

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 14 Issue 4

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

January 2010

EVOLUTION VIDEO FINALISTS

Discover magazine announced the five best evolution videos to as little fanfare as possible.

Last June, we told you about our tongue-in-cheek entry into *Discover* magazine's video contest.¹ In case you missed it, here's a recap to bring you up to speed.

The editors of *Discover* magazine picked April 1, 2009, to initiate a contest inviting readers to enter a home-made video describing evolution in two minutes or less. They wanted videos that would "convince even the most hard-headed creationist that Darwin was right." It was a foolish thing to do, so April 1 was the perfect time for them to make their dumb mistake.

We could not resist submitting an entry spoofing evolution in two minutes. It is called, "Evolution for Intellectuals" because "Evolution for Dummies" was already taken. You can download it from the link on our home page. We had a lot of fun making it, and judging from the email responses, many of you got a good laugh out of it. Of course, you are free to copy it and distribute it however you like.

The contest was supposed to end on June 1, but the deadline was extended. We heard nothing about it for months. Finally, we received an email (which may have been sent only to those people who entered the contest) announcing the winners in November. We would have written about it then, but we had so much to write about Ardi in the November and December issues that there wasn't room in the newsletter.

We aren't surprised that *Discover* hasn't made very much about the contest. The results are at <http://discovermagazine.com/contests/evolution-in-two-minutes-or-less>, but we were unable to find a link from their home page to the winning videos. Clicking on the "video" tab takes you to a page of videos, but the evolution contest finalists aren't on that page, either. The only way to find the results is to know about the contest and search for it.

We suspect they wish they had never opened that can of worms in the first place. The videos certainly fell far short of their expectations. **One can't present a compelling case for evolution in two hours**, or even two days, so trying to make a compelling video about evolution in two minutes is doomed to failure.

THE WINNER

The Official Winner (which clearly is the best of the five finalists) is *Evolution: The Song*, by teacher Scott Hatfield and student Brianna Christoffersen, from Bullard High School in Fresno, California. It is a catchy song performed very well. The music is synchronized well with the video.

Like all of the other finalists, it doesn't really address the controversial evolutionary issues. It just talks about microevolution, which creationists accept as fact. So, the repetition of "Mutation, Translation, Expression, Occasional, Genetic variation," isn't controversial. Of course, you have to know what those terms mean, because they aren't really explained in the video.

All the song really says is that there are random variations in individuals of a particular species. If those variations are inheritable, and provide some survival advantage, then those variations will become more common in that population. It is obviously true, and nobody disputes it. Microevolution explains variation in existing species.

Microevolution has nothing to do with the origin of life, or the origin of kingdoms, phyla, classes, and families of living things. So, it is irrelevant to the controversial question of origins.

OTHER FINALISTS

Those few people who knew about the contest were invited to vote on which of the five finalists

¹ *Disclosure*, June 2009, "Evolution for Intellectuals"

they liked the best. According to *Discover*, “The Viewer’s [sic, but maybe there really was only one vote cast] Choice Winner” is *120 Seconds* by Stephen Anderson of Texas. Anderson’s pathetic premise is that, just because evolution is a “theory” doesn’t mean it isn’t true. He makes the false, unfounded assertion that there are, “literally millions of separate facts from fields as diverse as paleontology, embryology, comparative anatomy, and genetics that support the theory.” (As he is saying the word “embryology” a picture of Haeckel’s faked drawings is shown on the screen.) He concludes by saying, “While scientists may disagree with some of the underlying details of how evolution works, there is no debate whatsoever in the scientific community that evolution is a fact.” Claiming there is no debate doesn’t make the debate go away.

LOSERS

The remaining three losing finalists are even more embarrassing to evolutionists.

