

# Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 11 Issue 7 [www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org](http://www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org)

April 2007

## Darbo, the Flying Elephant

*This is our annual special issue celebrating National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1), in which we give the theory of evolution all the respect that it deserves.*

The circus had come to town. Everyone was happy, except for Mrs. Elephant. She had been waiting a long time for her baby. But so far it had not arrived. Then one day the little elephant was born. His mother named him, "Darbo." All the elephants came to admire him.

Suddenly, the baby sneezed. AH-AH-CHOOOOO! And his ears flew up in the air. All the other elephants laughed when they saw how big his ears were.

The next day the circus paraded through town. The baby elephant was the smallest, so he was put at the end of the line. First he stepped on his right ear. Then he stepped on his left ear. And finally he fell flat on his face. Everybody laughed at him.

The ringmaster decided to make Darbo a clown. He put Darbo on the roof of a burning house. "Jump, Darbo, jump!" shouted clowns dressed as firemen. Even though the flames were not real, Darbo was afraid. But finally Darbo jumped. Everyone laughed to see an elephant jump into a net.

Poor little Darbo realized that because of sexual selection, he would never have a girlfriend. This made his selfish genes sad. His family line would end with Darbo. His selfish genes had to figure out a way to turn his mutant ears into a survival advantage.

The next day, Huxley, the circus mouse, found Darbo looking sad. "Don't be unhappy," he said. "I will be your friend. I will find a way to help you. Those big ears must be good for something! Maybe I can teach you how to fly with them!"

Jumping off the burning house had disproved the arboreal origin of flight. Therefore, flight must have evolved from the ground up.

Huxley took Darbo to the woods. There he made a runway out of a log and a board. "Just flap your ears hard and jump off," he shouted. Darbo flapped his ears hard and jumped. He fell flat on the ground.

Even though Huxley's brain was much smaller than Darbo's, Huxley was smarter. He knew that all Darbo needed to fly was feathers! Huxley gave Darbo a crow's feather to hold. Darbo flapped his ears hard and jumped. He fell flat on the ground.

Then Huxley realized what the problem really was. Darbo was a vegetarian. He ate peanuts. Darbo needs a higher calorie diet! All he needs to do is to eat bugs and worms. That will give him the strength he needs to fly.

Darbo didn't like eating the bugs and worms, but he did it anyway. Then Darbo flapped his ears hard and jumped. He fell flat on the ground.

Evolving into a bird was much harder than Darbo and Huxley thought it would be. Apparently it takes more than feathers and eating bugs to become a bird. Huxley finally realized that Darbo would need hollow bones, more efficient lungs, higher metabolism, different muscular structure, better balance, and a migratory instinct to become a real bird. He couldn't do all that! There must be some other way.

Then Huxley had a great idea. All he had to do to turn Darbo into a bird was to get a scientist to say he was a bird! That's how dinosaurs became birds. Scientists just reclassified them.

Darbo and Huxley hurried to the nearest university and found a scientist. He examined Darbo carefully and agreed that Darbo had been incorrectly classified. The scientist wrote a paper and published it in the journal *Science* saying that, based on Darbo's ears and teeth, Darbo was the first whale.

# A Bird By Any Other Name

*Evolutionists define birds to be dinosaurs, and vice versa, just to prove evolution.*

Science News wrote an excellent summary of a recent analysis of *Microraptor gui*. One paragraph of that summary said,

Four years ago, paleontologists described a species of feathered dinosaur from China that they named *Microraptor gui* (SN: 1/25/03, p. 51: <http://www.sciencenews.org/articles/20030125/fob1.asp>). A series of long feathers on the creature's legs and feet led those scientists to speculate that the dinosaur splayed its hind limbs to create an extra, hind set of wings. Other researchers cast doubt on that idea, noting that hip joints permitting such flexibility aren't found in any related dinosaur.

