

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 14 Issue 1

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

October 2009

DON'T QUOTE ME

We love to be quoted; but if you have to quote us, then you shouldn't.

This essay is in response to an increasing number of requests to provide material that can be used in debates with evolutionists. As much as we love to be quoted, it is probably in your best interest not to. Before we tell you why, let's eliminate one reason. This isn't a copyright issue.

COPYRIGHT

Except for a very few newsletters that were so crammed full that we had absolutely no space to spare, our newsletters have included this notice:

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

I love writing the newsletter, but I hate printing it. (That's why we encourage you to select the electronic option rather than the printed option when renewing your membership.) Every month I spend hours standing beside the printer, collating pages, stapling them together, punching holes, folding them, fastening them closed, putting address labels on them, putting stamps on them, and taking them to the post office. It's boring and time consuming. Every minute I spend printing the newsletters is a minute I can't spend doing research (or playing my guitar). So, when you download the newsletter and print it yourself (and perhaps print more copies for your friends), you aren't stealing from us. You are giving me more time to study (and try to recapture the musical proficiency of my youth). Thank you.

FREE SPEECH

Copyright laws don't limit free speech. If you disagree with us, you have every right to say, "Science Against Evolution wrote, '...' but they are wrong because ...". If you aren't permitted to quote us, how can you discuss (and dispute) what we say?

When we quote other sources we make every effort to quote them as accurately as possible. We look for passages that make the evolutionists' point as clearly and concisely as possible. Sometimes that's difficult when they aren't very clear or concise. © Consequently, some of the quotes are long and confusing. But we always provide footnotes and encourage you to read all that the evolutionist wrote.

We aren't playing a game where the object is to twist the evolutionists' words to make them sound stupid and discredit them. Our goal is to tell you the rest of the story. We want you to know what they left out, or didn't emphasize. We believe that if you know all the facts, and examine them for yourselves, you will conclude that the theory of evolution is not a reasonable explanation for the origin and diversity of life on Earth. Evolutionists want to censor the science curriculum. We want to add to it.

OWNING REALITY

Our final point about copyright is that we feel there is something fundamentally wrong with anyone claiming the financial rights to a biological, physical, or mathematical law just because he discovered it. Mathematicians do not have to pay royalties to the estate of Sir Isaac Newton every time they compute an integral or solve a differential equation. Facts should be freely available to everyone.

THE OTHER SIDE

Having said all that, we recognize that copyrights are (in some cases) necessary and legitimate. We would certainly be within our rights to claim compensation for some (but certainly not all) of the things we have written.

The first time we faced this decision was when someone wrote asking for permission to use our

parody, *The Wizard of Ooze*¹, as the script for a puppet show. We granted it without asking for (or receiving) any royalties. Our parodies, including *The Wizard of Ooze*, are special cases because they don't just contain biological facts. They also contain some brilliant ☺ satire that can rightfully be claimed as our own creation. Even so, we didn't copyright it.

We've included this little digression about copyrights because we are about to give you several reasons why we think you should not quote us, none of which have anything to do with copyrights. We want to make it perfectly clear that we don't object to you quoting us for financial reasons. Science Against Evolution is a secular, non-profit educational public benefit corporation. We aren't doing this for the money.

PRIMARY SOURCES

One reason you should not quote us is that you should get your facts from primary sources. We are a secondary source.

We tell you what other people have published, and what we think about what they have published. You should not say, "Science Against Evolution says that Doctor X says this." You should quote Doctor X directly. In order to do that, you have to actually read and understand what Doctor X published. That's why we put so many footnotes in our newsletters. We want you to read the source material and get your information first hand.

We quote from scientific research papers just enough to give you a feel for what the paper says. We try to capture the essence of the paper as clearly as concisely as possible, so you will know what we are talking about.

After we tell you what the scientists have said, we comment upon it. We tell you what we think the significance of the discovery is, and why we think that. That's just our opinion. You can agree with it or disagree with it. Our opinion is not some kind of absolute authority.

Here is the fine distinction: If you want to quote us, saying that we think something or other, that's fine. But if you quote us saying that something is true because we said it is true, that's wrong.

FACTS ABOUT FACTS

There is a difference between facts, analysis, and commentary. Facts are measured. The size and shape of a bone, and the mineral content of a rock, are facts. Any competent person taking the

measurement will get the same results. The length of a bone doesn't change based on the religion or political views of the measurer. **Facts don't change.** The data in scientific reports are facts.

