

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 12 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org September 2008

SLIMING SOFT TISSUE

Watching evolutionists slime each other about dinosaur soft tissue is amusing, but it undermines public perception of science.

It used to be that you could believe what scientists said. Science was based on observation and experimentation. Science revealed the truth. Truth doesn't change.

But the theory of evolution is nothing more than an opinion, so evolutionists have had to redefine "science" to be "consensus of scientists." Opinions change, and can't be trusted. Therefore, the public comes to feel that science can't be trusted.

DINOSAUR SOFT TISSUE BACKGROUND

A good example is the recent change in opinion about the analysis of dinosaur bones. We've been following this story for almost 10 years, and we invite you to review what we have written in previous essays¹ to get all the details. Briefly, here's what happened:

In 1990, Mary Schweitzer found what appeared to be dried blood in some unfossilized dinosaur bones. This discovery is inconsistent with the notion that dinosaurs have been extinct for millions of years. Her results were published in a now-defunct science tabloid in June 1997. Shortly thereafter, as Ben Stein might say, she was "expelled" from Montana State University Northern.

Our literature research found several other reports, published in professional scientific journals from 1990 to 1994, of proteins still remaining in unfossilized dinosaur bones. One researcher was receiving funding to determine what process allowed organic material to be

preserved for millions of years because of the obvious application to food processing and storage.

Mary somehow got a job at North Carolina State University and continued her research on unfossilized organic matter in dinosaur bones. She managed to get her research published in one of the major professional scientific journals by noting the similarity between the dinosaur material and corresponding substances in modern birds. Thus, it became "proof" that dinosaurs evolved into birds.

DINOSAUR SOFT TISSUE NEWS

We've told you all that before, in greater detail. Now, let's bring you up to date. The January, 2008, issue of *Discover* magazine published the "Top 100 Science Stories of 2007." Number 10 on that list was Mary's proof that birds evolved from dinosaurs. Mary was still riding high in evolutionists' eyes last January. *Discover* said,

Even more astounding, the team, which included Harvard University mass spectrometrist John Asara, was able to obtain sequences from proteins formed tens of millions of years ago. In addition to taking on the *T. rex* project, Asara also succeeded in wresting 76 collagen sequences from a slightly younger find—mastodon bone fragments with soft tissue estimated to be 160,000 to 600,000 years old. Some matched the mastodons' closest living relative, the elephant. (Elephant protein sequences in present databases are incomplete, so other matches for the mastodon turned up among more distantly related mammals, including dogs, cows, mice, and humans.) Since then, Asara and his team have gotten more than a hundred total collagen sequences, showing an

¹ *Disclosure*, May 1999, "Dinosaur Blood and DNA"
Disclosure, October 1999, "We Dug Dinos - Part 2"
Disclosure, April 2005, "Surprising Dinosaurs"
Disclosure, May 2008, "No Longer Expelled"

even greater similarity to today's elephant.²

It is tempting to talk about the discovery of frozen mammoths, and why that implies a problem with the evolutionists' timescale; but let's not get led astray from the point of this month's essay. The point is that, as recently as January, proteins from *T. rex* and mastodons were presented as proof that birds evolved from dinosaurs, and elephants evolved from mastodons.

A linked article described the analyses of the *T. rex* protein samples performed by John Asara, who runs a mass spectrometry research lab at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center in Boston, Massachusetts, and his colleagues. Asara was able to match sequences from all the collagen fragments to those of living species including chickens, better defining the evolutionary link between reptiles and birds.³

When you think about it, the proof isn't really compelling. Bones are bones. All bones contain calcium, so nobody would claim that the presence of calcium in dinosaur bones and bird bones is proof that birds evolved from dinosaurs. So, it isn't surprising, or significant, that dinosaur bones and bird bones contain some of the same proteins and collagens.

