

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 3

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

December 2007

WIKIPEDIA

Can you believe what you read in Wikipedia about the theory of evolution?

THE WIKI PHILOSOPHY

Wikipedia is one of those ideas that looks great on paper, but doesn't quite work in practice. Wikipedia's noble goal is to correct a weakness in traditional encyclopedias. Although a traditional encyclopedia has many authors, it reflects the single opinion of the editor/publisher. The editor/publisher chooses who writes the articles, and therefore affects the perspective of the article. The person chosen to write the article might be biased, or uninformed.

Wikipedia is an on-line encyclopedia based on the notion that it takes a village to write an encyclopedia. There is almost certainly someone else in the entire world more qualified to write an article about a subject than the person paid to write an article for a traditional encyclopedia. Therefore, one should be able to tap into the expertise of the entire world, and let the world edit the encyclopedia. Since all the articles are written by the most qualified, most informed person in the world, Wikipedia should be the ultimate source of truth. Furthermore, it should never be obsolete. As soon as new information is discovered, it can be incorporated into Wikipedia.

WHY WIKIPEDIA FAILS

It is a great idea in theory, but it fails miserably in practice for several reasons.

The first problem with Wikipedia is that it is so transient that it is useless for footnotes. Granted, old fashioned print encyclopedias have their limitations, but at least the 1960 *World Book Encyclopedia* still says the same thing today as it said in 1960. So, if we claim that evolutionists believed something in 1960, and quote the 1960 *World Book* as proof, one can go to the Library of Congress and check to see if we quoted it correctly. But if we quote Wikipedia, there is no

guarantee that it will still say the same thing by the time you read our newsletter. If we poke holes in a stupid argument on Wikipedia, it may look like we created a foolish straw man just to make fun of it.

So, the **first fundamental flaw** in Wikipedia is that it lacks permanence. You can't depend upon it to say the same thing today as it said yesterday.

The **second fundamental flaw** is that although Wikipedia is theoretically democratic, in practice it is Stalinist. Joseph Stalin said, "The people who cast the votes don't decide an election, the people who count the votes do."¹ The content of Wikipedia is not determined by the smart people in the world who contribute to it. It is determined by the people who decide what edits are legitimate, and what edits are "vandalism."

The **third fundamental flaw** is that you know nothing about the qualifications or possible agenda of the people who wrote the Wikipedia article.

OTHERS AGREE

These problems have been recognized by others for a long time. It was more than a year ago that the prestigious journal *Science* recognized the failure of Wikipedia.

A Wikipedia co-founder-turned-detractor is hoping to build a more academic alternative to the freewheeling, user-written encyclopedia.²

More recently, *New Scientist* published a two-page article listing all the reasons one can't trust the information Wikipedia. Ironically, the title of

¹ Joseph Stalin, <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/j/josephstal390697.html>

² *Science*, 27 October 2006, "A Scholarly Wikipedia?", page 571

this article is, "You can put your trust in Wikipedia 2.0." The subheading of that article tells the real story, however.

Wikipedia wants to be seen as more reliable, but will the changes it is planning deter genuine contributions?³

New Scientist then describes the problems, the suggested solutions, and the problems with those solutions, proposed for "Wikipedia 2.0". It really doesn't take two pages to explain the problem, however. The fundamental problem with Wikipedia is "Damned-if-you-do-damned-if-you-don't." If you let just anyone edit the articles, there is no guarantee that the person who wrote the article is qualified to write it. You don't even know who wrote it. (They could have lied about their identity.) If you put any restrictions on who can write the articles, then you have Stalin censoring what people can read.

THE INTERNET SHARES THE SAME PROBLEMS

A lot of what we have just said about Wikipedia could be said about the Internet in general. For example, we just used an Internet source for the Joseph Stalin quote. We have no guarantee that the link will still be valid when you try to follow it. We don't really know the quote is accurate because said it in Russian. We must trust the unknown translator. Furthermore, we don't really know he actually said anything of the kind. We did find multiple references to the quote on the web, but it could just be an urban legend. We used the quote because the statement is true, regardless of whether or not Stalin said it. If you don't believe us, just ask Al Gore! ☺

PRINT MEDIA

This is why we rely primarily on peer-reviewed print media (*Science*, *Nature*, and *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*) for facts about scientific research, and popular print media (*Time*, *Newsweek*, and so on) for descriptions of how that scientific research is portrayed to the general public. You can check the quotes, and you know who wrote it.

Be skeptical about everything you hear. Check out the facts for yourself. Don't believe something just because it is said by a scientist or a clergyman. Don't believe it just because we say it. Use your brain. Do your own research.

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

³ *New Scientist*, 27 September 2007, "You can put your trust in Wikipedia 2.0", pages 28-29

Evolution in Wikipedia

WIKIPEDIA'S BIAS

Wikipedia tries to justify their one-sided coverage of evolution.

