

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 10

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

July 2008

THE DEBATE DEBATE

Since we can't debate the theory of evolution, what should we debate?

Creation vs. evolution debates are becoming rare. Evolutionists won't debate any more. I was invited to participate in two debates ("The Theory of Evolution is True" and "Radiometric Dating is Accurate") but neither event took place because the event organizers could not find anyone to take the "pro" position against me. Evolutionists generally say that they won't dignify criticism with a response because it gives creationism credibility. They are right. Debates give creationism credibility because the creationist always wins.

PROTECTION FROM THE TRUTH

Evolutionists are doing everything they can to protect American children from the truth. On June 20, 2008, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) sent out this "alert" email.

Continuing AAAS Efforts to Protect Science in America's Public Schools

AAAS is urging the governor of the US state of Oklahoma to veto a bill that aims to protect the expression of religious viewpoints by students in their schoolwork, but could also undermine the teaching of evolution and other science concepts. A letter from AAAS CEO Alan I. Leshner to Governor Brad Henry suggests "...if a student were to state on an exam that the age of the earth is 6,000 years old, according to his/her religious belief, rather than the 4.5 billion years cited in the textbook, this bill could potentially force his/her teacher to give the student a good grade for an incorrect response. This is no way to teach science." Read more about the letter. ¹

AAAS opposed a second action, in the state of Louisiana, where two antievolution bills are pending in the legislature. In the early 1980s, Louisiana's lawmakers approved a bill requiring equal time for creationism in science classrooms, which was struck down by the US Supreme Court in 1987. Read the

AAAS-authored opinion pieces in *The Times-Picayune* and the *Shreveport Times*.

Other state legislatures, including Michigan, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, and Missouri, have proposed similar bills--the latter three died at the end of state legislative sessions. Find out more about AAAS's continuing efforts at our Evolution on the Front Line web page. ²

Five days later they wrote,

Louisiana "Academic Freedom" Bill Hits Governor's Desk. Last week the Louisiana Senate passed a second version of SB 733, the "academic freedom" bill, which had been slightly altered on its way through the House. The bill implies that certain theories, including evolution, are controversial among scientists, and would allow teachers to introduce supplemental materials including possibly books by pro-intelligent design groups. It now sits on Republican Gov. Bobby Jindal's desk. Scientific groups, including AAAS, have asked for the governor's veto, as has *The New York Times*. In related news, a teacher in Ohio was fired for not only refusing to stop teaching intelligent design/creationism in the classroom but also burning crosses on students' arms.

There is some question about whether or not that Ohio teacher was fired, or burned crosses on arms, but that's what AAAS claimed. Then, on July 2 they sent out this alert:

July 2 Anti-Evolution News. As expected, Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal (R) last week signed into law an anti-evolution bill--one of a handful of so-called "academic freedom" bills that intelligent design supporters pushed this year in state legislatures. (Four others died as legislative sessions ended, and a fifth, in Michigan, has not shown much progress.) The bill singles out evolution and other theories as controversial and paves the way for teachers to bring supplemental (and potentially nonscientific) materials into the classroom. AAAS had voiced its strong objections to this bill, both to

¹ http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2008/0515ok_letter.shtml

² http://www.aaas.org/news/press_room/evolution/

the legislature and to the Governor. In addition, a recent Gallup poll ³ found that 44 percent of Americans believe that "God created humans as is within the last 10,000 years," the foundational belief of Young Earth Creationism. The poll also found that 60 percent of Republicans (versus 38 percent of Democrats) subscribed to the idea of Young Earth. Elsewhere, a Christian group has been mass-mailing intelligent design propaganda to New Zealand schools, and the Education Ministry there said it has no plans to halt the practice since it does not violate the nation's Education Act.

The American Association for Advancement of Science is more properly called, "The American Association for the Censorship of Science." They don't want any discussion or debate about the Theory of Evolution. "Alerts" such as these should not come as any surprise to you if you saw Ben Stein's movie, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*.