The real breakthrough, say the scientists, is not proving the link to chickens, which was expected, but learning that this kind of fossil preservation and molecular analysis is even possible in material over a million years old.⁴

Since the link to chickens confirms their prejudice, it isn't important; but there is still that nagging question of how organic material could have survived for millions of years. Evolutionists had previously been able to convince a lot of people that birds evolved from dinosaurs. Showing similarity of proteins doesn't really bring much to the table. Believing that organic molecules can survive millions of years is a tougher sell. So, it is more important for the evolutionists to prove that the organic material isn't really organic material at all. As a result, "truth" had to change again.

TRUTH CHANGES AGAIN

The journal *Science* started publishing doubts on August 1, 2008.

² Barone, *Discover*, January 2008, "Top 100 Science Stories - #10. T. Rex time Machine", page 32

³ Dalton, *Nature*, 28 August 2008, "Fresh doubts over *T. rex* chicken link, page 1035

⁴ Barone, *Discover*, January 2008, "Top 100 Science Stories - #10. T. Rex time Machine", page 32

In 2005, researchers made headlines when they reported that they had found intact blood vessels from a 68-million-year-old *Tyrannosaurus rex*. The discovery raised hopes that paleontologists could get their hands on the flesh and blood of vanished animals. This week, however, other scientists challenged the results, arguing that the dinosaur flesh was in fact just coatings of young bacteria. But the original researchers stand by their results, calling the new argument weak. "There really isn't a lot new here," says Mary Schweitzer of North Carolina State University in Raleigh.⁵

Science News reported,

Three years ago, a team of scientists rocked the paleontology world by reporting that they'd recovered flexible tissue resembling blood vessels from a 68-million-year-old dinosaur fossil. Now, another group suggests that such pliable material could be something much more mundane: a modern-day film of bacterial slime.⁶

Remember, this all started with Schweitzer's discovery of something that looked like dried blood in dinosaur bones. Here is today's "truth" about them.

Kaye and his colleagues suggest that the small, blood-cell-like spheres in the bones they studied are tiny enigmatic structures called framboids, named for the French word for raspberry. The team found these berry-shaped microstructures in many of their samples. Framboids are typically made of iron sulfides, but those riddling the fossils analyzed by Kaye's team — as well as those found by Schweitzer's team in the 68-million-year-old *T. rex* leg bone — were instead composed of iron oxide.⁷

(By the way, here's a related observation, for what it is worth. When Mary first published her findings, she was opposed by a famous paleontologist. From 2003 to 2005, when Mary's results were hailed as proof of evolution, guess whose name was mentioned prominently in the published articles, giving him some of the glory. Now that the tide may be turning against Mary, it is "Schweitzer's team" again, and he isn't there defending her. ☺)

Mary didn't just find things that looked like dried blood cells. She also found things that looked like blood vessels.

⁵ Zimmer, *Science*, 1 August 2008, "Is Dinosaur 'Soft Tissue' Really Slime?", page 623

⁶ Perkins, *Science News*, 30 August 2008, "Tissue found in dino fossil may be biofilm", page 12

⁷ *ibid.*

In 2003, a crew led by Jack Horner of the Museum of the Rockies in Bozeman, Montana, dug up an exquisitely preserved *T. rex* fossil. Schweitzer dissolved a fragment in weak acid. With the bone gone, transparent vessels were left behind (*Science*, 25 March 2005, p. 1852). Other fossils yielded branched tubes, spheres that resembled blood cells, and what appeared to be bone-forming cells known as osteocytes. Later, Schweitzer and colleagues isolated what they identified as collagen proteins from the *T. rex* and from a mastodon fossil. The sequence of amino acids in the mastodon collagen was closest to that of elephants; the *T. rex* collagen was most similar to that of birds, its closest living relatives.⁸

What do scientists say about that today?

A variety of evidence suggests that pliable material found in fossils may be biofilms of modern-day bacteria rather than ancient cells and blood vessels. Many of the fossils analyzed by Kaye and his colleagues, including specimens recently unearthed from rocks several meters deep in a quarry, contained such flexible material. Carbon-dating analyses of some samples indicate that the material is very recent, forming after 1950, Kaye says.⁹

As commonly happens among paleontologists, there are charges that the other guy won't grant access to the raw material.