Now, a pair of scientists has come up with a four-winged flight posture that doesn't require *M. gui* to be a contortionist. In the new scenario, the animal held its feathered legs and feet beneath the body, says Sankar Chatterjee, a paleontologist at Texas Tech University in Lubbock. This pose would place the secondary wings below and slightly behind the main wings, just like those in aerobatic biplanes. Chatterjee and his colleague R. Jack Templin, an aeronautical engineer from Ottawa, describe their analysis of the four-winged dinosaur online and in an upcoming *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.<sup>1</sup>

Anxious to learn what Chatterjee and Templin had discovered, we read their article. Near the beginning of the article they set the stage by saying,

Hundreds of small, exquisitely preserved, feathered theropods were discovered in the Early Cretaceous Jehol Group of northeastern China as they died some 125 million years ago, smothered in the "Cretaceous Pompeii." Both anatomy and phylogeny strongly suggest that these theropods, including *Sinosauropteryx*,

*Caudipteryx* and *Protarchaeopteryx*, *Microraptor*, *Sinornithosaurus*, *Cryptovolans*, and the early bird *Confuciusornis*, show constructions ranging from small winged, arboreal theropods to fully winged, active flying birds. They offer new insights into the origins of feathers and flight, favoring the arboreal ("trees-down") over the cursorial ("ground-up") hypothesis.

Among these recent finds, *Microraptor gui* offers the best evidence that arboreal dromaeosaurs might have acquired powered flight through a gliding stage where both forelimbs and hindlimbs were involved.<sup>2</sup>

They then presented a lot of technical detail about its feathers, skeletal structure, muscle attachment, space for internal organs, and a description of the computer models they used to analyze the flight potential of *M. gui*. They reached this conclusion:

## Flight Performance

*Microraptor* displays several anatomical features that suggest it could become airborne: elongate and asymmetric vanes in the flight feathers at the distal segment of each limb; a scapulocoracoid whose ends are oriented at an acute angle to each other; a laterally facing glenoid for gentle dorsoventral movement of the wing; a single, enlarged sternum for attachment of the flight muscles; ossified sternal ribs and well developed uncinat processes for resisting compression force on the thoracic cavity imposed during downstroke; strongly bowed outer metacarpal; and a flattened central digit for attachment of primaries.<sup>3</sup>

Aircraft designers have mimicked many of nature's flight "inventions," usually inadvertently. Leading edge slats delay stalling, as does the alula of birds; birds' feet act as airbrakes, and streamlining reduces drag. Now, it seems likely that *Microraptor* invented the biplane 125 million years before the Wright 1903 Flyer.<sup>4</sup>

There seems to be no question that it had feathers and wings, and could fly. The question we have is, "Was it a dinosaur?" Merriam Webster gives us the conventional definitions of words.

di·no·saur

Etymology: New Latin Dinosaurus, genus

<sup>1</sup> Perkins, *Science News*, Vol. 171, No. 4, Jan. 27, 2007, "Ancient Glider: Dinosaur took to the air in biplane style" p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Chatterjee and Templin, *PNAS*, January 30, 2007, vol. 104, no. 5, "Biplane wing planform and flight performance of the feathered dinosaur *Microraptor gui*" 1576-1580

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*

name, from Greek *deinos* terrifying + *sauros* lizard

Date: 1841

1 : any of a group (Dinosauria) of extinct often very large chiefly terrestrial carnivorous or herbivorous reptiles of the Mesozoic era

2 : any of various large extinct reptiles (as ichthyosaurs) other than the true dinosaurs

3 : one that is impractically large, out-of-date, or obsolete

Definition 3 is a symbolic application of the notion of extinction, which need not concern us. A dinosaur is an extinct terrible lizard—some kind of extinct reptile. What is a reptile?

reptile

Etymology: Middle English reptil, from Middle French or Late Latin; Middle French reptile (feminine), from Late Latin reptile (neuter), from neuter of reptilis creeping, from Latin reptus, past participle of *reperere* to crawl; akin to Lithuanian *replioti* to crawl

Date: 14th century

1 : an animal that crawls or moves on its belly (as a snake) or on small short legs (as a lizard)

2 : any of a class (Reptilia) of air-breathing vertebrates that include the alligators and crocodiles, lizards, snakes, turtles, and extinct related forms (as dinosaurs and pterosaurs) and are characterized by a completely ossified skeleton with a single occipital condyle, a distinct quadrate bone usually immovably articulated with the skull, ribs attached to the sternum, and a body usually covered with scales or bony plates

3 : a groveling or despised person

Again, definition 3 is an irrelevant symbolic connotation. We were slightly surprised that the definition did not include the fact that reptiles are cold-blooded. All the example creatures are cold-blooded, but perhaps cold-bloodedness isn't actually a required characteristic of reptiles.