WHAT CAN WE DEBATE?

Since we can't debate the merits of the theory of evolution in science class, perhaps it could be a topic for a high school debate class. It might be legal, but it would be terribly unfair. The unfortunate student assigned to the pro-evolution side would be forced to use the dirty tricks that evolutionists generally use (personal attacks and changing the subject) because the scientific facts aren't on his side. Dirty tricks don't usually work, so the unfortunate student defending evolution wouldn't stand much of a chance.

A fair debate proposition would be, "The Theory of Evolution, Intelligent Design, and Creation Science are all equally scientific explanations for the origin and diversity of life on Earth." I would gladly argue either side of this debate, and my chance of winning the debate would depend entirely upon my rhetorical skills relative to the skills of my opponent.

CON

If assigned to refute the proposition, I would calmly seek to establish the definition of science to be "knowledge obtained through the scientific method." I would emphasize that the scientific method relies upon careful observation and repeatable experiments. Since the observations and results are independent of human bias, the knowledge obtained in such a manner is reliable. If I could establish that definition of science, then it would be a simple matter to show that neither the Theory of Evolution, nor Intelligent Design, nor Creation Science meet the definition of science, and therefore are not scientific.

This is the side I would prefer to take, because it is the definition of "science" that I grew up with. It is the kind of science we are talking about when we say, "Science is against evolution."

PRO

But, if assigned to the other side, I would do what evolutionists generally do. I would take a more theatrical approach based on history and current events. I would show pictures of famous scientists of the past (some of whom were theologians), and what they believed. I would talk about the generally accepted "scientific" belief that everything was made of water (proposed by Thales of Miletus around 600 B.C.). Then I would say that Empedocles of Agrigentum (450 B.C.) claimed there were actually four fundamental substances (fire, air, earth, and water). Plato believed the world was created by a godlike "demiurge." I would show astrological charts from the middle ages, making the point that scientists believed that the sun and the moon weren't the only heavenly bodies that influenced what happens on Earth. With example after example I would show that historically science has been nothing more than the opinions of men about the substance and operation of the natural world.

Then, with great dramatic effect, I would hold up the issue of *Discover*, *Scientific American*, or *New Scientist* that happened to be on the newsstand that day. The cover story would undoubtedly be about time travel, parallel universes, or some fantastic conclusion about something bizarre implied by string theory or quantum physics. Thus I would prove that science is whatever people think might be true. No experimental proof is necessary. People just have to think it might be true.

If I could establish that definition of science, then it would be a simple matter to show that the Theory of Evolution, Intelligent Design, and Creation Science are all equally valid scientific explanations for the origin and diversity of life on Earth. These three notions of origins are no more far fetched than anything Miletus, Agrigentum, or Plato believed. These three notions of origins lack proof, but no previously accepted scientific explanation for origins needed proof. Why should proof be required now?

TRUTH ISN'T INVOLVED

The reason why I could argue either side is that truth isn't involved. By that I mean that there is no "true" definition of science—there is only consensus. The word "science" means whatever we all mutually agree that it means. If the consensus is that "science" means "knowledge obtained by the scientific method," then that is

³ <http://www.gallup.com/poll/108226/Republicans-Democrats-Differ-Creationism.aspx>

what it means. If the consensus is that “science” means “someone’s opinion about the substance and operation of the natural world,” then that is what it means.

EVOLUTIONISTS CAN’T WIN

Evolutionists would not like to take either side of the argument because no matter who wins, they lose. **If the Theory of Evolution isn’t scientific, then it loses credibility.** As Professor Lidenbrock said to Axel, “*Assez. Quand la science a prononcé, il n’y a plus qu’à se taire.*”⁴ (“Enough. When science has spoken, there is nothing left to do but shut up.”) Although Professor Lidenbrock is a fictional character, the sentiment he expresses is not. There are real people who argue that the Theory of Evolution is scientific and therefore cannot be questioned. So, if the Theory of Evolution isn’t scientific, then it can be questioned. Furthermore, **if the Theory of Evolution isn’t scientific, then it should not be taught in science classes.**

But if “science” is nothing more than opinion, then Evolution, Intelligent Design and Creation Science are equally scientific, and deserve equal time in the science classroom. That is unacceptable to an evolutionist.

