

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 16 Issue 9

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

June 2012

THE CREATION THREAT

Why do evolutionists feel threatened?

An editorial in the journal, *Nature*, caught my eye because of the pull-quote printed in a large, multi-colored font in the center of the page. It said,

Ignoring the creationist threat will not make it go away.¹

The subheading said,

Creationists seize on any perceived gaps in our knowledge of evolutionary processes. But scientists can and should fight back, says Russell Garwood.²

There aren't any "perceived gaps"—there are real gaps! They don't know how dinosaurs evolved into birds for the same reason they don't know how Santa Claus can deliver all those toys on a single evening. They don't understand how it happened because it never happened.

But the phrase that really jumped out at me was "creationist threat." Why does Garwood feel threatened? What is the fundamental fear that drives him to "fight back" against criticism of an incorrect scientific theory? Here's what he says:

Last month, this journal [*Nature*] published a fossil study that described a new species of large tyrannosauroid dinosaur covered in feathers. A week later, the US state of Tennessee passed a creationist bill that encourages teachers to discuss the "weaknesses" of evolution. The first event provided fodder for a shrewd and calculated creationist machine; the second was its latest victory. As a palaeontologist, I believe the way

that scientists and journals present research in my field can help to feed anti-evolution disinformation. Because we tend to stress novelty and play up scientific disagreement, and like to shift paradigms and break moulds, we offer our critics ammunition. As the events in Tennessee show, the fight against evolution comes with significant consequences.³

Of course, there was a lot of scientific disagreement about this fossil because opinions vary, and modern science is now based on majority opinion rather than repeatable experimental results. Replacing the scientific method (that is, testing a hypothesis with a carefully designed experiment) with consensus naturally leads to disagreement and uncertainty. It is no surprise that Garwood wrote,

In my field, uncertainty is everywhere.⁴

But Garwood wants students to believe in the theory of evolution because it has been the consensus opinion of scientists for many years. Now that the consensus is weakening, and there is new evidence against the theory of evolution every day, he wants to suppress the disagreement. In free society, competing ideas are openly debated. But Garwood says,

Direct debates with creationists are risky. Organized discussions only support the 'evolution is in crisis' lobby.⁵

That's because evolution really is in crisis, and because evolutionists tend to lose scientific debates with creationists.

There are people who believe the 1969 moon landing was faked. Scientists are not afraid to debate the lunar lunatics because it can easily be

¹ Russell Garwood, *Nature*, 17 May 2012, "Reach out to defend evolution", page 281, <http://www.nature.com/news/reach-out-to-defend-evolution-1.10640>

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

proved that the moon landing actually happened, as evidenced by an episode of the TV program *Mythbusters*, (one of the few real science programs on TV). If the theory of evolution were true, scientists could win debates with creationists.

Garwood's ridiculous suggestion is,

If research is to appear that will attract an obvious creationist interpretation, an accompanying blog post could explain the work and highlight flaws in any anti-evolution attacks.⁶

This is foolish on multiple levels. The general public doesn't read the actual scientific literature, so they would not read an accompanying blog post. The general public usually hears about the scientific research on TV, which is already biased toward the evolutionary explanation. The notion that scientific research should be accompanied by a blog telling how to spin the research in such a way that it doesn't damage the theory of evolution is just silly.

Garwood's article ends by saying,

Ignoring the creationist threat will not make it go away. As scientists, we owe it to the schoolchildren of Tennessee and elsewhere to find another way to beat it.⁷

Nowhere in the article did he come right out and say why creationism is a threat that has to be beaten. Is it because he doesn't know? Is he suffering from an irrational fear? Or, is it because he won't admit why he is afraid?

FEAR OF RELIGION

We believe that evolutionists cling to the theory because they are afraid of the alternative. If life didn't originate and evolve through unknown natural processes, the logical conclusion is that life is the result of a guided, supernatural process. That raises the specter of a judgmental god who punishes sin. We believe this because of what evolutionists say about the Templeton Foundation.

