



Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy — 2016, t. 13

Philosophical Aspects of Origin

s. 1-10

ISSN 2299-0356

<http://www.nauka-a-religia.uz.zgora.pl/images/FAG/2016.t.13/art.01.pdf>

Mike Sutton

Darwin's Greatest Secret Exposed: Response to Grzegorz Malec's *De Facto* Fact Denying Review of My Book

This is a response to Grzegorz Malec's "There Is No Darwin's Greatest Secret",¹ a review of my book ***Nullius in Verba: Darwin's Greatest Secret.***²

Veracity regarding the data of how great discoveries are made is important. The history of scientific discovery informs us of how scientists conduct their research. It teaches us how to avoid errors, when not to give up, and how information of all kinds can be capitalised upon to make further quantum leaps in great thinking. In that regard, it is obvious that we need a veracious history of the discovery of natural selection, which is, arguably, the unifying theory of biology.

This response to Malec's grossly misleading review of my book is written in the interests of veracity about the history of discovery of the unifying theory of biology.

The title of my book serves well as a guide against Malec's misleading review of the book itself. The Latin phrase essentially means that we should not just take someone's word alone for it that something is true. This philosophy is

MIKE SUTTON, PH.D. — Nottingham Trent University, e-mail: michael.sutton@ntu.ac.uk.

© Copyright by Mike Sutton & *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy*.

¹ See Grzegorz MALEC, "There Is No Darwin's Greatest Secret", *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy* 2015, vol. 12, pp. 325-331, <http://www.nauka-a-religia.uz.zgora.pl/images/FAG/2015.t.12/art.10.pdf> (19.06.2016).

² See Mike SUTTON, ***Nullius in Verba: Darwin's Greatest Secret***, Thinker Books, Thinker Media Inc., Cary, North Carolina 2014.

essentially encapsulated in the contemporary expression “show me the evidence”. Sticking with the subject of appropriate titles, in his review of my book Grzegorz Malec fails to consider evidence in the book itself that challenges the title of his incredibly misleading review of it.

Any such outright and *de facto* fact denial behaviour by scientists and historians is a concern that we all have a communal duty to expose and tackle wherever we find it. If we allow this sort of behaviour in any quarter of academic work, what kind of message does it send? When it comes to university academics, professional scientists, and historians, we expect and rely upon them to be honest about the existence of proven facts about what exists in print in the publication record. What dreadful harms might our neglect of veracity further facilitate if we allow such clear fact denial to pass without whistle-blowing on the culprits?

So, what in fact has been newly discovered and is originally revealed in my book and presented in it as being of the greatest importance, which Malec’s review completely fails to mention?

The following seven key new facts collectively reveal the most significant new discoveries in my book. Among them is the new and original exposure of Darwin’s greatest secret. Namely, that from 1860 onward Darwin lied about the pre-1859 readership of Matthew’s book (1831)³ and the original ideas in it. Moreover, by so lying, he concealed the many routes of possible knowledge contamination from Matthew’s book (1831) to that of his unpublished and published work, and that of Alfred Wallace.

1. Darwin scholars can no longer claim — as they did before my book was published — that Patrick Matthew’s prior-published conception of macroevolution by natural selection was unread by any naturalists before Darwin and Wallace replicated it. Indeed, I originally discovered seven who cited the book that contains it in the pre-1859 literature. And Darwin and Wallace, and their influencers, knew four of them well. Hence it is most significantly newly discovered

³ See Patrick MATTHEW, **On Naval Timber and Arboriculture; With a Critical Note on Authors Who Have Recently Treated the Subject of Planting**, Adam Black, Edinburgh — Longmans and Co., London 1831.

and completely proven that routes of potential knowledge contamination exist between Matthew's book (1831) to the pre-1858 minds of Darwin and Wallace. The date evidence of this newly discovered publication record now debunks the old "knowledge claim" that Darwin's notebooks and private essays prove he independently discovered natural selection. See my latest peer reviewed article in this journal⁴ for the full facts Malec has conspicuously side-stepped in his biased review.

2. Darwin scholars can no longer claim, as they did before my book was published, that Darwin was an honest scientist. It has been proven that from 1860 onward, following information provided by Matthew himself, Darwin lied about the prior readership of Matthew's book and the original ideas in it by other naturalists. Moreover, Darwin told at least seven additional lies in order to convince the scientific community that he independently conceived the idea of natural selection.

3. It can no longer be claimed that Wallace was an honest scientist. Indeed, I discovered that he edited one of his letters in his autobiography to conceal his claim that he thought he was owed money and favours by Darwin and his associates for cooperating with the presentation of his replication of the concept of natural selection alongside that of Darwin in 1858.