We have received two different classes of email about Wikipedia. Here are samples of both.

Subject: Wikipedia
From: Joel
Date: 7/18/2006 6:44 PM
Hi there,

I found something that may merit your attention. The Wikipedia article on Evolution seems to contain very little reference to arguments against evolution, and what little there is is listed as "misunderstandings." I browsed through the page's history a bit and found that basically all attempts to note inaccuracies of or problems with the theory were removed, with the edit being labeled [sic] "vandalism." To me, this seems like a problem. However, I am not prepared or capable of dealing with it by myself. Perhaps there is a way to get readers to begin a "truth assault" on the page and fill in the missing information.

The following is typical of the second kind of email.

Subject: Not Science
From: Shadoom
Date: 10/4/2007 4:11 PM
If evolution is "no longer a respectable theory" then how come 98% of all scientists and 99% of scientists in the related fields (ie: biology) believe it?

We wondered where he got his facts, so we sent him an email saying, "We have tried very hard to get confirmation that most scientists believe in evolution. Where did you get your facts? Please send us the reference." We got an immediate response.

Subject: RE: Not Science
From: Shadoom
Date: 10/4/2007 7:08 PM
I got my facts from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Evolution/FAQ>, check the references at the bottom of the page if you want to find the original source.

So, we followed the link. We were amazed by what we read.

ONE-SIDED ADMISSION

Wikipedia freely admitted that they are one-sided. There are no criticisms of the theory of evolution because they categorically reject them all. Here are excerpts from what their FAQ page said in October of 2007.

Why won't you add criticisms or objections to evolution in the Evolution article?

This is essentially mandated by Wikipedia's

official neutral point of view policy. This policy requires that articles treat views on various subjects proportionally to those views' mainstream acceptance in the appropriate academic field. For example, if two contradictory views in physics are held by roughly an equal number of physicists, then Wikipedia should give those views "equal time". On the other hand, if one view is held by 99% of physicists and the other by 1%, then Wikipedia should favor the former view throughout its physics articles; the latter view should receive little, if any, coverage. To do otherwise would require, for example, that we treat belief in a Flat Earth as being equal to other viewpoints on the figure of the Earth.

Due to the enormous mainstream scientific consensus in support of modern evolutionary theory, and pursuant to Wikipedia's aforementioned policies, Evolution references evolution as an observable natural process and as the valid explanation for the diversity of life on earth. Although there are indeed opposing views to evolution, such as Creationism, none of these views have any support in the relevant field (biology), and therefore Wikipedia cannot, and should not, treat these opposing views as being significant to the science of evolution. On the other hand, they may be very significant to sociological articles on the effects of evolutionary theory on religious and cultural beliefs; this is why sociological and historical articles such as creation-evolution controversy give major coverage to these opposing views, while biological articles such as evolution do not.⁴

Their "neutral point of view policy" mandates that they present only one side! ☺ We sure hope that Wikipedia still says this when you go to check the link because we swear we didn't make this up!

THE SURVEY SAYS ...

The Wikipedia FAQ didn't actually say that 99% of all scientists (including biologists) believe in evolution, but that was the inference Shadoom got from it. **We have asked Gallop and Pew Research to do a survey to find out what percentage of scientists still do believe in evolution. They either have not done the survey, or won't publish the results of the survey, or have published the results and we have not seen them. If anyone knows of a survey taken by a legitimate, unbiased organization, please send us the reference!**

There was more on the Wikipedia FAQ page:

Evolution is controversial, so why won't

⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Evolution/FAQ>

you teach the controversy?

As noted above, evolution is at best only controversial in social areas like politics and religion. Evolutionary theory is not controversial in biology itself. Numerous respectable scientific societies, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Academy of Sciences, have issued statements supporting evolution and denouncing creationism and/or ID. In 1987 only about 0.15% of American earth and life scientists supported creationism.

Thus, as a consequence of Wikipedia's policies, it is necessary to treat evolutionary theory as mainstream scientific consensus treats it: an uncontroversial, uncontested, enormously widely-accepted explanation with no scientifically supported "alternatives".⁵

It is true that the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Academy of Sciences, have issued statements supporting evolution. These are political lobbying groups whose purpose is to obtain funding for science projects. Do you really expect them to say, "Evolution is nonsense, so don't waste your money funding evolutionary research!?" That's like asking tobacco companies if they think cigarettes are harmful.

The tobacco analogy isn't entirely frivolous. Suppose you make your fortune selling tobacco. Even if you knew deep down inside how harmful cigarettes are, wouldn't you argue heatedly that smoking cigarettes doesn't cause cancer? Aren't many of the most vocal evolutionists in the same situation?