The John Templeton Foundation serves as a philanthropic catalyst for discoveries relating to the Big Questions of human purpose and ultimate reality. We support research on subjects ranging from complexity, evolution, and infinity to creativity, forgiveness, love, and free will. We encourage civil, informed dialogue among scientists, philosophers, and theologians and between such experts and the public at large, for the purposes of definitional

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

clarity and new insights.

Our vision is derived from the late Sir John Templeton's optimism about the possibility of acquiring "new spiritual information" and from his commitment to rigorous scientific research and related scholarship. The Foundation's motto, "How little we know, how eager to learn," exemplifies our support for open-minded inquiry and our hope for advancing human progress through breakthrough discoveries.⁸

Some famous evolutionists don't like the Templeton Foundation very much.

As generous as the foundation's support is, however, many scientists find it troubling — and some see it as a threat. Jerry Coyne, an evolutionary biologist at the University of Chicago, Illinois, calls the foundation "sneakier than the creationists". Through its grants to researchers, Coyne alleges, the foundation is trying to insinuate religious values into science. "It claims to be on the side of science, but wants to make faith a virtue," he says.⁹

The [Templeton] prize has come in for some academic scorn. "There's a distinct feeling in the research community that Templeton just gives the award to the most senior scientist they can find who's willing to say something nice about religion," says Harold Kroto, a chemist at Florida State University in Tallahassee, who was co-recipient of the 1996 Nobel Prize in Chemistry and describes himself as a devout atheist.¹⁰

"A lot of money wasted on nonsensical ideas," says Kroto. Worse, says Coyne, these projects are profoundly corrupting to science, because the money tempts researchers into wasting time and effort on topics that aren't worth it. If someone is willing to sell out for a million dollars, he says, "Templeton is there to oblige him".¹¹

We found this last quote particularly amusing. Is there anything more nonsensical than the idea that hummingbirds descended from dinosaurs? Doesn't it corrupt science by replacing the scientific method with baseless speculation? Even if hummingbirds did descend from dinosaurs, would there be any practical value in knowing that? Don't scientists sell out by

⁸ <http://www.templeton.org/who-we-are/about-the-foundation/mission>

⁹ M. Mitchell Waldrop, *Nature*, 17 February 2011, "Faith in science", pp. 323-325, <http://www.nature.com/news/2011/110216/pdf/470323a.pdf>

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.*

accepting government grants to study evolution?

Avowedly antireligious scientists such as Coyne and Kromo see the intelligent-design imbroglio as a symptom of their fundamental complaint that religion and science should not mix at all.

"Religion is based on dogma and belief, whereas science is based on doubt and questioning," says Coyne, echoing an argument made by many others. "In religion, faith is a virtue. In science, faith is a vice." The purpose of the Templeton Foundation is to break down that wall, he says — to reconcile the irreconcilable and give religion scholarly legitimacy.¹²

The theory of evolution is based on dogma and belief. Doubt and questioning of evolution is a vice, in their eyes.

Sean Carroll, a physicist at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, is willing to participate in Templeton-funded events — but worries about the foundation's emphasis on research into 'spiritual' matters. "The act of doing science means that you accept a purely material explanation of the Universe, that no spiritual dimension is required," he says.¹³

Sir Isaac Newton did a lot of good science, but he did not accept a purely material explanation of the universe.

Scott Atran, an anthropologist at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor [says] many scientists find it almost impossible to think of religion as anything but fundamentalism at war with reason.¹⁴

This is why atheists think creationism is a threat. Evolution is not a reasonable explanation for the origin and diversity of life on Earth. Creation is the most reasonable explanation from a scientific viewpoint. Careful observation of how living things grow and reproduce simply highlights the many unreasonable assumptions of the theory of evolution.

Since science has been replaced by consensus, evolutionists must make sure that the theory of evolution is considered to be the majority opinion. The more scientists who are willing to look at the theory carefully and honestly, the fewer scientists will accept the theory of evolution and will consider an alternative. Creationism is a threatening alternative to the traditional consensus. That's why evolutionists fear it.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *ibid.*

Email

DYLAN'S RESPONSE

Apparently, Dylan wasn't who he appeared to be.

