



Figure 1: The author has completed the highschool with a gold medal, the master degree at the University of Tartu with Cum Laude, has published in top academic journals, including Physical Review, has been lecturer at the university. The first part of his CV can be found in <http://www.etis.ee>.

## Adam and Eve are divorced, so it is time to revise the Methodology of Science

Dmitri Martila<sup>1</sup>

Former researcher at Institute of Physics, Tartu University, Estonia

### Abstract

The Science tells us, that there is the chance, that Bible is true. But let us assume, that Y-Chromosomal Adam lived 600 years before the Mitochondrial Eve was born (according to references in Wikipedia, there is a chance, that Y-Chromosomal Adam lived same time as Mitochondrial Eve). But the female ancestor of that Eve lived also 600 years before the Mitochondrial Eve: latter has grand-grand-grand-mother called also “Eve”. Enough grand, that this grand-grand-grand-Eve lived the same time with Y-Chromosomal Adam. The future Eve was in the genus of those who lived with Adam. Therefore, one can say that Adam lived at the same time as Eve. This is argued in this paper. In addition, I use the opportunity for a discourse about the methodology of science, proposing a change of methodology.

Indeed, if the Mitochondrial Eve Valentina was born by Victoria, Victoria was born by Susy, and Susy was born by Eve, then Valentina, Victoria, Susy, and the original Eve are all our common ancestors. However, the original Eve is the most ancient common ancestor. Many

---

<sup>1</sup>eestidima@gmail.com

say that the most recent common ancestors might not even have been married. But my result is that the most ancient ancestors were indeed married.

In addition, I prove that the most ancient common ancestors are at the same time the most recent common ancestors. However, the attempt to divorce the couple and, therefore, to cut the source of the existence of humankind is a clear sign for a self-destructive nihilism and wrong methodology. Therefore, I argue for a change of methodology.

# 1 Most ancient common ancestors of contemporary humankind is the original married couple

If Y-Chromosomal Adam lived many centuries before the Mitochondrial Eve, he still knew the female Eve from whom the Mitochondrial Eve came. This female Eve can be, then, called the common ancestor of the contemporary female humankind. And the observation does not exclude Adam's and Eve's marriage. I quote from Wikipedia 2018: "As of 2013, estimates for the age Y-MRCA are subject to substantial uncertainty, with a wide range of times from 180,000 to 580,000 years ago (with an estimated age of between 120,000 and 156,000 years ago, roughly consistent with the estimate for mt-MRCA)."

In genetic genealogy, the identical ancestors point (IAP) or all common ancestors (ACA) point is the most recent point in a given population's past where each individual then alive turned out to either be the ancestor of every individual alive now or has no currently living descendants. Another words: the ACA is the time when everyone around was either an ancestor of everyone currently living or has no descendants at all. This point lies further in the past than the population's most recent common ancestor (MRCA). The identical ancestors point for Homo sapiens has been the subject of debate. In 2004, Rohde, Olson and Chang showed through simulations that the Identical Ancestors Point for all humans is surprisingly recent, on the order of 5,000 – 10,000 years ago. Ralph and Coop, considering the European population and working from genetics, came to similar conclusions for the recent common ancestry of Europeans. Wikipedia 2018 has following references: [8]

Suppose the moment of History called "ACA" has happened at 5500 BC. Then at this year 5500 BC lived, suppose 20000 Adams, it means, that any single human in our time (2018 AD) can trace own origin to one (or more) of the Adams [for example, man Bob – female Jane – man Igor – .... - man John – Adam number 1700]. But due to the direct male descendants line of Y-Chromosomal Adam (and line of females of Mitochondrial Eve) is present also at 5500 BC, then ACA point must be more ancient, than time when M-Eve and Y-Adam were born. It means, that mt-MRCA must be not 200 000 years old, but under 10 000 years old.