4. Darwin scholars can no longer claim that Matthew's conception of natural selection was contained solely in the appendix of his book. I reveal exactly how much is actually contained in the main body of his book and that Darwin lied when he wrote that Matthew's ideas were solely contained in the appendix. Matthew referred him to just some of the relevant text from the main body of his book and Darwin wrote to admit the fact to Joseph Hooker.

5. Darwin scholars should no longer claim that Matthew never understood what he conceived on the grounds that he never shouted about it from the rooftops. I show how the first half of the 19th century was governed by laws and conventions that forbade anyone from doing such a thing, and others from dis-

⁴ See Mike SUTTON, "On Knowledge Contamination: New Data Challenges Claims of Darwin's and Wallace's Independent Conceptions of Matthew's Prior-Published Hypothesis", *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy* 2015, vol. 12, pp. 167-205, <http://www.nauka-a-religia.uz.zgora.pl/images/FAG/2015.t.12/art.05.pdf> (19.06.2016).

cussing it. Moreover, Matthew told Darwin as much when he explained his book was banned from Perth Public Library in Scotland and that an eminent naturalist could not teach the original ideas in it for fear of pillory punishment.

6. Darwin, in 1859,⁵ originally four-word-shuffled Matthew's original term for his original conception from Matthew's (1831) "natural process of selection" into "process of natural selection", which is the only possible grammatically correct re-ordering of the four words Matthew used to name his discovery.

7. Darwin was the first to replicate Matthew's (1831) powerful artificial versus natural selection analogy of differences to explain Matthew's original hypothesis, whilst claiming it as his own independent discovery. Indeed, Darwin not only replicated Matthew's brilliant analogy in his private essay, he used it to open the first chapter of the **Origin of Species**.

Setting the Historical Record Straight in the Public Interest

In light of the most significant facts Malec chooses to ignore in his review of my book, we must inquire *Why is it that Darwin's newly discovered greatest secret is a proven fact that is concealed in his review of the book containing it?*

My book **Nullius in Verba: Darwin's Greatest Secret** originally revealed the main bombshell discovery from my research that, as opposed to the prior consensus among Darwin scholars⁶ that no naturalist, no biologist, or anyone else had read the original ideas in it before Darwin and Wallace replicated them, that seven naturalists in fact did read Matthew's (1831) original ideas. I have proved that they actually cited his book in the published literature pre-1858; and that Darwin knew four of them personally, Wallace knew one, and that three of those four played major roles at the epicentre and facilitation of their work on

⁵ See Charles R. DARWIN, **On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life**, 1st ed., John Murray, London 1859.

⁶ See, for example, Charles R. DARWIN, **On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life**, 3rd ed., John Murray, London 1861; Gavin DE BEER, "The Wilkins Lecture: The Origins of Darwin's Ideas on Evolution and Natural Selection", *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 1962, vol. 155, no. 960, pp. 321-338; Ernst MAYR, **The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution and Inheritance**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1982, p. 499.

natural selection.⁷ Furthermore, my book originally revealed that it is proven fact that Darwin⁸ lied when he wrote that no naturalist or anyone at all had⁹ read Matthew's original ideas before Matthew brought them to his attention in 1860, because Matthew¹⁰ had previously informed Darwin very clearly and in no uncertain terms that at least two eminent naturalists had read them, and fully understood them, that one feared pillory punishment were he to teach them, and that his book had been banned by the Public Library of Perth in Scotland because of the heretical ideas on the origin of species that are published in it!

I am concerned that in his review of my book Malec totally ignores my main findings regarding who we now know cited Matthew's book (1831) pre-1858, and what they then went on to do. Instead, his review focuses entirely on my less important, and far less prominently presented, findings about who was apparently first to be second in print with apparently unique Matthewisms.

Malec effectively then, indeed boldly, portrays a relatively minor part of my book as though it is the main findings presented in it. But even in that regard, Malec appears to have been able to find only one (out of the thirty examples I found) that can be currently rebutted. However, I must stress, at this appropriate juncture, that I am most grateful for Malec's excellent rebutting in this one single regard. His finding shall most certainly be attributed to him in the second edition of my book.

I know Grzegorz Malec has been trying hard to find other examples of apparent unique Matthewisms to rebut, because he has sent me e-mails in that regard (although oddly he fails to mention that fact in his review). Instead, he (arguably) gives the impression that there are others that have been rebutted. Per-

⁷ See SUTTON, *Nullius in Verba...*

⁸ See Charles R. DARWIN, "Natural Selection", *Gardeners' Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 21 April 1860, no. 16, pp. 362-363.