Even the *T. rex* protein samples have been questioned. On 30 July, Tom Kaye, a research associate at the Burke Museum of Natural History and Culture in Seattle, Washington, asserted that the collagen extracted from the ancient bone was in fact remnants of bacterial slime. Schweitzer told *Nature* that she rejects the evidence, from scanning electron microscope images, because it came from other bones — Kaye says that his team was denied access to the original bone.¹⁰

POLITICAL PROCEDURAL PLOYS

In politics, there are all sorts of procedural ploys that can be used to derail legislation. The politics of science are no different.

With the controversy over their original article unabated, Schweitzer says that she will hold a private meeting in November with invited scientific authorities to develop

⁸ Zimmer, *Science*, 1 August 2008, "Is Dinosaur 'Soft Tissue' Really Slime?", page 623

⁹ Perkins, *Science News*, 30 August 2008, "Tissue found in dino fossil may be biofilm", page 12

¹⁰ Dalton, *Nature*, 28 August 2008, "Fresh doubts over *T. rex* chicken link, page 1035

additional standards for publishing such work. But Pevzner is looking for a different response. "How many technical comments should there be before an article is withdrawn?" he says.¹¹

Do you suppose the conclusion of that private meeting might depend upon who gets an invitation? Does it bother you that there is a question about how many people must object before an article is censored?

CHARGES OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE

Schweitzer says she welcomes skepticism but that Kaye and his team "only address aspects of our study that fit conveniently with their preconceived ideas." They did not explain how proteins from a bacterial biofilm could be similar to bird or elephant proteins, for example. "They pick and choose what to focus on," Schweitzer says, arguing that a rebuttal of her work must account for all of her evidence. She also doubts that bacteria could have formed the tubes.¹²

What? Scientists "only address aspects of our study that fit conveniently with their preconceived ideas?" We are shocked! 😊 It sounds like scientists can be biased. Say it isn't so! 😊

Asara points out that his find does not mean chickens are the closest tyrannosaur relatives among modern birds, since he was able to compare the *T. rex* sequences only to species present in public protein databases. But identifying a bird as the nearest match validates researchers' expectations based on skeletal evidence.¹³

We are supposed to believe the results because they "validate researchers' expectations?" Isn't that an admission of bias and prejudice?

TRUST ME, I'M A DOCTOR

Evolutionists are so afraid that if creationists are allowed to criticize the theory of evolution, then it will confuse students and undermine their trust in science. The truth is that since evolutionists have replaced the old definition of science ("information obtained through repeatable observation and experimentation") with a new definition of science ("whatever the most powerful scientists currently believe"). They are the ones who are undermining public trust in science.

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² Zimmer, *Science*, 1 August 2008, "Is Dinosaur 'Soft Tissue' Really Slime?", page 623

¹³ Barone, *Discover*, January 2008, "Top 100 Science Stories - #10. T. Rex time Machine", page 32

DID WE LOSE?

Does the Long Term Evolution Experiment prove that information can be created by chance?

Last month's feature article worried Gus a little bit.

Subject: Creating new information for evolution
From: Gus
Date: Tue, 19 Aug 2008

Dear Do[-]While,
I was a tad concern reading your last entry, "The Long Term Evolution Experiment". In some of your previous articles, you've said something along the lines that "new information can not be created". In fact, I've used this to refute many Evolutionist[s].

Example:
"There are two fallacies in this argument. The first is that random changes in existing information can create new information. Random changes to a computer program will not make it do more useful things. It doesn't matter if you make all the changes at once, or make one change at a time. It will never happen. Yet an evolutionist tells us that if one makes random changes to a hemoglobin gene that after many steps it will turn into an antibody gene. That's just plain wrong."¹⁴

Now please explain if I misunderstand, but this newest article¹⁵ seems to prove that new information can be created? Yes, I understand your point is that it's sooo slow b/c of random chance that it couldn't have a huge effect on our populations; but still doesn't it prove that new information can be created. Please shed some light on the situation.

