

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 11 Issue 11

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

August 2007

Forget Everything!

Forget what you've heard about Homo habilis and Homo erectus, the origin of bipedal posture, and the genetic similarity of humans and chimps, because evolutionists have changed their minds, again.

This summer evolutionists have been changing their minds about practically everything they have been telling us about human evolution.

H. habilis and H. erectus

Here is the paragraph from a recent *Nature* article that stirred up a lot of the trouble.

With the discovery of the new, well dated specimens from Ileret, *H. habilis* and *H. erectus* can now be shown to have co-occurred in eastern Africa for nearly half a million years. Previously, the most recent occurrence of *H. habilis* was at 1.65 Myr ago or older (OH 13). KNM-ER 42703 now provides a reliable and substantially younger age of 1.44 Myr. The earliest occurrence of specimens with affinities to *H. habilis* is at approximately 2.33 Myr ago at Hadar (A.L. 666), but *H. habilis* (*sensu stricto*) first appears in eastern Africa at about 1.9 Myr ago (for example, OH 24). Diagnostic evidence of *H. erectus* appears in the African record at about the same time (that is, KNM-ER 2598), and the youngest African fossils attributed to that taxon are dated to circa 1.0 Myr ago (for example, OH 12, Daka, KNM-OG 45500).¹

Here is how that paragraph was reported in the popular press. Surprisingly, they got it right!

The fossils, discovered in eastern Africa, challenge the understanding that humans evolved one after another like a line of dominoes, from ancient *Homo habilis* to *Homo*

erectus and eventually to *Homo sapiens*, or modern people.²

The discovery by Meave Leakey, a member of a famous family of paleontologists, shows that two species of early human ancestors lived at the same time in Kenya. That pokes holes in the chief theory of man's early evolution - that one of those species evolved from the other.

And it further discredits that iconic illustration of human evolution that begins with a knuckle-dragging ape and ends with a briefcase-carrying man.³

The paper is based on fossilized bones found in 2000. The complete skull of *Homo erectus* was found within walking distance of an upper jaw of *Homo habilis*, and both dated from the same general time period. That makes it unlikely that *Homo erectus* evolved from *Homo habilis*, researchers said.⁴

Although they are trying to minimize the importance of the coexistence of these two species, they realize the trouble they are in. The cornerstone of the theory of evolution is extinction. The only way for a new gene to predominate is for two things to happen. First, the struggle for existence must be so great that a large segment of the population dies off. Second, the new gene must provide a significant survival advantage. If these two conditions are true, then the newly evolved variant will drive the older variant to extinction.

¹ Spoor, Leakey, *et al.*, *Nature*, 9 August 2007, "Implications of new early Homo fossils from Ileret, east of Lake Turkana, Kenya" pages 688-691

² Julie Steenhuisen, *Reuters*, August 8, 2007, "Fossils paint new picture of human evolution"

³ Seth Borenstein, *Associated Press*, August 9, 2007, "Evolution revolution creates stir"

⁴ *ibid.*

If *H. habilis* existed for more than a million years without being driven to extinction by *H. erectus*, then *H. erectus* must not have had a significant survival advantage over *H. habilis*, and there would have been no reason for the *H. erectus* genes to predominate.

To make matters worse,

... *Homo erectus* might have exhibited sexual dimorphism, a primitive trait, the researchers said.

Reduced size differences between the sexes is typically considered a trait acquired during human evolution.

"It makes *Homo erectus* a bit less like us," Anton said.⁵

H. erectus was supposedly more highly evolved than *H. habilis*, but the fact that *H. erectus* was more primitive than previously thought, makes him less of a stepping stone to modern humans. And speaking of stepping ...

Upright Posture

The names *H. habilis* (handy man) and *H. erectus* (upright walking man) were chosen based on the evolutionary notion that man first learned to use tools, and then learned to walk upright. Now that is coming into question, too.

The popular explanation: Some chimpanzee-like creature that dragged its knuckles on the ground descended from trees into grasslands, and gradually straightened up to walk like modern humans.⁶

Maybe walking upright on two legs isn't such a defining human feature after all. Scientists who spent a year photographing orangutans in the rain forest say the trait probably evolved in ancient apes navigating the treetops long before ancestors of humans climbed to the ground — a hypothesis that contradicts science museums the world over.⁷

The idea that a learned behavior (such as walking upright) would result in an inherited change was ridiculous in the first place. But evolutionists were bound to the stupid idea that apelike creatures who learned to walk upright would have offspring who naturally walked upright. Furthermore, walking upright was supposed to be more efficient, allowing more energy to flow to the brain, making them smarter.