Analysis involves drawing conclusions based on those facts. Data analysis involves judgment. Judgment can be influenced by religion, ego, rivalry, financial consequences, or perhaps other things. **Analysis is a blend of facts and opinions.**

Commentary is purely opinion. Commentary is what someone thinks about analysis. Commentary deals with what is important and why it is important, at least to the person making the commentary.

Our newsletters are mostly commentary. **We report the facts discovered by others, report the analysis of those facts by others, and then comment on their analysis.** So, if you want to quote facts or analysis, you should not be quoting us. You should quote whoever discovered the facts and made the analysis.

EXCEPTIONS

On rare occasions we do some analysis. Our analysis of the Apollo 11 moon rocks² is an example. Clearly we did not go to the moon and collect the rocks, nor did we measure their chemical composition. The data was obtained and published by others. We did, however, analyze the published data. In particular, **we tabulated all the computed ages of all the Apollo 11 moon rocks and concluded that the ages are so discordant that the age dating methods are not reliable.** We concluded that since the methods are not reliable, the assumptions upon which those methods are based must not be correct. The commentary on our own analysis is that since the age dating methods failed so miserably on the moon rocks, we should not give any credibility to those methods when used on Earth rocks. **In cases like that, it is appropriate to reference our analysis.**

A WASTE OF TIME

Another reason why you should not quote us is that **it is a waste of your time to try to convince an evolutionist that he or she is wrong simply because we said so.** We say this because we have gotten so many emails like this one from Paulette.

You are [expletive deleted] retarded. People like you need a "god" because you're too [expletive deleted] weak to make it through life without the idea of some "higher being" that's always watching over you. How

¹ *Disclosure*, April 2001, "The Wizard of Ooze", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v5i7f.htm>

² *Disclosure*, June 2008, "The Age of the Moon", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v12i9f.htm>

can you be that conceded [sic]? You're not that special. And, our DNA is 96% identical to that of a chimpanzee. I hate to break it to you, it's not a coincidence. It's because we had a common ancestor. Are you even capable of looking at things in a rational matter? Give it a try sometime, you'll see it makes loads more sense than your stories of people with magical powers who try to save people. If you really need to read that sort of [deleted], go buy a comic book. But here's the kicker, I'm not an atheist, but it's blatantly [sic] clear that your christian [sic] god was just something that your church made up years ago to gain dominance over the average person because they knew that the average person is:

1. Dumb
2. Fearful

And after painfully reading your article, you definitely come across as being average.

So good luck with the whole 2nd coming of christ [sic] thing... I hope that makes you feel better.

People like Paulette will not respond to a calm, rational explanation of why the theory of evolution is contrary to established scientific principles. That's why we don't try to convince hard-core evolutionists that they are wrong. You aren't going to convince them by quoting us.

OUR AUDIENCE

We write our newsletter for people who are honestly seeking the truth. They want to know what it is that is being censored from the American public school science curriculum so that they can make up their own minds. We don't strive to convince—we strive to explain.

We want you to understand the issues. We are pointing you to published scientific data that you can read and evaluate for yourself. We aren't giving you one-liners that you can use to convince other people that they are wrong.

DON'T QUOTE ME

If you want to argue with evolutionists, you are free to do so; but let us just give you this warning: "If you have to quote me, you have no business arguing." By that we mean, if you don't understand an issue well enough to explain it in your own words, using primary data you have read and understood, then you should not be debating the issue. If you don't understand what you are talking about, then all your opponent has to do is to turn the discussion slightly to get you off your script. You won't have a suitable quote, you won't know what to say, and you will look like a fool.

We aren't here to win debates. We are here to help people who are honestly trying to learn the truth. Our mission is to mine the professional journals for nuggets of truth and disclose the things that evolutionists don't want you to know. We are here to help you discover the truth for yourself.

DINO DISAGREEMENTS

Experts now tell us that what we used to know about dinosaurs is wrong (again).

Yes, this essay is about dinosaurs; but it is also about the nature of science. Science reveals reality. Reality never changes. If a process pretending to be science produces a series of contradictory descriptions of reality, then it can't really be science. It's just a series of opinions.

Everything we know about dinosaurs we know because scientists have told it to us. No living person has ever actually seen a dinosaur, unless you believe the evolutionists who tell us that birds actually are dinosaurs.

When the Canada geese honk their way northward, we can say: "The dinosaurs are migrating, it must be spring!"³

In that case, every living person has seen a dinosaur.

BIRDS DID NOT EVOLVE FROM DINOSAURS

In case you missed it, a few months ago scientists found evidence that dinosaurs did not evolve from birds.

