

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 16 Issue 5 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org February 2012

IS THE BATTLE OVER?

For almost 30 years, the NCSE has done nothing but oppose honest discussion of the theory of evolution; but that changed last month.

Clearly there are people who still believe in the theory of evolution, and there probably always will be; but several signs indicate to us that the theory of evolution is on its death bed. Foremost among these signs is a recent development at the NCSE. According to Wikipedia,

The National Center for Science Education (NCSE) is a non-profit organization based in Oakland, California affiliated with the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It is the United States' leading anti-creationist organization, and defends the teaching of evolutionary biology and opposes the teaching of religious views in science classes in America's public schools.¹

Wikipedia is somewhat more flattering in their description of the NCSE than we are. We would say that the NCSE is actually a political pressure group that has sought to censor the science curriculum by pressuring school boards, politicians, and courts to prohibit any legitimate criticism of the theory of evolution since 1983. That's why we call it the "National Center for Science Eradication."

For almost 30 years, the NCSE has done nothing but oppose honest discussion of the theory of evolution; but that changed last month.

In a 16 January [2012] announcement, the NCSE says that it will offer support to educators facing ideological opposition when teaching climate change, providing advice on how to present the underlying science. The strategy mirrors its approach to evolution, which includes clarifying for students why

science is an appropriate tool for understanding the natural world. "This perspective is also important in helping people to understand the reasons why scientists overwhelmingly accept climate change," the NCSE says in a mission statement describing the new effort.²

MAYBE IT'S JUST POLITICS

It is perfectly understandable why a group that seeks to censor the science curriculum on one subject to advance their political agenda would also seek to censor the science curriculum on a different subject to advance that same agenda. They could simply be politically motivated.

But there might be a financial aspect as well. Universities won't get government grants to study the theory of evolution and global warming if the taxpayers don't believe in evolution and global warming. Perhaps the NCSE has been forced to diversify because the support for the theory of evolution has dropped to the point where the NCSE can no longer sustain itself financially.

FUNDING DATA

But rather than just THINK that, we did some research, and checked the publicly available tax reports filed by the NCSE in recent years³, and found our suspicions to be true. Those reports show that the NCSE made substantial profits in 2007 and 2008, but they lost \$227,764 in 2009 and lost \$112,383 in 2010. Perhaps more telling is the fact that the NCSE collected speaking fees

¹

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Center_for_Science_Education

² *Nature*, 19 January 2012, "Evolution advocate turns to climate", page 248, <http://www.nature.com/news/evolution-advocate-turns-to-climate-1.9811>

³ <http://www2.guidestar.org/organizations/11-2656357/national-center-science-education.aspx>

of \$50,250 in 2009, but only \$18,871 in 2010. Apparently fewer people were willing to pay good money to listen to their propaganda.

In 2008, the NCSE reported \$834,391 in grants received. That dropped to \$522,313 in 2009 (a decrease of 37%) and \$687,773 in 2010 (a decrease of 18% from 2009). Tax forms don't tell where their grant money comes from; but the usual suspects are governments, universities, and political pressure groups. In 2008, the NCSE reported a total income of \$1,295,698, so 64% of its income that year came from organizations capable of making grants, rather than contributions from private individuals.

To put it simply, the NCSE gets most of its money from the government, either directly or via universities (which get government research grants). The NCSE spends that money on propaganda designed to increase public support for research into the theory of evolution. Now the NCSE intends to spend money on propaganda to increase public support for climate research, so the government and universities will have more money for research (and grants to the NCSE). The NCSE needs the government to give it money, and the government needs the NCSE to raise money to fund the government. It is a cozy arrangement that has more to do with politics than science.

But that doesn't really explain why financial support for the theory of evolution is down. Is it the economy, or some other reason, that is to blame?

CREATIONIST FUNDING

If it is the economy, we should expect the big creationist organizations, like Answers in Genesis and the Institute for Creation Research to be losing money as well. When times get tough, people cut back on discretionary spending. What can we learn from creationist non-profit tax forms?