⁹ See DARWIN, *On the Origin of Species...*, 3rd ed.

¹⁰ See Patrick MATTHEW, Letter to *The Gardeners' Chronicle*, "Nature's Law of Selection", *Gardeners' Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 7 April 1860, pp. 312-313; Patrick MATTHEW, Letter to *The Gardeners' Chronicle*, "Nature's Law of Selection", *Gardeners' Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 12 May 1860, p. 433.

haps there are others he knows of? But if there are, he has not yet told us of them.

If Malec can disconfirm more than just the one out of thirty examples in my book, on this theme, I have asked him to let us know.

In the spirit of objective enquiry, which I hope might one day rub off on Malec by association with it, I even set up an open competition, with twenty-nine free copies of my book as potential prizes, so as to encourage him and others to disconfirm this most troublesome hypothesis.¹¹ But even if all thirty examples of apparently unique Matthewisms in my book, and who was apparently first to be second in published print with them, are disconfirmed, that does not do what Malec appears to think disconfirming even just one example does. Debunking the first to be second (F2b2) hypothesis would not mean “there is no Darwin’s greatest secret”, as he claims disconfirming one example goes a long way to doing. This is despite what the dreadfully disingenuous title of Malec’s review of my book proclaims, in light of the lack of substance in his review of it. The reason why debunking the F2b2 hypothesis does not mean “there is no Darwin’s greatest secret” is because Darwin’s greatest secret is the main theme of my book, which is the same as the main theme of my article¹² in the journal *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy (Philosophical Aspects of Origin)*. Let me explain.

To necessarily repeat the point already made, Darwin’s greatest secret is that he and Alfred Wallace fallaciously claimed alternately that no naturalist and no one at all read Matthew’s prior-published discovery and explanatory examples of natural selection before they replicated both. The “New Data”, originally presented in my book, conclusively proves that is a fallacy. The proof of the fallacy is in the previously undiscovered 19th century printed words in publications that absolutely prove Matthew’s book, and the original ideas in it, were cited by influential naturalists, known both to Darwin and Wallace and their influencers, and their influencers’ influencers, before they replicated those same ideas — claiming they alighted upon them independently of Matthew’s prior

¹¹ See Mike SUTTON, “On the First to be Second (F2b2) Hypothesis”, *Dysology and Criminology: The Blog of Mike Sutton* 2015, https://www.bestthinking.com/thinkers/science/social_sciences/sociology/mike-sutton?tab=blog&blogpostid=22763%2c22763 (19.06.2016).

¹² See SUTTON, “On Knowledge Contamination...”.

publication of the same. Darwin would later fallaciously excuse himself from 1860 onward by claiming those ideas were unread before he and Wallace replicated them. Darwin is proven to have lied in writing that excuse, because he wrote that as an absolute self-serving lie after Matthew had informed him of two influential naturalists who read and understood his original ideas, and their significance, and that his book had been banned, because of those same bombshell heretical ideas, by Perth Public Library in Scotland. Credulous Darwin scholars have been parroting their namesakes' lies about the supposed lack of pre-1858 readership of Matthew's original ideas ever since. They have done so in order to necessarily construct and maintain the now newly busted myths that support the Darwinist paradigm of tri-independent discovery of Matthew's prior-published conception of macro evolution by natural selection.

Conclusions and the Way Forward

Alarmingly, there are scientists and historians of science working in our universities today who are prepared to deny that facts exist, or else — for whatever reason — to misrepresent work through cherry picking, *de facto* fact denial behaviour and other gross distortions of published evidence, that effectively misleads the public about their existence and what they mean for the history of scientific discovery.

Darwinists, named for their much deified hero, have traditionally worshipped Darwin for his honesty, integrity and originality. The “real facts”, newly discovered and originally presented in my book,¹³ originally prove they have been worshipping nothing more than a lying, replicating glory thief. In other words, they have credulously bet their careers on the wrong scientist. We should not expect an admission of this inevitability to be forthcoming anytime soon. Because esteemed research¹⁴ teaches us that paradigm changes in science take time and are at first met with fierce resistance.

¹³ See SUTTON, *Nullius in Verba....*

¹⁴ See Thomas S. KUHN, **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, 2nd ed., enlarged, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1962.

Darwinists are compelled to deny the existence of, or else the importance of, the “New Data”, because their worship of Darwin is like a stack of dominoes. If one of the “New Facts” is acknowledged, then the whole stack tumbles.