It is a case of, “Heads—the creationists win. Tails—the evolutionists lose.” They can’t win that debate.

The debate that evolutionists would like to win is, “The Theory of Evolution is scientific, but Intelligent Design and Creation Science are not.” They can’t win that argument with either of the definitions of science proposed so far. **Evolutionists need a third definition of science that fits the Theory of Evolution, but not Intelligent Design and Creation Science.** Their problem is that the definition they need is, “Science is an opinion (not necessarily supported by observation or experimentation) that does not involve any supernatural power.” In other words, **“Science is atheism.”** They don’t really want to say that for two reasons. First, too many (in their opinion) Americans believe in God. Second, it is apparent that it depends on the opinion that atheism is true and theism is incorrect.

So, not only do **evolutionists** not want to debate the scientific support (or lack thereof) for the theory of evolution, they **don’t even dare debate what science really is.** That’s why it is so important for the AAAS to go to court or pressure politicians to prevent any real discussion of the **Theory of Evolution** in American public schools.

⁴ Jules Verne, 1864, *Voyage au centre de la terre*, Chapitre XIV.

FORBIDDEN DISCUSSIONS

This brings up an interesting question, “**Are there any subjects that should not be discussed in public schools?**” For example, should the courts decide that **politics** never be discussed in public schools? Should **race** never be discussed in public schools? Should **global warming** never be discussed in public schools? If there is a long list of things that students can’t be told, then there is a lot that students can’t learn. **How is education improved by enforcing ignorance about selected topics?**

Suppose that only one side of certain topics could be taught in public schools. Suppose that politics could be taught in public schools, but only the Democrat side. Suppose race could be taught in public schools, but only the white supremacy side. Suppose that only one side of the global warming debate could be taught to students. **That isn’t “education,” it is “indoctrination.”**

TWO QUESTIONS

The two questions we would like answered are, **“What makes the Theory of Evolution so special that only one side should be presented in American public schools?”** and **“Who gave the AAAS the authority to decide that no criticism of the Theory of Evolution should be allowed.”**

Email

THE DEFINITION OF EVOLUTION

Evolutionists really don’t want get too specific about what evolution really means.

Edward wants to split hairs about the definition of “the theory of evolution.” But, in splitting the hairs, he just emphasizes the problem.

Dear Mr. Do While,
In your opening to “Seventy-five These [sic],” you stated that:
A famous court case regarding whether or not evolution can be taught in public schools used the following six-part definition of “the theory of evolution.”
This is incorrect. The case you cited, *McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education*, did not use that definition. **That definition comes from an act which that court struck down as violating the Establishment clause of the Constitution. In fact, the court had this to say about that definition:**
As a statement of the theory of evolution, Section 4(b) is simply a hodgepodge of limited assertions, many of which are **factually inaccurate.**
To see the entire case, go here [link to <http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/mclean-v-arkansas.html>].
Thank you for your time,
Edward

So, let's review what happened. Arkansas passed a law about the teaching of evolution, and the legislature gave a specific six-part definition as to what they meant by "evolution." They defined it that way because that is what is in the public school textbooks in Arkansas (and everywhere else in the United States). They didn't want it taught to their children because it is factually inaccurate. So, the court was supposed to decide if it was legal to teach evolution this way.

The court didn't like the six-part definition of evolution because it was "factually inaccurate." Duh! That was the reason why the legislature didn't want it taught!

What part (or parts) are factually inaccurate?