Therefore, Adam lived at the same time with the original Eve. Suppose that the family of Adam lived in the same city together with 10 families, and this was the complete population of the planet. Every woman of our time (year 2018 A.C.) can trace her line back to one of these families. Then the probability that they all came from the family of Adam is  $P = (1/10)^N$ , where  $N = 3500000000$  is the number of females in 2018 A.C. The probability that at least one female (of the contemporary female humankind) has not come from the family of Adam is then  $p = 100\% - P \rightarrow 100\%$ . But since the researches say that ABSOLUTELY ALL WOMEN in our days came from the family of Adam, the number of families is not 10, but 1.

## 1.1 Alternative derivation of the original couple

Look, from the Mitochondrial Eve (she is known to Science, the Science in Wikipedia talks about her: she is the real person) at least 3 500 000 000 female lines follow into the future:

these lines connect every women in our 2018 year with Mitochondrial Eve by blood (all females in 2018 are blood-relatives, all are “sisters in Eve”). But from Mitochondrial Eve only single female line follows into the past. And if the Y-Chromosomal Adam lived 600 years before Mitochondrial Eve was born, then he was walking on the planet, with the female blood relative(s) of Mitochondrial Eve. Moreover, from Y-Chromosomal Adam the single male line could follow into the past. However, due to human-monkey population becomes more and more small in numbers (while our mind motion into past), is expected, that past-directed Y-line and past directed M-line are converging to just one couple: original couple of Adam and Eve. Think about them, are they looking in your imagination as monkeys, alien biorobots, or a simple one-cell organisms? Oh my dear! What are your problems with the Absolute Truth?! [2]

## 1.2 What if the female common ancestor was a monkey or was created from aliens?

Assuming that close to the 5 human families in the city of Adam there was a forest with the 5 most developed monkeys, who later have produced some female lines of the humankind. Then the probability that a modern female traces her line back not to the city of Adam but to the monkey forest is much less than simply  $d := 1/10$ . Therefore, the result is that the probability of “all females in 2018 have a common female ancestor” tends to zero:  $d^N \rightarrow 0$ . But it has happened, so its probability was not the zero, but 100%, because there was no monkey forest, just the city of Adam with only one family: the one of Adam.

## 1.3 Conclusion

The Y-Chromosomal Adam is married with the female common ancestor, and all previous common male ancestors are married with female common ancestors. Therefore, the probability that the most recent male ancestor is the most ancient male ancestor tends to 100%. In other words, the Y-Chromosomal Adam is the original Adam. And because a contemporary woman must have equal human rights as a contemporary man, one can be sure that the most recent female ancestor is the most ancient female ancestor. In other words, the Mitochondrial Eve is the original Eve.

## 1.4 Should the evolution be directed into the past?

**Axiom:** *If the vector of degradation was not realized when there was more ability of minds, it will never be realized because without miracles, degradation of minds is irreversible.*

The embittered and damaged ones grow more and more in numbers, it is like the growth of Entropy (chaos) in Physics [1]. Therefore, is expected that Adam and Eve (Fig.2) were not *Untermenschen*, not animals, but fully evolved humans: the arrow of evolution is past-directed [3].



Figure 2: The Icon of Adam and Eve. We can be absolutely sure that in Eastern Orthodox Christianity Adam and Eve are fully respected as original saints. This is the past-directed evolution.

## 2 Does peer-review enslave the editors, so they can't have their own opinion and desire?

Dear Editors, thank you if you would sent my paper to the (anonymous) referees. But the referees are “humans”, so they can troll and block my paper just because I am not a PhD, and because the results are great (so they stimulate the envy). Therefore, I am asking you: if all reports would be total negativism, without any logical reasoning at all, would you still protect me and publish the breakthrough paper?

Because Science has taken its origin from monasteries, and because the only final goal of science was the study of God, science is now in schism with the atheism as basis of the methodology, justifying and praising ignorance, doubt, bullying, trolling and uncertainty – which is non-knowledge and non-truth. See for instance Mr. Ra’s bullying against theist Kent Hovind. Mr. Ra is convinced that this is OK [4]. Doubt, uncertainty and ignorance constitute the official policy [5]. They even ignore their own life and existence, just as they ignore the God of Existence [6].