Explanations for why expert Darwin scholars failed to see the obvious and significant fact that Darwin lied when confronted by Matthew in *The Gardeners' Chronicle* in 1860, can be understood in terms of “blindsight” cognitive bias, and other explanations provided by Cohen's **States of Denial**¹⁵ within the context of the so-called “Darwin Industry” operating within a highly pervasive and controlling “corporate” framework. The same thing explains why, unlike myself, they failed to “follow the data” on John Loudon who was a famous naturalist, noted botanist, a friend of the famous naturalists Joseph Banks, John Lindley and William Hooker, and member of the Linnean Society of naturalists. Had they done so they would have found that Loudon edited two of Blyth's most influential papers on organic evolution. That is an important discovery, among several others in my book, because Darwin admitted Blyth was his most important informant on organic evolution. This among several other potential routes of knowledge contamination are originally revealed in my book — but all are weirdly ignored by Malec.

Perhaps cognitive blindsight explains also why Malec's review of my book missed all the most significant parts in the book and focused instead on presenting the least important as the whole? Clearly, more research is needed if we are to understand the reasons for similar misleading bias and de facto historical fact denial behaviour at the very heart of the scientific community.



Mike Sutton

References

COHEN Stanley, **States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering**, Polity, Cambridge 2001.

¹⁵ See Stanley COHEN, **States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering**, Polity, Cambridge 2001.

DARWIN Charles R., “Natural Selection”, *Gardeners’ Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 21 April 1860, no. 16, pp. 362-363.

DARWIN Charles R., **On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life**, 1st ed., John Murray, London 1859.

DARWIN Charles R., **On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life**, 3rd ed., John Murray, London 1861.

DE BEER Gavin, “The Wilkins Lecture: The Origins of Darwin’s Ideas on Evolution and Natural Selection”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 1962, vol. 155, no. 960, pp. 321-338.

KUHN Thomas S., **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, 2nd ed., enlarged, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1962.

MALEC Grzegorz, “There Is No Darwin’s Greatest Secret”, *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy* 2015, vol. 12, pp. 325-331, <http://www.nauka-a-religia.uz.zgora.pl/images/FAG/2015.t.12/art.10.pdf> (19.06.2016).

MATTHEW Patrick, Letter to *The Gardeners’ Chronicle*, “Nature’s Law of Selection”, *Gardeners’ Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 7 April 1860, pp. 312-313.

MATTHEW Patrick, Letter to *The Gardeners’ Chronicle*, “Nature’s Law of Selection”, *Gardeners’ Chronicle and Agricultural Gazette* 12 May 1860, p. 433.

MATTHEW Patrick, **On Naval Timber and Arboriculture; With a Critical Note on Authors Who Have Recently Treated the Subject of Planting**, Adam Black, Edinburgh — Longmans and Co., London 1831.

MAYR Ernst, **The Growth of Biological Thought: Diversity, Evolution and Inheritance**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1982.

SUTTON Mike, **Nullius in Verba: Darwin’s Greatest Secret**, Thinker Books, Thinker Media Inc., Cary, North Carolina 2014.

SUTTON Mike, “On Knowledge Contamination: New Data Challenges Claims of Darwin’s and Wallace’s Independent Conceptions of Matthew’s Prior-Published Hypothesis”, *Filozoficzne Aspekty Genezy* 2015, vol. 12, pp. 167-205, <http://www.nauka-a-religia.uz.zgora.pl/images/FAG/2015.t.12/art.05.pdf> (19.06.2016).

SUTTON Mike, "On the First to be Second (F2b2) Hypothesis", *Dysology and Criminology: The Blog of Mike Sutton* 2015, https://www.bestthinking.com/thinkers/science/social_sciences/sociology/mike-sutton?tab=blog&blogpostid=22763%2c22763 (19.06.2016).

**Darwin's Greatest Secret Exposed:
Response to Grzegorz Malec's *De Facto* Fact Denying Review of My Book**

Summary

Grzegorz Malec's "There Is No Darwin's Greatest Secret", a review of my book ***Nullius in Verba: Darwin's Greatest Secret***, takes one extremely minor finding from my book and, despite his best efforts, manages to disconfirm just one of thirty examples of that minor finding. He then takes that one disconfirmed mere minor example and presents it as evidence that he has disconfirmed all the original major findings in my book. By so doing, his deceptive review goes far beyond the counter-academic deviance of mere cherry picking, it is more a case of gross misrepresentation to the point of *de facto* fact denial amounting to historic revisionist behaviour.

Keywords: Darwin, Matthew, misrepresentation, bias, fact denial, historic revisionism.