## What is a bird?

bird

Etymology: Middle English brid, bird, from Old English bridd

Date: before 12th century

Archaic : the young of a feathered vertebrate

2 : any of a class (Aves) of warm-blooded vertebrates distinguished by having the body more or less completely covered with feathers and the forelimbs modified as wings

3 : a game bird

The definition of a bird does not include the ability to fly because some birds can't fly. The

important diagnostic characteristics are wings and feathers.

Was *M. gui* a dinosaur or a bird? To be a dinosaur, it had to be a reptile. A reptile crawls or moves on its belly or on small short legs, and has a body usually covered with scales or bony plates. A bird has wings and is covered with feathers. Clearly, *M. gui* was a bird.

This leads us to the more important question, "Why would scientists call a bird a dinosaur?" Here is one possibility that we will present to you for your consideration. Perhaps the discoverers of the fossil did not want to suffer the same fate Larry Doby did. You don't know who Larry Doby was? That isn't surprising.

Just three months after Jackie Robinson signed with Brooklyn, Larry Doby broke the American League color barrier by becoming a member of the Cleveland Indians. As a player, Doby didn't have the immediate impact that Robinson did, but he did develop into a star, leading the AL in both home runs and RBIs in 1954. Doby faced the same prejudices as Robinson, but received very little media coverage. It was, as someone once commented, similar to being the second man who invented the telephone.<sup>5</sup>

Evolutionists believe *M. gui* died out 125 million years ago. They believe *Archaeopteryx*, a true bird, died out 155 to 150 million years ago. If *M. gui* was a bird, it wouldn't be the oldest known bird, so it would get as little press coverage as Larry Doby did. When was the last time you saw a headline that said, "Second oldest fossil [whatever] discovered!" You probably haven't ever seen such a headline. It is always the oldest [whatever] discovered.

*M. gui* isn't worth much ink if it is just a bird—even a four-winged bird. But, if it is a dinosaur on its way to evolving into a bird, then the people who fund the digging will continue to fund the project in hopes of finding even more evidence for evolution.

It's hard to believe dinosaurs evolved into birds once, and twice as hard to believe it happened twice. But if the dates and classifications are correct, then an unknown dinosaur evolved into *Archaeopteryx*, and 25 to 50 million years later, *M. gui* was evolving into another kind of four-winged bird. Those four-winged birds must not have been very well suited for survival because they are extinct today. Why would an inferior kind of bird attempt to evolve 25 million years after the superior *Archaeopteryx* already evolved?

<sup>5</sup> John R. Groesbeck, *Tidbits*, 2 February 2007, "Our National Pastime"

## Horses and whales

This isn't the first time evolutionists have defined one kind of creature to be something else just to prove evolution. They do the same thing with horses and whales. We have discussed horses in detail four other times in the last 10 years<sup>6</sup>, we will spare you all the gory details. Suffice it to say that in 1874, Othniel Marsh published a paper on horse evolution in which he claimed that fossil evidence showed how a small five-toed animal evolved gradually into a large one-toed animal. Although they are displayed as part of a sequence of "horse evolution," *Hyracotherium*, *Mesohippus*, *Merychippus*, and *Pliohippus*, aren't horses. That's why their names end in "therium" or "hippus" instead of "equus." Even though they weren't horses, they were defined to be horses just to show evolution. Furthermore, there isn't any evidence that any of them begat the next one in the supposed sequence. But the general public assumes they did because they are all "horses."