To their credit, Wikipedia gave a reference for only 0.15% of life scientists favoring creation. Here it is:

As reported in *Newsweek* magazine, 29 June 1987, Page 23: "By one count there are some 700 scientists with respectable academic credentials (out of a total of 480,000 U.S. earth and life scientists) who give credence to creation-science..."⁶

This survey is more than 20 years old! We don't know who did the counting, and what their criteria were for "respectable academic credentials." All we know is that it was the result of "one count." Does that mean there were twelve other counts that found lots of scientists who believe in creation (which by implication means they reject evolution)? **If Wikipedia is so cutting-edge, why are they quoting dubious research that is 20 years old? Is it because so much scientific evidence against evolution has surfaced in the past 20 years that they can't find modern research to support their prejudice?**

We were pleasantly surprised that **they at least**

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

admitted that there are hundreds of scientists “with respectable academic credentials” who rejected the theory of evolution 20 years ago. Evolutionists generally want you to believe that there aren’t any scientists at all who reject evolution. Today, there are more and more “real scientists” who are finding the courage to “come out of the closet” and admit that they reject evolution. That’s why the controversy has intensified in recent years.

COLOSSAL IGNORANCE

The author of the Wikipedia FAQ is unknown. You are supposed to assume, however, that whoever wrote the FAQ is knowledgeable and has impeccable credentials. We can’t help but wonder about the credentials of whoever wrote the following FAQ, when they make such obviously ignorant (or intentionally misleading) statements as these:

Has evolution ever been observed?

Main article: Evidence of evolution

The process of evolution has been observed countless times in numerous situations. For example, evolution has been observed and tested in laboratories, particularly in organisms that breed rapidly, such as bacteria and fruit flies. Evolution has also been observed in the field, such as in the fish tilapia and the peppered moth. A new species of mosquito has evolved in the London Underground system since it opened.

However, while the process of evolution has been observed many times, not every aspect of evolutionary theory, and particularly of the evolutionary history of life, has been directly observed. For example, non-avian dinosaurs have never been observed; their existence has only been inferred from their remains, in the form of fossils. However, these inferences are extremely well-supported by the mountains of evidence testifying to them. Such inferences are also common to all fields of science. For example, the neutron has never been observed, but all the available data supports the neutron model. In the same way, although the entire evolutionary history of life has not been directly observed, all available data supports the evolutionary model. This is why scientists accept evolution even though it isn't 100% "proven".⁷

Does the author not know the difference between variation and evolution? Is he or she intentionally confusing microevolution with macroevolution to be deceitful? or is he or she just terribly uninformed or ignorant?

The peppered moth study has been known to have been flawed (to put it delicately) for years.⁸ The photographs were staged. The release-and-count methodology was unrealistic. There were dark and light moths at the beginning of the study, and there were dark and light moths at the end of

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *Disclosure*, February 2002, “Horses and Peppered Moths”

the study. The moths didn’t evolve into anything else. Only the relative percentage of light- and dark-colored moths changed. Yet, the Wikipedia FAQ author cites peppered moths as evidence that one kind of creature can evolve into another. Is he or she still stuck back in the 20th century?

ILLOGICAL LOGIC

Yes, we can infer that dinosaurs existed because we have discovered lots of dinosaur bones; but that doesn’t mean that we can infer every species on Earth evolved from a common ancestor just because we have discovered lots of species.

In case you didn’t catch it, he or she said, “non-avian dinosaurs have never been observed.” That’s because avian dinosaurs (*i.e.* birds) have been observed. After all these years of evolutionists making fun of creationists for believing that dinosaurs and man lived contemporaneously, they now insist that dinosaurs are still alive and living among us today!

Some evolutionists define birds to be dinosaurs because they are assumed to have evolved from dinosaurs. Therefore, the “fact” that birds are dinosaurs should not be used as proof of evolution. That’s circular (invalid) logic.

EVOLUTION CONFUSION

We don’t know how many people wrote the Wikipedia FAQ. It could all be the work of one ignorant mind. Perhaps the person who wrote the FAQ, “Has evolution ever been observed?” is the same person who wrote the following FAQ. If it was a different person, it shows that ignorance about microevolution and macroevolution is rampant at Wikipedia.

Why is microevolution equated with macroevolution?

Further information: Microevolution, Macroevolution

The article doesn't equate the two, but merely recognizes that they are largely or entirely the same process, just on different scales. The great majority of modern evolutionary biologists consider macroevolution to simply be microevolution on a larger timescale; all fields of science accept that small ("micro") changes can become large ("macro") ones, given enough time. Most of the topics covered in *Evolution* are basic enough to not require an appeal to the micro/macro distinction. Consequently, the two terms are not equated, but simply not dealt with much.