Discovery Raises New Doubts About Dinosaur-bird Links

ScienceDaily (June 9, 2009) — Researchers at Oregon State University have made a fundamental new discovery about how birds breathe and have a lung capacity that allows for flight – and the finding means it's unlikely that birds descended from any known theropod dinosaurs.

The conclusions add to other evolving evidence that may finally force many paleontologists to reconsider their long-held belief that modern birds are the direct descendants of ancient, meat-eating dinosaurs, OSU researchers say.⁴

After talking about lungs, and the position of the thigh bone, the article says,

The implication, the researchers said, is that

³ Bakker, *The Dinosaur Heresies*, 1986, page 462 (The last sentence of the book.)

⁴ *ScienceDaily*, June 9, 2009, "Discovery Raises New Doubts About Dinosaur-bird Links", <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/06/090609092055.htm>

birds almost certainly did not descend from theropod dinosaurs, such as tyrannosaurus or allosaurus. The findings add to a growing body of evidence in the past two decades that challenge some of the most widely-held beliefs about animal evolution.

"For one thing, birds are found earlier in the fossil record than the dinosaurs they are supposed to have descended from," Ruben said. "That's a pretty serious problem, and there are other inconsistencies with the bird-from-dinosaur theories.

...
"It's really kind of amazing that after centuries of studying birds and flight we still didn't understand a basic aspect of bird biology," said John Ruben, an OSU professor of zoology.⁵

Even though they proved birds did not evolve from dinosaurs, they don't expect other evolutionists to agree, but not because of facts.

OSU research on avian biology and physiology was among the first in the nation to begin calling into question the dinosaur-bird link since the 1990s. Other findings have been made since then, at OSU and other institutions, which also raise doubts. But old theories die hard, Ruben said, especially when it comes to some of the most distinctive and romanticized animal species in world history.

"Frankly, there's a lot of museum politics involved in this, a lot of careers committed to a particular point of view even if new scientific evidence raises questions," Ruben said.⁶

They are right to expect prejudiced opposition.

BIRDS EVOLVED FROM DINOSAURS

Just last month, the *Guardian* published a headline that screamed,

Feathered dinosaur fossils find has Chinese scientists all aflutter⁷

The body of the article describes *Anchiornis huxleyi* fossils. Here's why these new fossils are important.

"These exceptional fossils provide us with evidence that has been missing until now," Xu said. "Now it all fits neatly into place and we have tied up some of the loose ends."

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ Morris, guardian.co.uk, 24 September 2009, "Feathered dinosaur fossils find has Chinese scientists all aflutter", <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2009/sep/24/dinosaur-fossil-discovery-china?CMP=AFCYAH>

The finds date back to between 151m and 164m years ago, which suggest they are older than archaeopteryx, previously thought to be the oldest undisputed bird.⁸

First, there is the admission that the evidence for dinosaur to bird evolution "has been missing until now." Now they claim to have tied up some (but not all) of the "loose ends." So, there still is missing evidence. The vast conclusions are based on half-vast data.

Remember that archaeopteryx was originally claimed to be a missing link, a dinosaur starting to turn into a bird. Then it was claimed to be the first true bird. Now archaeopteryx is no longer even "thought to be the oldest undisputed bird."

Xu, who is based in Beijing, said: "The fossils provide confirmation that the bird-dinosaur hypothesis is correct, and supports the idea that birds descended from theropod dinosaurs (the group of predatory dinosaurs that includes allosaurus and velociraptor)."⁹

But it was just three months ago that scientists DISPROVED the bird-dinosaur hypothesis! At least we still know how *Tyrannosaurus rex* evolved. Or do we?

TINY T-REX

On September 17, BBC News reported the discovery of *Raptorex kriegsteini*.

The team believes that the new fossil completely overturns accepted opinion on the evolution of tyrannosaurs.

Until now it had been thought that their strange body shape evolved as a consequence of their large size.

...
The fossil record tells us that tyrannosaurs only grew to huge sizes during the final 20 million years of the Cretaceous.

Dr Brusatte said: "So that means that for most of their evolutionary history, about 80% of the time that they were on Earth, tyrannosaurs were small animals that lived in the shadow of other types of very large dinosaur predators.

"In short, much of what we thought we know about tyrannosaur evolution turns out to be either simplistic or out-and-out wrong."¹⁰

We can't say it any more clearly than that.

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ Burns, BBC News, 17 September 2009, "Tiny ancestor is T. rex blueprint", <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8259902.stm>

Evolution in the News

ARDI

There's breaking news that scientists say completely revolutionizes the story of human evolution.