⁵ Julie Steenhuisen, *Reuters*, August 8, 2007, "Fossils paint new picture of human evolution"

⁶ Lauran Neergaard, *Associated Press*, June 2, 2007, "Did upright walking start in trees?"

⁷ *ibid.*

Out of Africa

The 19th century view was that apelike creatures evolved into *H. habilis* in Africa, which evolved into *H. erectus* in Indonesia, which evolved into Neanderthal man and Cro-Magnon man and eventually white *H. sapiens* in Europe. This was the scientific justification for believing that the darker the skin, the less highly evolved, and therefore less human, a person was. Scientific "truth" reflected the racial views of European society at the time, and justified slavery.

In the latter part of the 20th century, political correctness made this view unacceptable, so it is not surprising that 20th century scientific evidence was found that reflected current racial views. Humanity evolved in many places simultaneously, making all races equal. But now evolutionists seem to be going back to the 19th century view.

An analysis of thousands of skulls shows modern humans originated from a single point in Africa and finally lays to rest the idea of multiple origins, British scientists said on Wednesday.⁸

Genetic Similarity

There have been numerous calculations of the similarity of human and chimp DNA, which generally turn out to 94% to 99%. As we have told you in previous articles⁹, they get those numbers by comparing only the parts of the DNA that are similar enough to compare, ignoring large sections of DNA that are so different they can't be compared. Of course, if you just compare the similar parts you will see that the similar parts are similar. The 99% similarity is totally bogus, and now evolutionists are admitting it.

The consortium researchers aligned 2.4 billion bases from each species and came up with a 1.23% difference. However, as the chimpanzee consortium noted, the figure reflects only base substitutions, not the many stretches of DNA that have been inserted or deleted in the genomes.¹⁰

Why did they do it this way? Evolutionists now admit they wanted to make humans and chimps seem more similar.

In a groundbreaking 1975 paper published in *Science*, evolutionary biologist Allan Wilson of the University of California (UC), Berkeley,

⁸ Ben Hirschler, *Reuters*, July 18, 2007, Skulls confirm we're all out of Africa

⁹ *Disclosure*, October 2005, "Chimps Are Like Us"

¹⁰ Cohen, *Science*, 29 June 2007, "Relative Differences: The Myth of 1%" p. 1836

and his erstwhile graduate student Mary-Claire King made a convincing argument for a 1% genetic difference between humans and chimpanzees. ... But truth be told, Wilson and King also noted that the 1% difference wasn't the whole story. They predicted that there must be profound differences outside genes--they focused on gene regulation--to account for the anatomical and behavioral disparities between our knuckle-dragging cousins and us. Several recent studies have proven them perspicacious again, raising the question of whether the 1% truism should be retired.

"For many, many years, the 1% difference served us well because it was underappreciated how similar we were," says Pascal Gagneux, a zoologist at UC San Diego. "Now it's totally clear that it's more a hindrance for understanding than a help."¹¹

Those last two sentences speak volumes about the motivation behind the numbers. When evolutionists wanted us to believe that humans and chimps are very similar, they fudged the numbers to make them look similar. Now that it would be more helpful to emphasize differences, they want to change the numbers.

We have previously said that there really isn't any valid way to make the comparison. Now a famous evolutionist agrees with us.

Could researchers combine all of what's known and come up with a precise percentage difference between humans and chimpanzees? "I don't think there's any way to calculate a number," says geneticist Svante Pääbo, a chimp consortium member based at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany. "In the end, it's a political and social and cultural thing about how we see our differences."¹²

Politics affect scientific conclusions. If chimps are 99% human, then courts of law might decide chimps should have human rights, which would restrict the scientists' freedom to do experiments on them. Since some courts seem to be leaning this way, scientists have to come up with numbers increasing the difference between chimps and humans.

Damage Control

Clearly, these latest publications cause some trouble for evolutionists.

Susan Anton, a New York University anthropologist and co-author of the Leakey

work, said she expects anti-evolution proponents to seize on the new research, but said it would be a mistake to try to use the new work to show flaws in evolution theory.

"This is not questioning the idea at all of evolution; it is refining some of the specific points," Anton said. "This is a great example of what science does and religion doesn't do. It's a continuous self-testing process."¹³

Every time they say that the old facts are wrong, but the new facts are true, their credibility decreases. Truth doesn't change on a daily basis. Yes, electrical engineering textbooks used in the 1960's are obsolete today, but nothing in them is wrong. Ohm's law is still true. Everything they say about vacuum tube amplifiers is still true. The old electronics textbooks aren't obsolete because they are wrong. They are obsolete because they don't contain new information about transistors and integrated circuits. As science advances, new truth is added, but old truth is still true.