According to the publicly available tax forms filed by ICR, ⁴ 2010 was a great year for them. They showed a profit of \$3,207,877 on an income of \$8,748,095, none of which came from grants. \$8,160,466.00 of that came from contributions, and the rest from the sale of books, and speaking fees, etc.

The latest available Answers in Genesis tax forms ⁵ are from 2009. That year they showed a profit of \$936,478 on a total income of \$22,065,512, none of which came from grants.

⁴ <http://www2.guidestar.org/organizations/95-3523177/institute-creation-research.aspx>

⁵ <http://www2.guidestar.org/organizations/33-0596423/answers-genesis-kentucky.aspx>

They received \$8,311,034 from contributions, \$5,400,987 from admission fees to their museum, and \$6,947,586 from sales of books and DVDs.

So, in comparison, the NCSE was losing more than \$100,000 on a measly income of roughly \$1 million, most of which came from grants, at a time when ICR was showing a profit of \$3 million on contributions from private individuals of more than \$8 million, and Answers in Genesis had a profit of nearly \$1 million while receiving \$8 million in contributions, \$7 million in sales of books and DVDs, and \$5 million in museum gate receipts.

You can draw your own conclusions. Our conclusion is that financial support for the theory of evolution is falling, while financial support for creationism is strong.

OTHER INDICATIONS

Our belief that support for evolution is declining isn't based strictly on money. In the beginning, we were overwhelmed by hate mail from evolutionists. Lately, our hate mail has dropped off to practically nothing. (Hopefully this essay will inspire what few evolutionists are left to write us nasty emails which we can use as grist for our mill.)

This might not be significant, but we noticed when reading their campaign literature that neither of the candidates for president of the AAAS mentioned the importance of keeping evolution in the public school curriculum this year, as some candidates have in past years.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

So, the evidence suggests to us that because support for the theory of evolution is dropping, financial support for the NCSE is dropping as well.

The NCSE has never published any scientific research on climate change. Their only area of expertise is censorship. They are seeking to expand their customer base by selling their data suppression skills to the highest bidder.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Science Against Evolution takes no position on whether or not the apparent change in climate is real or not. We take no position on whether or not man is responsible if the change is real. We merely point out that it is not surprising that the NCSE would seek to unfairly influence scientific examination of climate change, regardless of whether it is true or false, given their desperate need to find another funding source.

The NCSE is losing the battle over evolution, and they know it. They need to fight another battle to stay in business.

THE LARYNGEAL NERVE

Is it badly designed?

In last month's email column, "Comparative Anatomy Vindicated," John tried to argue against Intelligent Design on the grounds that the laryngeal nerve follows a path that "no engineer, no designer would logically include." Michael sent us this email in response.

David

I read up on the laryngeal nerve. There are two. One goes direct to the larynx for one vocal chord. The other loops down under the aorta, enervating the heart, and back up to the larynx for the other chord. It makes sense if we take into account embryonic growth. The nerve supplies the heart, lengthening as the baby grows and the heart moves away from the brain. The larynx starts to grow later on. It's simpler to grow [sic] onto the end of the nerve than to tap into the middle, so that's why it grows back up to the throat. We thereby have one nerve working more than one organ, keeping it simple yet workable. How does that sound to you as an engineer?

Yes, one nerve could supply both vocal chords. Every body part has a use, so there's likely to be a reason for the heart-larynx hook-up. I won't speculate or assume what it might be, without further research. I certainly won't insist my explanation's right, without any kind of test or other true-life observation.

So, the path that John thinks is illogical may, in fact, be elegantly sophisticated. Since Michael asked my opinion as an engineer, I will share a personal story relative to that subject.

A significant portion of my career was spent doing "foreign material exploitation." That is a polite way of saying that I reverse engineered Russian copies of American guided missiles (which I had helped design) to determine their capabilities and weaknesses. In the process, I named my Russian counterpart, "Ivan," and tried to get inside his head and imagine what he was thinking when he designed his version of our missile.