We do not debate with sick people, but we cite the recognition of “scientific rights” posted by the Flat Earth Society [7] and the recognition of “scientific rights” of atheism [9]. Who does remember, when the debate of believers and atheists began? The fact is that doctors do not argue with sick patients; but patients are being treated. God is so obvious, that even a proof is not required. And when they begin to debate with atheists, they unwillingly recognize “right” to godlessness [10].

To revert this one needs to get used to use such words in everyday communication like godless lie, godless abnormality, godless persecution, godless perversion, godless deception, godless terror, godless hate, godless evil, godless monstrosity, etc; to any negativity one has to add the word “godless”.

There is nice definition of faith [11] (cf. 2018 year’s Wikipedia: “In the context of religion, one can define faith as confidence or trust in a particular system of religious belief, within which faith may equate to confidence based on some perceived degree of warrant, in contrast to a definition of faith as being belief without evidence). One can shorten this definition: Faith is Faithful-ness to Knowledge.

The usual definition of Science is the following: “Science is a systematic enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe”. This simply says that Popper’s scientific criterion is the scientific method to extract knowledge. Therefore, basically, Science is defined to be the process of extraction by using Scientific methods. However, this definition can be greatly shortened: “Science is knowledge extraction.” Usually after a term definition a description of it follows: “Science is composed of main sections, such as: Methodology, Metrology, and Disciplines (Physics, Mathematics, Chemistry, Art, History, Philosophy, Psychology, Theology).”

The words “Science is a system of knowledge obtained by scientific methods” is a tautology. After all, scientific methods are the “methodology” section of science. In Theology, one of the methods is the reading of the Bible and the prayer (cleansing the mind).

### 2.1 Scientific theory is always confirmable

Common belief: “A scientific theory is true (with its confirmation) and scientific (with its falsifiability). That’s all. If the theory is not confirmed, it can not be true and will be rejected by this criterion.”

But these are just our “romantic” fantasies. And what does Popper’s official wording say?

There are no words “Truth”, “confirmability”. Well, indeed, the criterion of Popper (believer, by the way!) sounds like this: a scientific theory is scientific when it can be refuted. That is, to prove that it is a lie and falsehood. Therefore, lies and untruths entered science. And in order for the unchangeable Dogmatic Knowledge of the Church to be included in Science, it is necessary to rewrite the criterion in this way: “scientific theory is confirmable.” If a theory test disproves scientific theory, then it is no longer scientific. The aim of a test is not to disprove a scientific theory but to confirm it. If it sadly happens that a theory becomes disproven, the theory is not scientific anymore (NB! Read my wording: usually a test is meant not to prove but to confirm). Otherwise, the vector is directed towards idiocy, not towards evolution: scientists and journal referees are called to lie for Science to be refutable. If someone refutes a scientific theory, then the latter is no longer scientific and, therefore, not confirmable. But it stays forever refutable, if once refuted.<sup>2</sup> The Flat Earth theory is refuted, so this theory is scientific, because it is forever refutable. Please consider how love, respect and trust are lost in them [15]. Popper’s destructive ideology is incompatible to the dogmatic knowledge, to the Absolute Truth. Latter can not be refuted. That is why there is a conflict between religion and technical science. The small word “confirmable” makes the difference between the hell on earth and the happy life. The theist Immanuel Kant has destroyed Thomas Aquinas’s five proofs of God by using the wishfull thinking only: Kant wished (according to Popper’s definition of science) to destroy, wished to refute. Better is to wish to confirm, to built, to love the theorem authors, to respect their work.

## 2.2 The burden of proof is the presumption of non-existence

The modern Methodology supposes that if the article was not refuted by the reviewer, but he did not understand this article, the journal must reject the article. This is known under name “burden of proof”. Science is based on methods. But has science proved own methods in strictly scientific way? Or are they “proven” only by practice? But how unfair could become this practice? I suspect that often a reviewer understood everything, but lied that he did not understand to stop the author. Indeed, one lies, when says that paper is unclear: if the author has defined all terms, and showed relations, then the paper is complicated, but clear for those referees, who want to think. The burden of proof is not suitable for the methods of science, because it does not fight the unjust activity.