Last month, we published our email exchange with Dylan. He presented himself as someone who wanted to help us by making helpful suggestions. Specifically, he suggested an index to all the peer-reviewed scientific articles we had ever referenced over the past 15 years, and not include abiogenesis in our discussion of evolution. We addressed his concerns in last month's newsletter. We sent him an advanced copy so he would not have to wait for the normal distribution day (the third Tuesday of the month). When he saw it, he was not happy! Here is his heated response:

Hello again,

While I am honored that you took my concerns so seriously and have used them to encourage more dialogue over these important topics, I may have misinterpreted your website to believe it is something its not. My first impression was that your website aimed to collect and make available scientific data that refuted evolutionary theory. Your language choice however hints at ulterior motives that I find quite troubling and hopefully you can reconcile these concerns before I jump to any conclusions. The first sentence that caught my eye was "We put the definition on our home page as a defense against that dirty trick the evolutionists typically use.". This implies that there is some sort of scientist-driven conspiracy to disseminate misinformation. Your sentence also implies that most evolutionists do not believe in evolution themselves and try to mislead people. Of course such a claim is silly as there is no apparent motive, no one to benefit from this and most of all such a theory would require scientists from all over the world to agree on one unified theory that they could all then fabricate data for. The second troubling item was this "Variation caused by breeding is a scientific fact that creationists not only accept, but depend upon for their argument that Noah's Ark was big enough to hold all the animals.". This implies a young earth creationist alternative to evolution which is of course nothing more than religion inspired pseudoscience. Lastly your response to my search for peer reviewed literature leads me to question your familiarity with the scientific process. I am aware there is no single paper that refutes evolution entirely however one that raised significant doubts would be very welcomed. You stated the evolutionist response to these articles was "This PORTION of the theory of evolution WAS PREVIOUSLY INCORRECT, but we have a NEW EXPLANATION that corrects this error.". This is entirely correct and I would expect nothing less from any decent scientist. That is how science works. When peer reviewed literature refutes an accepted paradigm, the paradigm is either adapted to fit the data or it is thrown out and a new more parsimonious

paradigm is formed. You also stated that "there are a few wrecking balls that demolish the entire theory" however without peer review they cannot really demolish anything which makes me question their existence. All of this leads me to believe that not only do you not understand the scientific method (that would seem like a prerequisite for running a website with science in the title) but you are also attempting to spread unscientific ideas under the banner of science. I really am sorry if the progression of science conflicts with your religious views but as of now, the theory of evolution is the most parsimonious explanation for the diversity of life on Earth. Please do not see me as some evolutionist trying to ruin your day, my search for evidence against evolution is sincere as I am sure any scientist worth his salt would love to disprove evolution. I really hope I arrived at the wrong conclusion about you and your website but if I did indeed hit the nail on the head, I wish you the best of luck in your ongoing struggle against reality.

Best regards,
Dylan

PS: Don't let this stop you from publishing that news letter, regardless of this last email, it probably is still very applicable to your cause.

PS: In your bio, it states you are an electrical engineer. Theories on the origin of life and biodiversity really have no bearing on your life or the majority of people in the world. These theories really only effect people who engage in science as a career. Take a load off, relax, leave it to people who spend decades of their lives researching this stuff.

He certainly sounds like an evolutionist trying to ruin my day! ☺ We really doubt that he would love to disprove evolution.

Notice that he has bought into the notion that one can't question the theory of evolution. One can only question how evolution produced all the various life forms. Furthermore, one can only disprove an evolutionary process if one suggests a different evolutionary process in its place.

Engineers have successfully proved that no perpetual motion machine can exist. If engineers thought like evolutionists, they could only prove that one particular perpetual motion machine would not work unless the engineer proposed a different kind of perpetual motion machine that would work (even if it didn't work, either).

Creationists do publish peer-reviewed literature that refutes evolution (and even suggests non-evolutionary alternative in its place); but evolutionists don't consider it "peer-reviewed" because any scientist who doesn't believe in evolution isn't really a scientist in their opinion.