In most cases, it was obvious why he had made the design decisions he made because I had made exactly the same ones. Sometimes he made slightly different design decisions because he was forced to use transistors with looser tolerances than those manufactured in America. What he lacked in resources he had to make up for with more complicated design.

There were cases when Ivan didn't follow our design exactly. At first I presumed that Ivan must have been working from incomplete schematics,

or damaged hardware, and therefore didn't know how we had done it. I thought that must have been the case—otherwise he would not have done it so stupidly.

Since he had obviously made a mistake, that was where I centered my attention, expecting to find some fatal flaw which we could exploit through some clever countermeasure. But it soon became apparent that Ivan's "stupid mistakes" were actually brilliant design improvements. He had done something clever that never occurred to me.

It was humbling, annoying, and frustrating to realize that Ivan had a better idea than I did. It made me angry, at first; but, as time went on, my respect and admiration for Ivan gradually increased.

Consequently, whenever I find myself in a situation where I don't understand someone else's logic, my reaction is, "What does he know that I don't know?" Often it turns out that he does know something that I don't know, and I am better off by learning it.

John looks at the laryngeal nerve and he doesn't understand the path it takes. He immediately assumes it is illogical, as I initially did when I first started working with foreign material. That's because he is starting from the assumption that the path is the result of random chance. There is no logic to a random process.

Michael looks at the laryngeal nerve starting from the assumption that it was routed that way on purpose, looks for the purpose, and probably has correctly determined the logic behind it.

Sir Isaac Newton started from the assumption that everything was created by God on purpose. When he didn't understand something, he strove to learn the purpose. If Newton had been an evolutionist, and started from the assumption that there is no God, and everything is the result of chance, he would not have been as motivated to find the purpose. He would have simply said, "It just happened that way. There is no reason for it."

If someone tells you that a diamond ring was lost in the park, and that there is a reward for finding it, you might go to the park to look diligently for it. Lacking that knowledge, you might go the park looking for a valuable lost item just because you have nothing better to do, but you won't search as diligently.

The theory of evolution hinders scientific progress because it presumes the absence of reason or purpose. Therefore, an evolutionist is unlikely to discover the true purpose, and dismiss reason as mere chance.

CAN EVOLUTION AND CREATION COEXIST?

http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Can_evolution_and_creation_coexist

Various Opinions on the Subject

This month's web site looks at a question asked on Answers.com. This is a web site where a user can ask questions or search through other people's questions. Questions can be either answered or unanswered. The web site operates as a wiki whose users can add, modify, or delete its content via a web browser using a simplified markup language or a rich-text editor. Questions are also placed in categories that makes searching for similar content easier.

The question for our discussion is "Can evolution and creation coexist?" The answers found in the wiki make for interesting reading. Some people answer yes and others no. The reasoning for the answers is what makes things interesting. You will find the usual comments about the "theory" of evolution versus the "Creationist Theory". Many people believe that evolution is "testable, falsifiable and makes accurate predictions and has been proved", while Creationism is not testable and is based solely on faith.

One answer points out that "there is a growing group of scientists that believe that one can accept evolution as scientific fact and still believe in a creator God, because science and faith are different and distinct aspects of life". Not all agree and still believe that faith and reason are not mutually exclusive and that "it takes just as much faith to believe in evolution as God".

Another answer states that Creation and Evolution are the same thing. The argument is made that we really don't know how long one of God's days compared to ours is. This allows for long periods of time for evolution to have occurred.

One answer provides an extensive chart that tries to make the case that evolution and creation are not compatible. The chart points out that many aspects of creation are **observable** while corresponding aspects for evolution are **not observable**.

Many more ideas are presented in the various answers that a web site reader might find of interest.

The many opinions expressed (which are often contradictory) point out that the debate regarding creation and evolution is by no means resolved.



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

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at **ScienceAgainstEvolution.org**.