Not only are there Dino Disagreements, the October 2 issue of *Science* contained a major series of articles revising evolutionists' views of human evolution. We will tell you about it next month.

Email

SPECIFIED COMPLEXITY

Is Specified Complexity worth considering?

We would like to address an email we received which began as follows:

Subject: Problem with Specified Complexity
From: John
Date: 9/26/2009

In September's Disclosure, you made a reference to Specified Complexity. I would like to think that this theory was watertight, but I have seen one problem with it which I can't resolve, so I was wondering what you made of it.

The rest of the email was a polite, well-reasoned explanation of the problem he had with an article he had read. The article in question wasn't really about specified complexity—it was about trial-and-error design of electronic circuits using the so-called “genetic algorithm” approach. John's conclusion was,

Nevertheless, as far as I can see, it's still a documented, repeatable example of specified complexity without a designer.

We have previously discussed genetic algorithms¹¹ so we won't go over that same ground in detail again. Suffice it to say that the genetic algorithm really does involve a designer. The designer has simply chosen to use a rather ineffective, brute force approach to solving a problem.

John's email gives us an opportunity to clarify a related issue, however. We really want to drive this point home.

We do not advocate creationism or Intelligent Design. We evaluate the arguments for evolution. An evolutionist who calls himself “Wowbagger” made an argument for evolution based on his

¹¹ Disclosure, September, 2006, “Evolutionary Programming”

www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v10i12e.htm

ignorance of the concept of specified complexity.

It was not our intention to describe or defend the notion of specified complexity. That is still not our intention; but since any mention of specified complexity is forbidden in American public schools, there are many people who don't know what we are talking about. Basically, specified complexity is the notion that when a function can be performed only by a system consisting of a highly improbable complex arrangement of components, the existence of that system is evidence of design. If you want a better description of specified complexity, you can find it on an Intelligent Design website.

Our position is merely that Intelligent Design advocates have some criteria which they think can be used to distinguish actual design from the mere appearance of design. We take no stand on whether or not those criteria are valid. You are free to debate whether or not those criteria are valid or not, unless you are in an American public school. ☺ Evolutionists have gone to court to prevent those debates.

It is our position that science is not advanced by prohibiting discussion of how to detect intentional design.

At one point in my career, I was involved in the design of guided missiles whose seekers distinguish man-made objects (buildings, trucks, airplanes, etc.) from naturally occurring objects (trees, rocks, lakes, etc.). Details are, of course, classified; but one can make some general statements about target recognition at the unclassified level. Target recognition is nothing more than a particular type of pattern recognition. Pattern recognition involves looking for a specific collection of attributes. The probability of false detection depends upon how complex that collection is, and how probable that collection of attributes is.

Evolutionists argue that students who are never permitted to consider the concept of specified complexity receive a superior education than students who are exposed to the evil influence of Intelligent Design. We disagree. Insights that students receive when pondering the validity of specified complexity might be of some value if their career path takes them into a branch of science that involves pattern recognition.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to send a donation of \$15/year to Science Against Evolution, P.O. Box 923, Ridgecrest, CA 93556-0923, to help us in our work. ☺

by Lothar Janetzko

THE EMPEROR HAS NO CLOTHES

<http://www.detectingdesign.com/>

Naturalism and the Theory of Evolution

This month's web site review looks at a site recommended by a reader in response to an article in the September Issue of *Disclosure*. On the main page of the site you learn that "this website is a rough draft collection of my own notes and thoughts as well as the thoughts of many others concerning the theories of evolution and design".

The article "The Emperor Has No Clothes" serves as the home page for the www.detectingdesign.com website and deals "specifically with the theory of evolution and the hold that this theory has taken upon the scientific community as well as the popular imagination". The author really wants to know why anyone who questions the theory of evolution should be branded as "ignorant, stupid, or insane".

You will find an interesting discussion of the scientific method. A point made is that "when a theory or interpretation can no longer be questioned, it leaves the realm of science and moves into the realm of holy, untouchable, religious dogma". Many more interesting observations are made as to what scientists define as "natural" versus "supernatural".

Clicking on the Essays link, located on the main page of the site, you will find articles covering the following topics: 1) Detecting Design, 2) Defining Evolution, 3) Early Man, 4) The Geologic Column, 5) The Fossil Record, 6) Ancient Ice, 7) The Scabland Debate, 8) Kenneth Miller's Best Arguments Against Intelligent Design, 9) The Flagellum, 10) Trillion upon Trillions of Years – Not Enough Time, 11) The Steppingstone Problem, and many more.



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