Where do we come from? by Maggie Tse, Tony Cheng, and Stella Chung, of New York begins with a cartoon showing how long-necked sheep might evolve because they can eat the leaves off tall trees that other sheep can’t reach. They make the foolish statement, “Today, an understanding of evolution is crucial to modern medicine.” If that were true, they would teach evolution in medical school.² The last sentence of the video is, “But the biggest challenge faced by today’s scientists is not finding more evidence for evolution, but helping the theory gain general acceptance by the public.” If they could find some actual evidence for evolution, maybe the public would accept it.

It’s Evolution by Benjamin from Arizona simply claims that evolution is change over time, and that microevolution leads to macroevolution. They really had to be scraping the bottom of the barrel to call this video a finalist.

The strangest finalist is *Why Elephants Do Not Have Wings* by Whitney Gray, of Chapel Hill, NC. The video does not mention elephants. It doesn’t even mention any creatures with wings. So, it is hard to imagine why he chose that title for his video. His video consists of nothing more than foolish, unfounded assertions. For example, he says, “Despite public opinion to the contrary, the scientific debate as to whether or not evolution happens ended nearly 100 years ago.” If that is true, then why is the debate still going on? He ends his video making the absurd claim, “Indeed, evolution is universally accepted as the origin of

² *Disclosure*, August 2009, “Unanswerable Questions”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.org/v13i11f.htm#med>

species simply because every aspect of every discipline in biology confirms it independently. All of these analyses independently line up to give us a clear picture of the history of life on this planet. It is for this reason that after 150 years of rigorous scientific testing every day not a single observation or experiment has been made which has falsified the unifying theory of biology.”

We should not be too hard on him, we suppose. He is just repeating the propaganda he has heard in school.

SILENCE IS GOLDEN

It is wisely said that, “It is better to be quiet and let people think you are a fool than to open your mouth and remove all their doubts.” Most evolutionists know this. That’s why evolutionists avoid any debate, or even any real discussion, of the theory of evolution. As soon as they start talking about it, it exposes their foolishness. That’s why they try to cut off discussion by saying there is no debate.

Discover made a huge mistake by opening this can of worms. They don’t really want you to see “winning” videos because they make it clear that there is no good argument in favor of the theory of evolution. That’s why all the entries avoided the subject, either by talking about microevolution, or by claiming that there is no question about evolution.

Since it is our goal to disclose “things evolutionists don’t want you to know,” we could not fail to mention it.

Email

CLIMATEGATE AND EVOLUTION

The theory of evolution has ramifications for theories about other things, including global warming.

Through no planning on our part, last month’s article on Journalistic Credibility happened to be published at the same time as allegations that scientific data about global temperature observations had been ignored or fabricated. Alex expected us to make a connection.

Subj: Climategate³
Date: 12/18/2009 11:36 AM
I came by your site today to see what

³ Ever since the Watergate break-in, any scandal (or perceived scandal) has been called “something-gate.” Hence, the controversy regarding the global temperature data has been called “climategate” by some people in America.

you've been interacting with. When I saw the article titled "Journalistic Credibility" I thought for certain that you would be addressing Climategate. The Palin article was fine, but there is something more interesting and pertinent in the Climategate.

The point for you to pick up on is that this is an example of the mask coming off of the science-priests. The attempt to cover up shows a lack of sincere science, and instead shows an effort to make or coerce all "rational people" to tow the line, lest you be labeled "irrational, fundamentalist, conservative, etc." all words for "heretic."

I figured that by pointing it out you might show that "science" isn't always honest with itself. Climate change is the topic du jour, and this instance simply demonstrates the inevitable drift toward ideological bias which undercuts the very essence of the scientific method. This can happen in a field of study that is relatively young and on which so little ideology depends relative to the vast sums of ideology entangled in the success of evolution. If people think it irrational to doubt the science-media-corporate combo, well, here is clear evidence to tell everyone to be more cautious and discerning.

However, I can see that introducing the topic may draw you and your site off your main focus. It would not help to be seen as also battling the popular climate change theories. I thought that the emails themselves (without bashing the theory itself) would give excellent examples of how those humans who do science are just as susceptible to bias as anyone.