The burden of proof should not become the presumption of the guilt, that “if something has not been proven, it does not exist.” Instead, the presumption of innocence has to be used: “as long as something is not refuted, it exists.” As you have noticed, such principles allow theology to rank with technical science [16].

The trolls use the presumption of non-existence: “If something is not proven, it is like if it does not exist”. This is the “burden of proof”. But I use the presumption of existence, the presumption of innocence and the presumption of righteousness, the latter expressed as “until one would become disproven, the person is treated as if he is in right”.

The degradation has reached the groundless assertion of “what can be asserted without evidence can be rejected without evidence” (Hitchen’s razor). Such a razor deals with an author in the following cruel way: first, the editor of the journal posts doubt that there is no proof in the article. The author responds that there is a proof, since the author thinks so, and

---

<sup>2</sup>The “Hawking temperature” of the black hole is explained differently in the two abstracts of Refs. [12]. However, it has to coincide, because it is Hawking’s most famous discovery. Has the World gone with the true one? Another example: all scientists used (and are still using (cf. e.g. Laura [13]) the solution of a dust collapse almost for a century, but this was wrong [14]. Some of the peer-review “mistakes” are uncovered in Rudolf Peierls, “Surprises in Theoretical Physics” (1979) and “More Surprises in Theoretical Physics” (1991).

asks not to be rude but rather check the proof for correctness. But the editor was “brought up” by the Hitchen which means that the author’s latter sentence is not in itself a strict refutation of the editor’s statement, so the article is not accepted for consideration with the argument of having no proof. Hitchen’s razor justifies any tyranny and highhandedness.

A typical editorial office [etazhi-lit.ru/edition](http://etazhi-lit.ru/edition) reports that their journal

- does not take payments and does not pay the royalty for the publication of manuscripts;
- does not enter into correspondence with the authors, does not notify the author whos manuscript was rejected, and also does not explain the reasons for the refusal;
- does not review and does not give advice on the text of the manuscript;
- can not share the opinion of the author.

The cancellation of royalties at the end of the XX century does not mean anything good for “plebs”, i.e. independent researches. The independent and free-thinking science has lost support and financial means. The love is dying [17].

If a journal may not share the opinion of its own journal article, all articles in the journal are self-justifications of the authors, so they are not objective despite the peer-review. By saying that “the journal does not trust its own papers”, the peer-review system becomes nihilated. What is the point then about the journal? If the editors of scientific journals do not review the submitted material, they can be self-justifying tyrants. And if all such journals are tyrants, they do not respect the truth. “The truth is born in the argument” (popular aphorism), but editors deny disputes. And if so, their journal is like a junk yard.

The degradation of the meaning of the printed word became obvious in the developments related to Fermat’s last theorem. In plain language, journal decided that letters from plebs go to the trash unopened. This is really mean: “Proving the Fermat theorem among mathematics lovers was so popular that in 1972 the Kvant magazine, publishing an article about the Fermat theorem, accompanied it with the following postscript: “The editors of Quant, for its part, consider it necessary to inform readers that letters with the “proofs” of the Fermat theorem will not be considered (and returned)” [18].

Dr. Michio Kaku, a quite popular physicist on YouTube insincerely says: “If you find out what Dark Matter is, let me first know”, or “the Nobel Prize is waiting for someone who understands why there is so few antimatter in the Universe”. As the “plebs” do not have a direct channel of communication with the elite. Can’t they organize a fees for talking to elites like Kaku?