Thank you,
Gus

That was just the first of three emails we received from Gus. In a subsequent email he said,

I think the reason I keep e-mailing you on the subject is b/c this is the only time I feel Evolution actually got a small victory no matter any way I look at it. ... But, just like in a football game, no matter how much my team is up, I hate to see the other team score.

One might say that evolution did get a small victory, but you only win 100% of the time if you are the U.S. Women's Beach Volleyball team.¹⁶ ☺ Seriously, the results were encouraging for evolutionists, but they were far from a victory.

Gus also wrote,

¹⁴ Disclosure, September 1998, "Information and Evolution"

¹⁵ Disclosure, August 2008, "The Long Term Evolution Experiment"

¹⁶ Misty May-Treanor and Kerri Walsh finally did lose to Elaine Youngs and Nicole Branagh last month, after winning 112 matches in a row.

The e-coli experiment seems to show that positive mutations (or positive noise in the transmitted information) can create new types of e-coli. Am I understanding correctly?

There are two misunderstandings that we need to address. First, a new type of *E. coli* is still an *E. coli*. A dog with short hair is still a dog. A purple rose with orange polka dots is still a rose. Nothing new was created.

Second, one can dump a bunch of Scrabble™ tiles on a table, and some of the letters might form valid English words, but no information is created or conveyed.

Gus then asks,

And if this is true, what stops it from adding on more positive mutations until it is something totally different?

He is asking the wrong question. The correct question is not, "What stops it?" The correct question is, "What allows it?"

The incorrect answer to the incorrect question is, "Time." If it took 30,000 generations to acquire a minor improvement in digestion (in just one of 12 populations), just think how many generations it would take for the cow's entire digestive system to evolve (including the chewing the cud part).

The answer to the correct question is, "Nothing we know of allows it." We can't generate information simply by having supercomputers running day and night, generating random words.

MODIFICATION ISN'T INNOVATION

Consider this analogy. Racing bicycles typically have very narrow tires that are filled with high pressure air to minimize friction on paved roads. If you try to ride a racing bicycle through the desert around here, you won't get very far because the narrow, hard tires dig down into the sand and get stuck. Suppose someone accidentally put big soft tires on a racing bicycle by mistake. It would be easier to ride across the sand. It would be a beneficial random modification for people who live here in the desert.

So, one might ask, "What stops random mistakes like this one from turning a bicycle into a motorcycle?" To turn a bicycle into a motorcycle, one needs to add an engine, battery, gas tank, and fuel line. One needs innovation to turn a bike into a motorcycle. The real question is, "What would cause innovations (adding new things such as an engine) by accident?" The answer is, "Nothing." It can't happen.

The LTEE showed that in rare instances some mistakes are beneficial. But there is more involved than a few beneficial modifications. Evolution requires innovation. Evolution requires

creative mutations; not just beneficial mutations. The LTEE didn't demonstrate any innovation through creative mutation. The bacteria weren't able to do anything that no living thing had ever been able to do before.

OUTRAGEOUS CLAIMS

Suppose I make the outrageous claim that I, not George Harrison, played the lead guitar part on all the songs recorded by the Beatles. To prove my claim, I practice the easiest song they ever played 30,000 times, and then I play it for you 12 times. Eleven times, I get every note wrong; but the twelfth time I get one note right. Do you believe me now?

Figuratively speaking, it has been claimed that bacteria evolved the ability to play all the music ever written. To prove it, twelve colonies of bacteria were given 20 years to learn to play one song. Eleven of those colonies failed completely. Only a few of the bacteria in the twelfth colony learned a single note. Such limited success disproves the proposition.

IGNORANCE IS BLISS

The less one knows about evolution, the more believable it is. Experiments like the LTEE simply prove just how inadequate mutation and natural selection are for causing even the slightest improvement in living things. Seeing how hard it is for evolution to produce such a simple improvement in the digestion of a bacterium makes it impossible to believe that the pancreas evolved by chance.