Alex

He expected us to make the argument that since global warming is a hoax, it logically follows that evolution is also a hoax. We don't make that argument for the following reasons.

First, Science Against Evolution takes no position on whether or not global warming is real or dangerous. As Alex correctly observes, it would draw us off topic.

Second, even if global warming is a hoax, it doesn't prove evolution is a hoax.

Instead, we make a related observation, but from the opposite direction. Climategate is a symptom of the damage the theory of evolution has done to the scientific discipline.

In the glory days of science, truth was discovered using the scientific method. But since the theory of evolution cannot be confirmed by the scientific method, and since there was a fervent desire in some circles to declare the theory of evolution to be scientifically valid, the definition of science had to be changed. The definition of science became, "whatever scientists believe to be true, whether they can prove it or not." Science moved from the realm of objective reality to dogmatic ideology.

Since the theory of evolution doesn't stand up to objective analysis, any criticism of evolution had to be censored from the classroom. The rationale was that teaching both sides of the

evolutionary controversy might "confuse" people.

A generation of scientists has been educated this way. So, it is certainly understandable why a climate scientist might feel justified in suppressing data that doesn't support the prevailing consensus. If it is OK not to confuse people by presenting evidence for and against evolution, then it is also OK not to confuse people by presenting evidence for and against global warming. Once scientists have reached a consensus, facts don't matter anymore.

We don't know if any climate scientists actually suppressed data against global warming or not. We are simply saying that the one-sided teaching of the theory of evolution, and consequent suppression of data that does not support the theory, sets the stage for scientific dishonesty. If it is OK to ignore data that contradicts evolution, then it is OK to ignore data that contradicts global warming.

We can't stress too much that we don't know if there was any scientific misconduct regarding climate studies. What we do know, however, is that scientific credibility is at an all time low. We believe the dishonest presentation of the theory of evolution is largely to blame.

THE SKY IS FALLING

A few years ago, scientists said millions of people were going to die from the bird flu. This year scientists are telling us millions of people are going to die from the swine flu. Scientists are always telling us that the sky is falling and crying wolf. Nothing assures Federal funding more than an imminent crisis. If the consensus of scientists is that there is an impending health crisis, who really needs data to back it up?

We remember the days when you could trust what scientists say. But since scientists have abandoned the scientific method, those days are apparently gone. This is due in great part to scientists insisting that the theory of evolution is true, ignoring all evidence to the contrary. Consensus trumps experiments. Opinions reign supreme, especially if they are financially or politically rewarding.

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

You are also 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

DEFEATING DARWINISM

<http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/defeatng.html>

Phillip Johnson Steals the Microphone

This month's web site review looks at an article that discusses the book Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds by Phillip Johnson, a law professor at the University of California, Berkley. The book was published in 1997 by Inter Varsity Press and is Johnson's third book in his debate with naturalistic evolution. His other two books are Darwin On Trial and Reason in the Balance.

The article begins by explaining why a law professor decided to take on the evolutionists. "It seems that Johnson became aware of a significant difference between the way the theory of evolution is presented to the public and the way it's discussed among scientists. To the general public, evolution is presented as being settled with respect to the really important questions. Among scientists, however, there is still no consensus as to how evolution could have occurred." The writer of this article points out that Professor Johnson has concluded that "what keeps the 'evolution-as-fact' dogma alive is not scientific evidence at all, but rather a commitment to the philosophy of naturalism."

The article continues by discussing what Naturalism is and then takes a closer look at Johnson's book Defeating Darwinism. The discussion is presented under the following headings: 1) Where's the Beef? 2) Baloney Detectors Wanted, 3) Intelligent Design and 4) Evaluation.

The Intelligent Design section points out that Johnson believes information content and irreducible complexity are strong physical evidence for intelligent design.

The article provides a good look at Johnson's book and recommends that you obtain a copy to read for yourself to help you think critically 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