Rather than continue a useless debate, I tried to politely end the conversation by saying,

You just might be the scientist worth his salt who eventually does disprove evolution. I certainly hope so.

Dylan wasn't content to leave it there. He responded,

Thank you for that. You did not deny anything I said so I assume I did hit the nail on the head with my response. In that case would you mind elaborating on your ideas so that I can understand better. I have no malicious intent, I simply want to see the world from multiple perspectives and your point of view is one that I truly do not understand. Specifically the scientist driven conspiracy and the part where they use tricks to mislead people. The rest of creationism makes some sense to me as many devout christians [sic] interpret the bible [sic] literally and nothing will change that. The conspiracy question is really the one that I don't understand and I would appreciate it greatly if you could expand upon your views. I think open dialogue is a great thing to have in any disagreement as it promotes a better understanding for both sides. Some specific questions I have are 1) Who benefits from teaching a bad theory? 2) Why do you think you would know more about how the universe works than the global consensus of scientists? 3) How would such a conspiracy spread worldwide? 4) Why would knowledge of alternative theories be suppressed if they were valid?. I have asked these questions before but just get yelled at by less civil creationists and I do not think you are like that. Your tone and use of scientific arguments gives me the impression that you are a good and intelligent person and that is why I would like these answers from you. If you have any questions for me you can also feel free to ask. I wouldn't call myself an expert but I do have much more knowledge on the subject than the average layman.

Regards,
Dylan

PS: I am sorry if I was a bit harsh at the end of my last email. Scientific integrity is something that is very close to my heart and I can get a bit defensive when I fear science is being manipulated or misunderstood.

Since he asked some reasonable (although somewhat misguided) questions, he deserved answers. So, I gave him some.

1) Who benefits from teaching a bad theory?

People with an agenda. Tobacco companies benefit from "science" that says cigarette smoking isn't harmful. Tyrants who want to control the economy and freedom of movement benefit from the "science" of global warming. Atheists benefit from teaching evolution.

2) Why do you think you would know more about how the universe works than the global consensus of scientists?

When you talk about "consensus" you are not talking about science—you are talking about philosophy. True science depends upon experimental verification, not an opinion poll.

What most people want to believe is not necessarily correct. I put my trust in objective science rather than the biased, subjective consensus of philosophers calling themselves scientists. (There is a reason why their degree is "Doctor of Philosophy.")

3) How would such a conspiracy spread worldwide?

I don't believe there is a conspiracy. I just believe there are lots of people who want to believe in evolution because it absolves them of responsibility. It lets them determine their own standards of morality, which they can set comfortably low. In addition to those people, there are also lots of people who have been told all their lives that evolution is true and have never questioned it. It isn't a conspiracy--it is simply a commonly held erroneous belief.

4) Why would knowledge of alternative theories be suppressed if they were valid?

Because people don't like to discover that they are wrong. Ignorance is bliss. Furthermore, if the alternative theory hinders the advancement of their agenda, they certainly would try to suppress it.

You didn't ask,

5) Why would knowledge of alternative theories be suppressed if they were INVALID?

They wouldn't! Because it would be easy to prove that the alternative theory is invalid. For example, engineers are taught about perpetual motion machines because it teaches them why they can't possibly work. Christian schools typically teach about abiogenesis and Darwinian evolution—including why some people believe in them and why some people don't. It is only the public schools that teach only one side of these issues.

P.S. Apology accepted.

TYPICAL DEGENERATION

From this point on, hopefully you can see why these conversations are a waste of time. Dylan just keeps repeating himself. Here is his reply:

If I may dig a little deeper, I don't think that fully answered my questions.

1) I still do not quite understand the agenda. I'm sure you would agree with me that it is completely useless to teach something that was not based on evidence. Is your argument that to accept evolution is a way atheists are trying to destroy Christianity by removing god [sic] from creation? If so that reeks of conspiracy.