At least the supposed horse ancestors looked like horses. The fable about whale evolution is even more bizarre. Since we've discussed this before,<sup>7</sup> we will just give a brief recap here. Whales supposedly evolved from *Pakicetus*. This creature was named because it was found in Pakistan, and was supposedly a cetacean (whale). The first fossil was a "52-million year old skull" found in 1983 by Phil Gingerich. Since he only found the skull, he assumed (actually, he wished) the body would be whale-like. When more complete skeletons were found in 2001, it was clear that *Pakicetus* was a fully terrestrial mammal like a cow, goat, or pig. If a whole skeleton had been found initially, it would have been too ridiculous to call it a whale. But since it had previously been declared to be a whale, the classification stuck. It became proof that whales evolved from land mammals.

The simple fact that somebody classifies a land mammal as a whale doesn't make it a whale ancestor. We hope you thought it funny when our parody about Darbo, the Flying Elephant was classified as an ancestral whale, but when you

---

<sup>6</sup> Disclosure, May 1997, "The Many Myths of Evolution"

Disclosure, October 1997, "Education Behind The Times"

Disclosure, April 1999, "Scientific Honesty"

Disclosure, July 2004, "The Elder Statesmen of Evolution"

<sup>7</sup> Disclosure, August 1999, "In A Whale of Trouble"

Disclosure, November 2001, "Whale Tale Two"

think about it, an elephant makes a more plausible whale ancestor than *Pakicetus*.

## Bad Science

Calling a Chinese bird a dinosaur doesn't prove that dinosaurs evolved into birds. It is just bad science. The theory of evolution is detrimental to science because it distracts scientists from important work by sending them on a wild dino-goose chase.

If creationists had discovered these fossils, much of the analysis would have been the same. Creation scientists would have studied its feathers, skeletal structure, muscle attachment, and space for internal organs, just like the evolutionists did. They would have developed computer models to analyze the flight potential of the creature, just like the evolutionists did. The difference is that they would have spent more effort comparing *M. gui* to birds and bats and insects (especially dragonflies) in an effort to understand principles of flight, and would not have wasted any time trying to figure out how a dinosaur could turn into a bird, or how the ability of flight could have happened by chance.

Email

## Dinosaur National Monument Revisited

*Unfortunately, the quarry at Dinosaur National Monument has been closed.*

Kerry wrote to tell us about his recent visit to Dinosaur National Monument.

Greetings,  
On March 25, 2007, I visited the Dinosaur National Monument for the first time (pictures attached). I discussed my observations with others before reading your feature article "We Dug Dinos - Part 2"<sup>8</sup> and was rewarded by the fact that we came to the same conclusion regarding the rock/soil.

The quarry at the monument is closed. Condemned would be a better word. Those who were working there had just 48 hours to close down the building after it was inspected. The lone park ranger who is currently there said, "The quarry is closed due to base material instability." I say, "Sand by any other name is still the same". I could almost hear the discussion between the contractor and the scientists when the structure was built. The contractor warning about building on sand/sediment and the scientists saying it was 75 million year old rock. Cracks in the building attest to the nature of the base material. The crack pictured is typical and

---

<sup>8</sup> Disclosure, October 1999, "We Dug Dinos - Part 2"

not the worst of what has happened to the building, including complete separation of supporting beams.

From Dinosaur N.M., I drove north to Flaming Gorge and into Wyoming. The trip provides amazing scenery but for the purpose of my theory, I would describe the area as a giant gutter surrounding the Green River. There were thousands of cattle, sheep, antelope, mule deer, etc. grazing in the flats around the river. I could easily imagine thousands of dinosaurs grazing in the same area. I believe a massive wall of water came rushing down that tube. The dinosaurs were either swept up or ran to the highest point they could reach and were then quickly covered by sediment. Given the crumbly-porous nature of the material surrounding the quarry, it is impossible to believe that it could have stood there for millions of years without eroding.

I asked the park ranger if any fill material was added to the site for the walking paths. She said, that to the best of her knowledge, no. What we were walking on looked like river-bottom sand to me. The sand was covered by grey sediment.

The fact that paleontologists can so easily reject evidence that fails to match their ideology is sad. I optimistically clung to the hope that facts could prevail in a scientific debate. After seeing how clear the evidence is against ancient dating, I am convinced it is emotion and not facts that prevail.