This isn't the case with biology textbooks. The things old biology textbooks say about human evolution aren't true any more. That means those things weren't true when the old textbooks were written. Similarly, the things in current biology textbooks will someday be contradicted by future biology textbooks. That's because the theory of evolution is philosophic, not scientific.

That old evolutionary cartoon [of human evolution], while popular with the general public, is just too simple and keeps getting revised, said Bill Kimbel, who is science director of the Institute of Human Origins at Arizona State University and wasn't part of the Leakey team.¹⁴

The cartoon "keeps getting revised" because researchers need to find the oldest (or youngest) something-or-other to get published and get more research funding. When they do claim something is older or younger than previously believed, there are consequences.

Evolutionists seem to be content to admit that all the details about evolution are wrong while insisting the general principles are right. That isn't good science. It isn't even good logic. All these "facts" and discoveries can be twisted every which way because they have no foundation in truth. Truth doesn't change. The theory of evolution never stays the same.

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ Seth Borenstein, *Associated Press*, August 9, 2007, "Evolution revolution creates stir"

¹⁴ *ibid.*

Why Did He Ask?

Is Ken sinister, or just lazy?

We received this sentence fragment and question from Ken:

Since your website www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org is science based. Who are the PhD biologists that support it?

That's all he wrote. We replied with our standard answer. "We don't provide any information on our members."

Later, we gave his email more thought, wondering why anyone would ask such a question. We came up with two possibilities.

Perhaps he asked because he wanted a list of people he could persecute. Nothing can get a professor fired faster than doubting evolution. The most recent example¹⁵ is Iowa State University astronomer Guillermo Gonzalez, author of *The Privileged Planet*. That's why we keep our membership list confidential. If we had given Ken a list of our contributors, he could have gone to their employers and made trouble for them.

But there is wisdom in the saying, "Never attribute to malice what can adequately be explained by stupidity," so we lean toward the second possibility. Perhaps Ken is simply too dumb or lazy to think for himself. He might be content to let someone else do the thinking, and accept whatever a smart person tells him.

There are people who believe something simply because it is said by a scientist, rabbi, priest, imam, minister, witch doctor, Republican, or Democrat. People who do this are easily led astray. Of all these authorities, the scientist is the easiest to check out. The scientist should have some experimental data upon which he bases his opinion. A wise person examines the data and decides if the scientist's conclusion is reasonable or not.

What Ken apparently failed to realize is that the name of our corporation is "Science Against Evolution," not "Biologists Against Evolution." We never cite personal authority as the reason for believing anything. Instead, we cite published secular scientific research.

¹⁵ David Klinghoffer, *The Weekly Standard*, 8 June 2007, "Tenure Trouble"

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/013/733rlosv.asp>

Yes, we do tell you who did the research, but our intention is not convince you of its accuracy based on that person's reputation. We tell you the scientists' names because we want you to be able to look up the references, and check to make sure we have quoted them accurately. We want you to know that we aren't making up the foolish things evolutionists say. We want you to hear it straight from the horse's mouth.

Evolutionists know that if you examine the theory of evolution for yourself, you are likely to reject it. That's why they are so desperate to censor the science curriculum in public schools.

Evolution in the News

Dropping the Façade

Evolutionists admit their goal is to attack Christianity.

In the past, evolutionists have claimed that there is no conflict between the theory of evolution and religion. That's nonsense, of course. If that were true, why would religious leaders object to the teaching of evolution in public schools? Realizing that many people no longer believe that lie, evolutionists are starting to openly attack Christianity.

Last month the journal *Science* published a special section about science education around the world. The page on the United States was especially revealing. All you really need to read is the article's title and subheading.

'This Is the Front Line ... Where I Can Really Make a Difference'

Lisa Park and her colleagues take on creationism and other antiscientific attitudes in the classroom--and in the voting booth¹⁶

If you read the entire article you will learn,

... Park and her colleagues often confront mainstream attitudes toward science, including creationism. In recent years, Park has seen a tide of creationism rising both on campus and off.¹⁷

When evolutionists say "mainstream attitudes toward science" they really mean "mainstream attitudes toward evolution." Mainstream America isn't against science, but mainstream America is against the unscientific theory of evolution.

Why is creationism rising both on campus and off? It is because evolutionists are being less and

¹⁶ Elizabeth Culotta, *Science*, 6 July 2007, page 67

¹⁷ *ibid.*

less able to censor the science curriculum. They aren't able to prevent the public from hearing all the evidence. The more mainstream America hears about the theory of evolution, the more America rejects it.