2) You are absolutely correct science is not an opinion poll, it is not a democracy. However I was not talking about philosophy, I was referring to peer review. Science [sic] is based on a system of merit that comes from peer review. That has always been my problem with the ["teach the controversy"] approach because there is no controversy within scientific literature. There are many quite strong philosophical arguments for creationism but none translate well into peer reviewed studies papers.

3) This one your answer made sense and while I may not believe it is true, I thank you for that insight into your point of view. This one really just comes down to which side is the commonly held misconception which you and I differ on.

4) While it is true that people do not like to be wrong, that mindset is not how science works. Any time a new theory has revolutionized the way we see the world, it has been met with skepticism but as more evidence is built to support that theory, it is accepted. Science is about refuting bad theories more than it is about affirming good ones. Any scientist who could conclusively refute evolution would be instantly awarded a Nobel Prize as that would be truly revolutionary.

And lastly I did not ask your 5th question as I have an answer for that myself. Its [sic] the same reason we do not teach ancient aliens in history class.

If it is useless to teach something that isn't based on evidence, why teach evolution? ☺

He seems to believe that Nobel Prizes are granted on scientific merit without regard to political ramifications. That hasn't been the case for several years.

Since we weren't getting anywhere, I tried politely to end the discussion with a little bit of humor.

I'm sorry you did not find my answers satisfactory.

Perhaps if we did teach the evidence for and against ancient aliens in history class, the belief in ancient aliens would have been completely rejected by now. (Or maybe it would have been confirmed. [image: winking smile])

But Dylan had to have the (insulting) last word, so I gave it to him.

For any given topic there are theoretically infinite bunk explanations for one true to teach every bad theory is not useful. As your argument now hinges upon teaching ancient alien theories (like creationism is regarded as pseudoscience in case you were not aware) in schools I can only take this to mean that these questions have provoked a significant amount of thought for you, or you just got tired of thinking. Either way it doesn't seem like I got through to you but as you do admit yours is a religious idea, you can still do America a favor by not trying to turn us into a theocracy like Iran. I may waste my time talking to people like you or Don Batten of the Discovery Institute because its [sic] a little fun and gives me insight into how fundamentalist minds work but thanks to the First Amendment I don't have to worry about people like you setting us back 200 years. Like I said within science evolution is a non-issue so this is really just for myself and the delusional hope that one of you will see the light and start thinking for yourself. So you can go join the flat-earththers, the ancient aliens and the AIDS denialists and form an equal rights group for bunk theories so we can ignore you together. I again wish you the best of luck in your struggle against reality.

Best regards,
Dylan

THE EMPEROR HAS NO CLOTHES

<http://naturalselection.0catch.com/>

Naturalism and the Theory of Evolution

This month's web site review looks at a site recommended by a reader of our newsletter. 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 web site author is Sean Pitman, who is a medical doctor.

The web site is organized around an introductory article by the author where he describes his views regarding the theory of evolution. He points out that "the theory of evolution has become so popular and so pervasive that it is difficult for anyone to question it without being branded as, 'ignorant, stupid, or insane'". He also questions, "So why don't I get it? What is wrong with me?"

He then presents a discussion about the scientific method and how it should be used to detect truth. He also points out that the "power of the scientific method comes from its ability to detect error."

The web site author makes many more interesting points in his introductory article and in his summary he states that "a number of very highly educated men and women of science have and are openly questioning the sacred status of the theory of evolution."

Above the introductory article of the web site you will find links to 1) Intro, 2) New Topics, 3) Older Topic Updates, 4) Essays, 5) Presentations, 6) Articles, 7) Debates, 8) Links, 9) Site Search, 10) Gallup Poll, 11) Videos, and 12) Personal Profile. Most of these links will direct the web reader to the right side bar of the main web page where you will find more detailed information.

By following links of interest you will find a great deal on information in a variety of formats including Word Files, Power Point Presentations and Video Files. As with most web sites there is much to explore and learn.

It is good to know that there is a great deal of information on the Internet that seeks to present honest answers to questions regarding the theory of evolution. As the web site author points out, "never underestimate the 'crazy' or the 'blind'. History has often shown that those who were crazy and blind in their own day turned out to be right after all."



**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**.