discover that these things are filled... they are rife... with intrigue, destruction, hoaxes, greed. This is amazing folks, yet this stuff is being taught to *your* children every day.”**

I think we'll discovered just how "deeply" *you* looked at this Carl, and suffice it to say that had you skimmed the surface any more lightly you would have been in danger of missing it entirely and instead clicking on that bookmark for "NunsInRubber.com" that inexplicably found its way onto your toolbar. Thus, to have you recommend to *anyone* that they look into *anything* deeply is the biggest irony since Hillary Clinton called up John McCain to give him some hot tips on how to run for office. After all, Carl, if it really was a good idea for the blind to lead the blind, then wouldn't we all be agreeing with Mr. Trump that Melania married him for his cutting wit, his rapier sharp mind and his studly good looks?

As for the rest of your closing monologue, apart from one thing, I think I've pretty much covered all of the lies and inanities you repeated here, so I'd like to take this opportunity to mention that there were a number of hilarious-yet-malodorous nuggets that you crimped off as asides throughout your video that had me busting a nut with merriment. I think, however, that it would be extremely selfish of me not to share them with the world, so I just wanted to give you a quick heads-up to be ready for a third and final installment. So if you decide to get up once I'm done, Carl, do make sure it's just to stretch your legs and don't go far, because I'm going to need you back here again, face down and arse up, before you know it.

So in closing let me address what you said about what's "being taught to *your* children every day", because this happens to be a subject that lies close to my heart. Obviously the "your" you're referring to here Carl are the poor, oblivious sheep whose ignorance you're so assiduously intent on perpetuating, and while that ignorance is, to some extent, a matter of their own choosing, I begin to feel my blood pressure rise when I think of them abusing their children by teaching them demonstrable fables as fact while deprecating the one thing that's been shown to make humanity's physical existence better. And when I see a vile, two-faced, jumped-up, lame-brained, shit-kicking cock-sucker strut out into public and encourage them in that abuse, well... my anger boils over into unmitigated fury.

How dare you, Carl? How dare you try and deprive *children* of a true knowledge of our world and the wonder that accompanies it? *How dare you?! Is it then any wonder that I lose all patience with the niceties civil discourse and feel the need to tell you exactly what I think of you.* You're nothing better than a filthy shyster on a street corner, luring the innocent into your white van with your fantastic fables and then whisking them away to sully them with the putrescence of dementia. And if I can do *anything* to stop just one of them from getting into that van of yours, Carl, then rest assured I'll do it, because just the *thought* of the young minds you're scarring makes me want to weep.

Perhaps part of my anger stems from *actually* seeing what *you'd* deprive curious young minds of, Carl. You see, I'm lucky because what's being taught to *my* children is the indescribable splendor of how the world actually works and how *we've* come to know it. I'm lucky because both my girls have had the opportunity to attend a prestigious science magnet where they've *not* been held back by *your* backward, primitive tribalism. I'm lucky because my eldest is at a top university learning to be an engineer, and has already been more productive than *you* will ever be over your whole lifetime. I'm lucky because while her sister's passion lies with the arts, I can rest easily knowing that she will go out into an increasingly technological world fully armed with the skills needed to navigate it and contribute productively to her society. I'm lucky because when my children look out into the world they see one whose phenomena are fully explainable and can be appreciated not only for *what* they are but *how* they are. I'm lucky because my children can understand their deep connection to this planet and therefore the importance of looking after it themselves, because no one else is going to do it for them. And I'm lucky because they're aware of this ancient, deeply rooted connection to Mother Earth because they understand

they're currently at the apex of an evolutionary process that has shaped them to be inexorably connected to their environment. A process that has been elegantly unfurling over countless eons and that has left clues of itself in the very fabric of our planet and ourselves. A process that we have decoded through these clues and through the sheer force of our will, so that we can now look back to where we came from, across an unfathomably vast gulf of time, and gaze in awe and wonder at the long and winding road we took, traced over millennia, from the humble lowliness our beginnings to the lofty heights of our achievements. A process that, if it was designed, and as all sane Christians recognize, could only have been created by a being of unimaginable creative genius, a being of such exquisite transcendence that its brilliance would immediately eclipse the shamanistic petty conjuror, the megalomaniacal, barbaric, genocidal maniac *you* think is such a spiffing, bang-up chap.