Creationist speakers visit the campus fairly regularly, sponsored by religious groups or a "critical thinkers club." In her geology classes, Park explicitly debunks the idea that the biblical flood formed the Grand Canyon.¹⁸

Notice that *Science* put "critical thinkers club" in quotes as a way to deride it. **Universities are supposed to encourage critical thinking, but they don't want any critical thinking about the theory of evolution.** They want just one side of the issue presented. Presenting both sides "confuses" the students. ☺

Mainstream secular geologists have accepted the rapid erosion of the Grand Canyon (a scenario that is consistent with a global flood) since 2000.¹⁹ Since modern geological thinking is consistent with the Biblical flood, why would Park feel a need to explicitly debunk it? Clearly, she has religious motivations.

Last fall, Park and her colleague, biology professor Stephen Weeks, worked nonstop to elect a pro-science candidate to the Ohio Board of Education. "I could not stand by and do nothing," says Park.²⁰

Was there an anti-science candidate? There probably was an anti-evolution candidate, but **we doubt there was an anti-science candidate.** Evolutionists like to equate "science" with "evolution" because most Americans are very much pro-science. Science is good. We would not have iPhones™ without science! **She worked to elect the pro-censorship candidate,** who would prevent any criticism of the theory of evolution in the science classroom.

The really amazing admission, however, is this one:

Park and Weeks each missed a January deadline for submitting research proposals to the National Science Foundation (NSF). "To me, fighting for evolution is part of my job," says Weeks. "But the system is not set up to benefit those who make this kind of move."

Park has been funded by NSF, despite a low success rate in paleobiology, and by other sources--enough to support research by a small

group of undergraduate and master's students.²¹

The NSF, and other unnamed sources (we wonder who they might be), **continue to fund Park despite her "low success rate in paleobiology" and the fact that she missed a January deadline.** She is so involved in politics that she doesn't get much work done, and can't even submit a proposal on time; but they funded her because **the NSF thinks attacking Christian beliefs is more important than paleobiology research.**

This is in sharp contrast to what happened to Dr. Guillermo Gonzalez at the University of Iowa.

Dr. Gonzalez is primarily interested in studying the late stages of stellar evolution through the use of spectroscopic observations. Recent work includes spectroscopic abundance analysis of post-AGB supergiants and RV Tau variables. He has also undertaken a study of the parent stars of the recently discovered extra-solar planetary systems. The results indicate that these stars have anomalous chemical abundances, suggesting some sort of unusual formation history.²²

He was recently denied tenure for publishing the book *The Privileged Planet*, which supports the idea of intelligent design, **even though he never expressed these views in the classroom.** **If he had expressed these semi-religious views in the classroom, should that have been reason to deny him tenure? Lisa Park was rewarded for her anti-Christian classroom attack on the Biblical flood.** Why should there be a double standard?

The question we most often get is, "If science is against evolution, why do some scientists believe it?" Part of the answer is, "Their belief is based on philosophy or religion, not science." Lisa Park is a poster girl for the evolutionists. **The NSF funds her despite her admittedly poor research performance and inability to meet deadlines because she attacks Christianity in the classroom and works to elect pro-censorship candidates.**

The other part of the answer is that the public has a distorted perception of the number of scientists who believe the theory of evolution. **Scientists who disbelieve the theory of evolution are reluctant to say so because, when their belief is made known, they are punished by the evolutionists who have control the NSF and universities, as Dr. Gonzalez was.**

¹⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁹ *Disclosure*, October 2000, "Grand Canyon Breakthrough"

²⁰ Elizabeth Culotta, *Science*, 6 July 2007, page 67

²¹ *ibid.*

²² Iowa State University Department of Physics and Astronomy web page
<http://www.physics.iastate.edu/web/researchgroups/astromony/faculty-and-staff/gonzalez>

by Lothar Janetzko

The Watchmaker

<http://www.kids4truth.com/watchmaker/watch.html>

“An artistic Dynamation about our Creator!”

This month’s web site review looks at the Kids 4 Truth web site. The link to *The Watchmaker* provides access to a Macromedia Flash multimedia presentation of a poem written by Dave Hawkins. The poem’s words are provided in audio and written format and are accompanied by a “dynamation”.

After hearing and watching the message of *The Watchmaker* the web reader can click on a link and get more information about the subject of the poem. Here you learn that William Paley wrote that the existence of a watch implies the existence of a watchmaker in his book Natural Theology in 1802. Also you learn that “the proper term for the argument purported with ‘The Watchmaker’ is called the Teleological Argument for the existence of God.”

A link is also provided where you can purchase a self running file of the presentation for either a PC or a Mac.

By exploring the Kids 4 Truth web site you will find that there many more multimedia dynamations available for viewing on the site. Also there is a lot of content available just for kids. Just explore the site and I am sure you will find something of interest.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of

Twenty-first Century

Science

Against

Evolution

P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org