If two competing things, if two competing theories ( $A$  and  $B$ ), if two competing Theologies are possible, then it can be a subject for investigation: the set  $S = (A, B)$  is refuted, however  $A$  and  $B$  are not yet. You should recall my meaning of presumption. It is not assumption. Presumption of innocence means that the author is being treated as if he is in right, as if he is not criminal nor crazy, until the opposite would be proven. Presumption deals more with KINDNESS and RESPECT and LOVE and CULTURE, than with technical truth. We are not robots! Without this there is no knowledge, because all is in doubt. But the latter sentence is the knowledge. The new methodology will make us happy [19]. But nowadays such lovable principles are being laughed at, so an “opponent” might act like a disrespectful troll:

“The text is weird and confusing. It is read as if the author had got a paper rejected by a journal, and this event has triggered a mental breakdown. The internet is full of stuff like that. What are we supposed to do with this? The author has a confusing understanding of genetics/genealogy, considerable bitterness towards the scientific world, and ... What? What’s the point?”

Me: “It is a problem not of me, but of you, the receiver. Prove you right. Be specific. It is not enough to say that “truth is stupidity.””

Opponent: “Be specific about what? The author’s evident belief that the Y-chromosome Adam is some special ancestor whom we can take to be the Adam of the Bible? We have lots of common male ancestors, most of them much more recent than the Y-chromosome Adam.”

Me: “You can not disprove the proof in my paper just quoting textbooks. I know textbooks, and have gone further than these.”

## 2.3 Technical Science has cut itself by Occam’s Razor

Involution (from the latin *Involutio* = coagulation) is the reduction or loss in the process of evolution of individual organs, simplifying their organization and functions, the reverse development of an organ. See for instance the involution of the uterine after childbirth; the atrophy of organs during the natural aging. Involution is sometimes used as a synonym for invagination, for example, when cells are moved from the germ surface inward. Degeneration is the process of simplifying an organization, associated with the disappearance of organs and functions, as well as entire organ systems.

But this is not surprising. Such a vector of simplifications was set by the method called Occam’s Razor. Even in everyday life, people talk about texts longer than a page in a degenerate tone: “it is too long; I didn’t read.” The simplest explanation for the most complex phenomena are: “massive hallucination, juggling, falsification, error and deception.” Occam’s razor brought science to complete solipsism [20].

Occam’s razor makes the work of a scientist<sup>3</sup> ungrateful and not funded. After all, Occam’s razor and naturalism<sup>4</sup> are official methods of wrong going science. Why? Man has two kidneys, not one: most high does not follow Occam’s razor.

The “death-moan of human reason” really sounds louder and louder: “we do not know what is around us. Nature somehow works, but we cannot understand how. Science has a nervous breakdown, equations make no sense and we can not do anything about it. So, something is fundamentally wrong. Is this schizophrenia?” [21].

And what does the lawlessness of Joseph Stalin “no human – no problem” means, if not terrible simplification?

## 2.4 Sir Michael Atiyah’s proof of Riemann’s hypothesis

In 2018, Sir Michael Atiyah presented a proof of Riemann’s hypothesis [22]. But in the same month came the collective idea not to check the proof. This means that the proof was not refuted, but scientists are way too sceptical to look for a refutation, because (1) the author has previously made mistakes in his articles, and (2) the proof looks too simple. It is a shame for the un-human methodology of science that the proofs and dis-proofs of Riemann Conjecture are constantly coming, but are going into trash unopened [23].

---

<sup>3</sup>Work on science which is meant to introduce technical complications giving a mass to neutrinos, Dark Matter, and the needed vacuum energy.

<sup>4</sup>This is the simplest philosophy, namely the philosophy of emptiness: “before the Big Bang there was nothing and there was no Creator, but from nothing the nothing comes, and therefore we are a hallucinating mold on the planet, a disease of the planet that imagines self-consciousness, Religion and soul”

### 3 Conclusion

Well, how could we all have gone in the wrong direction? The wrong direction started from Ancient Greece, when the methodology of mistrust began to form. This direction was developed by the Christians: Popper, Occam, Darwin. It sounds like the Church Schism. Today, Dr. Kaku “teaches” that reality does not exist: [20] and that the Science got it all wrong: [21].