A more nuanced version of the claim that evolution has never been observed is that

microevolution has been directly observed, while macroevolution has not. However, this is not the case, as speciations, which are generally seen as the benchmark for macroevolution, have been observed in a number of instances.⁹

Microevolution and macroevolution are entirely different processes! Macroevolution isn't just a lot of microevolution building up over time. Speciation has nothing to do with macroevolution. Can the person who wrote that FAQ really be that ignorant?

Email

GRANDFATHERLY ADVICE

Ken is going to get a life; but what kind of life will he get?

We still get some email like this one from Ken; but not nearly as often as we once did.

From: Ken
Date: 11/28/2007 5:23 PM
To: Contribute@ScienceAgainstEvolution.org
Subject: Please get a life
All I wish to contribute is a comment. What in the hell do a bunch of engineers know about evolution anyway?
Please get a life (one that evolved from bacteria).
Ken
PhD Candidate
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

We routinely delete emails like these without giving them a second thought, much less a response. There was something about the email from this kid, perhaps it was his signature, that brought out the protective grandfather in me. So, this is what I wrote back to him.

"Dear Ken,

"Thank you, but I've already had my life. It was successful professionally and personally, and I am grateful for the opportunity to have lived it. Now I am near the end of my life, and I can look back without regret.

"You are at the beginning of your life. How will you spend it? Will you spend your entire career trying to figure out how bacteria evolved into blue-green algae? Or will you accomplish something?

"Stanley Miller was a brilliant man. He was a great man. From the time he was a graduate student, until his death more than fifty years later, he spent his entire career trying to figure out how

chemicals formed the first living cell through purely natural processes. He never figured out how it happened because it never happened. All his experiments were doomed to failure.

"But even though all his experiments failed, he himself was not a failure. He, more than anyone else, proved that life could not have originated by purely natural processes. He left no stone unturned in his single-minded pursuit of the origin of life. But failing to find anything under any stone, he conclusively proved that there was nothing under every stone.

"Some day, I hope, the world will recognize and appreciate the contribution that Stanley Miller made to science. More than anyone else, he deserves the credit for proving that there is no way life could have arisen spontaneously through natural processes. He does not yet have the honor he truly deserves.

"I never met Dr. Miller. I wish I could have spoken to him in the last days of his life. I would have liked to have told him how much I appreciate all his research. I sometimes wonder what he thought on his deathbed. Did he look back over his entire career and realize that not one of his experiments turned out as he hoped? Did he get discouraged by a 0% success rate? Or did he realize that he, in fact, discovered the truth? The truth is that his hypothesis was wrong; and he conclusively proved it was wrong.

"Since I never communicated with him, I don't know what he thought about how he spent his life. I wish I knew. I simply hope that he found joy and satisfaction in the knowledge that he achieved great success through all his failed experiments.

"How I spent my life, and how Dr. Miller spent his life, can't be changed. But your life is just beginning. You are about to get a life. What kind of life will you get? Will you be successful in discovering how biological systems work? Or will you fail to discover how bacteria evolved into algae? This is a critical point in your life. Will you find success through success, or success through failure? The choice is up to you. Choose carefully. Your happiness depends upon it.

"If you choose to devote your life to a futile attempt to prove evolution, we hope you won't get discouraged. Leave no stone unturned. Exhaust every possibility. Then publish your research. Leave no doubt in anyone's mind that bacteria could not have evolved into algae. That will be a great contribution to science. Don't let failure discourage you.

"Sincerely,

"Do-While Jones"

⁹ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Evolution/FAQ>

by Lothar Janetzko

CREATIONISM VS. EVOLUTION

http://www.sntp.net/darwin/evolution_creationism.htm

“The battle over beliefs involving ‘how everything came to be’”

This month we look at a web site that provides an interesting discussion concerning people's beliefs regarding creation vs. evolution. The web site author, Gene Zimmer, begins this particular web page by providing a brief description of Creationism and the Theory of Evolution. His first observation is that “it is absurd to engage in such a battle of ideologically driven notions. It is equally absurd, and wrong, that the government has been duped into supporting the beliefs of one group (evolution, humanism, the materialistic interpretation of the social sciences) while refusing to support and even attacking the beliefs of the other group (creationism – religion).” Most of the web page explains why he feels this way.

The viewpoint that he expresses on the web page is that, at the most basic level, both creationism and evolution are beliefs. It is his observation that “neither belief corresponds to any actual perceivable, observable, or verifiable tangible thing or occurrence(s) ...in the end it's fundamentally only a matter of personal opinion and what anyone chooses to believe.”

On the web page you will also find he discusses the term “science”. He says “science should refer only to subjects derived from honest and careful application of the scientific method.” He has a lengthy discussion of “Belief and Faith Parading as Science”.

Throughout the web page you will find links to other topics such as modern medicine, ideas and concepts, modern materialism, behaviorism, force and the study of the mind. These links lead to other web pages written by the site author.

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