That's why evolutionists want desperately to censor the science curriculum in public schools. The more students know about life, the less likely they are to believe in evolution. Ignorance of the facts is vital to belief in evolution.

Science is against evolution. That's why we aren't afraid to report the results of the LTEE. Evolutionists don't have truth on their side. That's why they don't want any criticism of evolution (which might "confuse students") permitted in the public schools.

We trust that if you examine the evidence for yourself with an open mind, you will come to the conclusion that evolution is an inadequate explanation for the origin and diversity of life on Earth. That's why we don't threaten or badger you. That's why we encourage you to hear the evolutionists' side.

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

EVOLVE, THE TV SERIES

Sometimes it is better to say nothing and let people think you are a fool than to open your mouth and remove all doubts.

For years we have been poking holes in the theory of evolution; but nothing we have written is as damaging to the theory as the Evolve series on The History Channel. In trying to explain evolution, they actually expose its fundamental flaws. The entire series will be available from The History Channel on four DVDs for \$34.95 after November 20, 2008. We suggest that you try to catch an episode or two for free on TV because we want you to see it; but we don't want you to waste your money on it.

We haven't seen all the episodes; but we have seen enough of them to see the general pattern. Take the episode on Flight for example. The adjectives it uses to describe the evolution of flight are, "remarkable, amazing, incredible, unlikely, astounding, true marvels," and "nearly impossible," to name just a few. It is as if they went to the thesaurus and used every possible synonym for "miraculous," but consciously avoided using that term. ☺ It is peppered with phrases such as, "may have, may be, could be, it is possible, biggest mystery of all, lingering debate, exactly why remains a mystery, some kind of ancestor, area of speculation, the question still remains," and "breaks evolutionary rules." The episode is filled with examples of remarkable, amazing, incredible, unlikely, astounding, marvelous, and nearly impossible things that must have happened, if the theory of evolution is true.

What isn't in the episode is any kind of evidence. They assert that flight evolved independently in insects, birds, pterosaurs, and mammals; but they don't give any proof.

They follow the same pattern in their episode on Skin. Skin is remarkable, and necessary for life. The more you know about skin, the more amazing it is.

We urge you to watch these shows with an open, critical, and objective mind. Ask yourself, "Do they have any basis for the assertions they make?" Then ask yourself, "Why should I believe the unbelievable?"

The theory of evolution is simply fantastic speculation for which there is no good scientific explanation. This TV series makes it evident. We really hope you watch it.

by Lothar Janetzko

THE VANISHING CASE FOR EVOLUTION

<http://www.icr.org/article/260/>

“Evolutionary belief is a remarkable and largely unexplained phenomenon.”

This month's web site review looks at an article from the Institute for Creation Research. From the home page of this article you will find links to Home, Get the Evidence, Resources, Departments and Search. Each of these links provides access to more links to guide you on your visit to this site. You can also click on a link to receive free publications from ICR.

In the introduction to the article, the author Henry Morris, states that “Evolutionary belief is a remarkable and largely unexplained phenomenon. It is a belief held by most intellectuals all over the world, despite the fact that there is no real scientific evidence for it at all. Evolutionists allege that evolution is a proved scientific fact, based on a multitude of scientific proofs, but they are unable to document even *one* of these supposed proofs! This curious situation is illustrated below in quotations from several leading evolutionary scientists.”

In the body of the article he discusses the “Altogether Missing Evidence”. He outlines the article by discussing 1) No Evolution at Present, 2) No New Species, 3) No Known Mechanism of Evolution, 4) No Fossil Evidence, 5) No Order in the Fossils, 6) No Evidence that Evolution is Possible, 7) No Evidence from Similarities and 8) No Recapitulation or Vestigial Organs.

He concludes his article by addressing “The Residual Case for Evolution”. At the end of the article you will find detailed references. The article makes for interesting reading and can be used as a launching point for exploring all the interesting content that ICR provides regarding questions about creation and evolution.

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