I wanna peace on Earth, without conflicts. The Science tells, that there is a chance, that Bible is true. Why not then close and de-fund the alternative “ways”?

### References

- [1] Dmitri Martila, “What I’ve got new in Science”, in print, the drafts are available from <https://my.mail.ru/community/fysika/22CBFF5BBE0B227E.html>
- [2] “Erasure - Ship of Fools” <https://youtu.be/i7KY0LTbk2U>
- [3] “And if you lost your way, look back for yesterday, remembering this way” (from a song in the movie “Casper” (1995))
- [4] “Debate: Hovind vs. Ra” <https://youtu.be/du0xy3omB-4>
- [5] Stuart Firestein, “Ignorance – the critical driver for science” <https://youtu.be/44eTY5pYCTQ>
- [6] “The Universe Shouldn’t Exist, Physicists Questioning Reality” <https://youtu.be/bu-pu0wkVd8>
- [7] “SCIENTISTS DISCOVER Flat Earthers Know REAL SCIENCE!” <https://youtu.be/L9WouDyfHa0>
- [8] Wikipedia 2018 has following references: D.L. Rohde, S. Olson, J.T. Chang, “Modelling the recent common ancestry of all living humans”, *Nature* 431(7008), 562–566 (2004); Peter Ralph, Graham Coop, “The Geography of Recent Genetic Ancestry across Europe”, *PLOS Biology*, May 7, 2013; D.L. Rohde, “On the common ancestors of all living humans”, Submitted to *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* (2003).
- [9] “Epic Debate Over God’s Existence” <https://youtu.be/aUKIVV48L0k>
- [10] “We didn’t start the fire, it was always burning, since the world’s been turning; no, we didn’t light it, but we tried to fight it.” <https://youtu.be/BKfaKdFsFds>
- [11] Alvin Plantinga, “Warranted Christian Belief,” USA: Oxford University Press (January 27, 2000). pp. 169–199; Kenneth Boa. “Faith Has Its Reasons: Integrative Approaches to Defending the Christian Faith.” USA: IVP Books (March 1, 2006) pp. 251–255
- [12] Steven W. Hawking “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Comm. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199–220; Steven W. Hawking “Black hole explosions?” *Nature* **248** (1974) 30–31
- [13] “We use the matching of metrics at the surface of the star, illustrated in Section 2.2 for the OS model,” in Laura Mersini-Houghton, “Backreaction of Hawking Radiation on a Gravitationally Collapsing Star I: Black Holes?” *Phys. Lett.* **B738** (2014) 61–67; arXiv:1406.1525; arXiv:1409.1837; <https://youtu.be/gSh-bzz4z58>; <https://youtu.be/qBfo4SNZq7I>.

- [14] “At this point OS made a fatal error by choosing an ...” in Trevor W. Marshall, Max K. Wallis, *Journal of Cosmology* **6** (2010) 1473-1484. Available from <http://journalofcosmology.com/MarshallWallis.pdf>
- [15] “The best flat earth song ever!!” <https://youtu.be/Zfuma1Ahhw>
- [16] “Jesus Takes My Burdens Away” <https://youtu.be/vJCJiHxuyd4>
- [17] “OneRepublic, “Love Runs Out” <https://youtu.be/00Wj0CiM8WU>
- [18] Y. Gastev, M. Smolyansky, “A few words about the Great Fermat Theorem,” *Kvant.* **8** (1972) 23-25
- [19] “Little Big Town – Happy People” <https://youtu.be/DDcJiamY9N8>
- [20] Michio Kaku, “The universe should not exist, because in any case we should not be here. It is so frustrating that we are ready to tear our hair out” <https://youtu.be/esPXpagkVwY>
- [21] “Science vs. God: It’s The Collapse Of Physics As We Know It” <http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2jbd7x>
- [22] “Sir Michael Atiyah Riemann Hypothesis Proof” <https://youtu.be/UBVy0o0YczQ>
- [23] <https://preview.tinyurl.com/y754ckml>