Best regards,  
Kerry

Seeing dinosaur bones in a museum is impressive, but it is much more instructive to see where the bones were found. That's what makes places like Dinosaur National Monument so important.

When you actually see where the bones were found, it is clear that the stories told by evolutionists don't make any sense. For example, the signs at the visitors' center at Agate Fossil Beds in western Nebraska say the concentration of fossils resulted from animals dying at a waterhole. But the beds are on top of the highest hill for miles around.<sup>9</sup> That's a strange place for a waterhole! It is much more reasonable to think that the animals gathered there because all the surrounding land was under water. The Mammoth Site near Hot Springs, South Dakota, is also on top of a hill, but officially said to be a waterhole.

The dinosaur egg nests I helped excavate in northern Montana were located in places in coulees that appeared to be geologically young, and probably contained water when the dinosaurs were alive.<sup>10</sup> They nested on the shoreline.

If you ever get the chance to visit a dinosaur dig site, please take it! You will be amazed at what you see.

<sup>9</sup> Disclosure, March 2006, "How Fossils Form"

<sup>10</sup> Disclosure, September 1999, "We Dug Dinos"

## Response From Iceland

Last month we told you about a study of Icelandic attitudes towards the theory of evolution. Egill sent us this email from Iceland in response. There are a few minor grammatical errors, but far fewer than there would be if I tried to write a response in Icelandic! ☺

Hi there

I somehow stumbled upon your webpage about the Icelandic opinion on evolution and found it very interesting.

If you have been seeking information I guess you'll know the following things.

Almost everyone in Iceland speaks excellent English. You could therefore have the lectures and questions in English to save money. This though doesn't apply to the older generations (60 years + although many of them speak English).

Your choice of the description "a study of why Icelandic opinions are so different from American opinions on certain important topics." would have awoken great interest amongst Icelanders and if you set it up in a way that it's not too time-consuming you probably would be able to gather some sum of people.

The subject of evolution here does not come up often as it's thought of as a fact of life. That it is an issue of debate in the states is thought to be amusing and looked at as a symbol of America's backwardness. America is though in many fields admired here though President Bush has done much ruin that. Icelanders see themselves as very liberal and well-educated with a very open and tolerant society. Gay rights are among the highest here in the world and the welfare system is strong.

I am fairly sure that the outcome will be the same, but I still think this is a very interesting thing to check out.

I wish you all the best.  
yours sincerely,  
Egill

This is consistent with what I encountered when I was in Iceland in 2001. In particular, it is significant that the subject of evolution is not often discussed because it is assumed to be "a fact of life." We are fairly sure that if the well-educated people of Iceland examined the theory critically the outcome would be that they would conclude that science is against evolution. We are now more anxious than ever to put that to the test.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter. If you received this newsletter indirectly and would like to receive a copy every month, write to us and ask to be placed on our mailing list.

by Lothar Janetzko

# The Big Debate

<http://evolutionlie.faithweb.com/bigdebate.html>

*“Did cars evolve into aeroplanes?”*

This month's web site review looks at a site I discovered that provides an interesting allegory regarding the creation versus evolution debate. The story begins “500 years in the future, there was a major argument. World disasters had taken their toll on the human race and only a million people lived on the planet, mostly in the USA. Man was just starting to use petrol driven transport again - cars were on the roads and planes were in the air. The big debate was about cars and aeroplanes”.

The debate was whether cars had evolved into aeroplanes over millions of years, or whether they were both the brilliant creation of an intelligent creator.

The actual debate takes place on television between two scientists. Zak Smith proposes that cars evolved into aeroplanes. Bob Williams II believes the controversial 'intelligent design' theory.

From the spelling of aeroplanes you can guess that this story comes from the United Kingdom.

In the debate, Smith discusses transitional forms of cars discovered in the shallow seas of the beaches of Brighton and Williams provides quotes from the sacred book, the 1994 Rolls Royce driver's manual.

The interaction between Smith and Williams and the audience makes for interesting reading and I believe the debate itself provides insights into our views regarding creation and evolution. The debate ends with Smith stating that his theory is based on solid evidence...it's called science.

## Disclosure

The official newsletter of



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](http://www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org)