1. Emergence by naturalistic processes of the universe from disordered matter and emergence of life from nonlife;

It is factually inaccurate that life evolved from non-life. That's why the Arkansas lawmakers didn't want it taught in public schools.

2. The sufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing about development of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds;

It is factually inaccurate that mutation and natural selection can create new living kinds. That's why the Arkansas lawmakers didn't want it taught in public schools.

3. Emergence by mutation and natural selection of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds;

Since mutation and natural selection can't create new living kinds, it logically follows that new living kinds did not emerge that way. That's why the Arkansas lawmakers didn't want it taught in public schools.

4. Emergence of man from a common ancestor with apes;

If mutation and natural selection can't create any new living kinds, it naturally follows that man could not have been created from a common ancestor with apes by mutation and natural selection. That's why the Arkansas lawmakers didn't want it taught in public schools.

5. Explanation of the earth's geology and the evolutionary sequence by uniformitarianism; and

Uniformitarianism is the notion that processes in the past were the same as processes in the present, and that the rates of those processes have not changed over time. The alternative view

(accepted by some modern geologists) is that geologic structures were formed by temporary catastrophic processes (such as volcanoes, earthquakes, and floods). The evolutionary timeline is based on uniformitarianism. Did the court find that factually inaccurate, too?

6. An inception several billion years ago of the earth and somewhat later of life.

Did the court find that the Earth is not several billion years old? If so, then why should it be legal to teach that it is? Does the court believe that public school textbooks don't teach that the world is billions of years old? Has the court never read a public school textbook?

There are other definitions of evolution. Evolution means "change." Nobody argues with that. Microevolution is minor variations in species. Nobody argues with that, and nobody wants that removed from public schools.

The Arkansas legislature wrote that six-part definition of evolution because that was what was being taught as absolute truth in their school system. It is factually incorrect, and so they didn't want it taught any more. If that wasn't what was being taught, then nobody would be upset about it. But the court overturned the law prohibiting that from being taught, and we bet those things are still being taught in some Arkansas schools today.

Email

CULTURE AND OPINIONS

It is hard to write for a global audience.

One of our members (we will call him Brett, although that isn't his real name) wrote to object to our Email column last month.

First of all, let me say that I unequivocally respect and support the work you do. You have a firm grasp of the material you discuss with regards to evolution and, perhaps more importantly, present your findings in a reader-friendly way.

I must say, however, that I find your recent discussion of Japanese culture grotesquely simple-minded and unsubstantiated. In fact, I had to go through it a second time to see if you had sources for any of your claims--you had none. To suggest that Japanese culture is as simple as the youthful boy respecting the elder male is simplistic, close-minded, and terribly understating the cultural milieu. ...

Again, I sincerely appreciate your writing, the time you give to random emails like mine, your hard work, and, quite frankly, your intellect, but I think you fell terribly short and appear rather ethnocentric this time.

We tried very hard to make it clear that, unlike the vast majority of our articles which are based on fact, that our answer was merely an opinion. We specifically said,

Since we are unaware of any study that definitively answers Tim's question, we will offer an opinion. It is my personal opinion that culture and religion are both involved.

Since this a personal opinion not based on any solid scientific data, ...

We even highlighted the fact that we don't have any sources for our claims.

ETHNOCENTRICITY

We try very hard not to be "ethnocentric." We are well aware that we are no longer a local non-profit corporation in Ridgecrest, California. We have members literally all over the world. That's why we agonized over using the word "billions" in the last newsletter. In America, a billion is a thousand times a million. That quantity is called a "milliard" in the British Empire. Outside of America a billion is a million times a million. So, the first sentence of last month's newsletter was potentially confusing.

Last month we saw that rubidium-strontium isochron dating of the Apollo 11 moon rocks showed that the moon is 4.3 to 4.56 billion years old.

Should we have said, "4.3 to 4.56 billion/milliard years old," or should we have inserted a footnote? We want to continue to "present our findings in a reader-friendly way" that is clear to all readers without being unnecessarily distracting. The solution we chose was to use scientific notation in the abstract.

Evolutionists say that the Moon is $4.43 \pm 0.13 \times 10^9$ years old.

We figured that British readers would understand that we were using the American definition of billion, without unnecessarily confusing American readers. It was a tough call.

We also debated between the spellings "Moslem" and "Muslim." We chose Moslem because Muslim suggests (to some people) the (possibly prejudicial) concept of "radical Black Muslim." We were simply trying to identify a religious belief without the baggage that some people might associate with it.

Was our characterization of the Japanese culture as historically being more polite, respectful, and honorable than modern American culture too simplistic? Probably so. But the point wasn't to present an in-depth analysis of cultural beliefs. We were trying to say that culture affects

attitudes. Since we apparently didn't do a very good job of it, let's try again, taking a slightly different approach.

If facts are facts, and people are logical, then everyone should come to the same conclusion. Tim had noted that people in different countries come to different conclusions regarding the theory of evolution. So, there must be something more than facts and logic involved in reaching conclusions.

It is the function of the Supreme Court of the United States to determine if laws are constitutional or not. The Constitution clearly spells out what powers the United States government has. Laws are either constitutional or not. So, theoretically, every Supreme Court decision should be 9 – 0. It should not matter who is appointed to be a Supreme Court judge. Anyone who passes the bar exam should be acceptable. But Supreme Court decisions are often 5 – 4, and Supreme Court nominations are contentious. Confirmation hearings are heated because there is an expectation that judges will make decisions one way or another even before anyone knows what cases will be brought before it. Therefore, Supreme Court cases must be decided on something other than facts and logic.

If even Supreme Court cases are decided on something other than facts and logic, then it should come as no surprise that popular decisions about the theory of evolution are decided by something other than facts and logic. What is that other something? It is my opinion that culture and religion have something to do with it.

It might have been a mistake to use the stereotypical view of Japanese culture to make that point, but I still feel the point is valid. Specifically, people make decisions based on more than simply facts and logic. If people made decisions on nothing more than facts and logic, then the most qualified presidential candidate would be elected unanimously.

Evolution in the News

BACTERIAL EVOLUTION

Several readers alerted us to a claim in *New Scientist* that "bacteria made a major shift in the lab." So, we found the original research paper and, not surprisingly, found that *New Scientist* got it wrong. We are out of space in this newsletter, so we will tell you about it next month.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter.

by Lothar Janetzko

SEEING CREATION AND EVOLUTION IN GRAND CANYON

<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/06/science/sciencespecial2/06canyon.html>

“Two rafting trips through the Grand Canyon reached different destinations in the debate over creationism and evolution”.

This month's web site review looks at a site that describes two rafting trips through the Grand Canyon. Since it is summer and most of us are thinking about going on a vacation I think this site provides some interesting insights into what we may see in the great out-doors.

The web site is an article from the **Science** page of *The New York Times* from October 2005. The two rafting trips described in the article are 1) Tom Vail, with his 29 guests on his Canyon Ministries trip and 2) Eugenie C. Scott, with her 24 rafters sponsored by the National Center for Science Education. You may remember that Mr. Vail wrote a book on the Grand Canyon that evolutionists tried to ban from park stores. We did a web site review about this in the May 2004 issue of *Disclosure*. In the August 2001 issue of *Disclosure* we did a review of the National Center for Science Education.

It makes for interesting reading to see how the two different groups relate to what they see by rafting through the Grand Canyon for eight days and 280 miles. A reporter accompanied each group for half of each journey.

The reporter breaks her report into the following sections: 1) Origins of Two Journeys, 2) Worship in a Glorious Cathedral, 3) Questions and More Questions, 4) Faith in Science and 5) Same Object, Different Views.

By reading this article you come to the conclusion that it appears that creation and evolution like beauty are indeed in the eye of the beholder.



**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