

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 18 Issue 1

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

October 2013

FOOD FIGHT

The fight over diet-driven evolution

According to evolutionists, changes in diet caused the evolutionary split between apes and humans. In particular, it is now believed (by some) that eating grasses caused humans to evolve from their apelike ancestors.

THE OLD TALE REJECTED

The traditional story about how apes evolved to humans is nearly 90 years old.

Humans, like children, are the products of their environment. The famous anatomist Raymond Dart recognized that back in 1925, when he described the first hominin skull found in Africa. The evolution of this "Man-Ape," he wrote, markedly differed from that of earlier apes. While apes lolled about in "luxuriant" tropical forests that posed relatively few survival challenges, the "Man-Ape" had to compete for scarce food and water with saber-tooth tigers and other dangerous beasts of the arid savanna—and ended up sapient. "For the production of man a different apprenticeship was needed to sharpen the wits and quicken the higher manifestations of intellect—a more open veldt country," Dart wrote.

This "savanna hypothesis" suggested that as a drier climate caused grasslands to spread, our ancestors moved out of the trees and began walking upright in order to spot predators and prey in the waist-high stems. That freed their hands to use tools and spurred the development of big brains.

Today, no serious paleoanthropologist believes that particular evolutionary tale.¹

¹ Ann Gibbons, *Science*, 2 August 2013, "How a Fickle Climate Made Us Human", <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/341/6145/474.full?sid=4f9e8fd3-dcc3-4294-8d27-ca23161a4f5a>

THE OLD TALE REVIVED

New research, however, is reviving that old tale. Scientists have been taking core samples from places they believe to be habitats of ancient hominins, and measured the carbon isotopes in the remains of grasses found at various depths. Based on these carbon isotopes they classify the plants as "C₃" or "C₄." Using assumptions about how these carbon isotopes relate to time, climate, and vegetation, they conclude,

As went plants, so went the animals that grazed on them: By 6 million years ago, C₄ grasses had replaced C₃ plants as the most significant component in the diet of African grazers, Cerling says, according to studies of carbon isotopes in the tooth enamel of horses, elephants, antelopes, and other animals.

This suggests that hominins were born when grasses were on the rise. In fact, Cerling and his colleagues think that the first hominins had more grass in their environment than initially proposed—40% to 60% of the vegetation at nine *Ar. ramidus* fossil sites was C₄ plants, Cerling suggests (*Science*, 28 May 2010, p. 1105).

Recent data now show that later hominins responded to the rise of grasses by broadening their diets. Species that arose more than 4 million years ago, including *Ar. ramidus* and the oldest australopithecine, *Australopithecus anamensis*, subsisted on an apelike diet of at least 90% leaves and fruits from C₃ plants, Cerling and his colleagues reported in June in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. By 3.5 million years ago, a descendant of *Au. anamensis*—*Au. afarensis*, whose most famous member is the skeleton named Lucy—apparently adapted to the widespread grasslands by also munching on many C₄ plants, according to Cerling's analysis

of carbon isotopes in the tooth enamel of seven hominin species. *Au. afarensis*—a leading candidate for the ancestor of *Homo*—and another hominin, *Kenyanthropus platyops*, still ate mostly C₃ woodland plants, but about 22% of their diet was also made up of these C₄ plants, making them the hominins with the most varied menu. Their meals included grasses and sedges such as water chestnuts and papyrus, and perhaps animals that fed on those plants.²

In other words, a variety of vegetables made us human.

THAT THEORY BARBEQUED

So, 3.5 million years ago, eating vegetables made us human. But, 1.8 million years ago, eating meat made us human—at least that's what evolutionists tell us.

Nearly two million years ago our ancestors began to barbecue. And those hot meals, Richard Wrangham argues, are what made us human.

With our supersized brains and shrunken teeth and guts, we humans are bizarre primates. Richard Wrangham of Harvard University has long argued that these and other peculiar traits of our kind arose as humans turned to cooking to improve food quality—making it softer and easier to digest and thus a richer source of energy. Humans, unlike any other animal, cannot survive on raw food in the wild, he observes. “We need to have our food cooked.”

Based on the anatomy of our fossil forebears, Wrangham thinks that *Homo erectus* had mastered cooking with fire by 1.8 million years ago.³

But the article isn't really about evolution. Wrangham's conclusion is,

If you just say, “Well, animals eat their food raw, and humans are animals, then it should be fine for us to eat our food raw,” and you bring your children up this way, you're putting them at very serious risk.⁴

There is an ulterior motive for the article. He is using the “scientific” proof that eating cooked meat caused apes to evolve smarter brains in order to frighten vegetarians into feeding meat to their children by warning them about the “very serious risk” of eating raw, unprocessed foods.

² *ibid.*

³ Kate Wong, *Scientific American*, September 2013, pages 66-69, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=case-for-very-early-cooking-heats-up>

⁴ *ibid.*

Here's how to tell real science from pseudo-science. Real science isn't affected by personal belief. That is, a spark will cause hydrogen and oxygen to explode regardless of whether or not the scientist thinks it should. Science is based on experimental verification.

Pseudo-science is based on wishful thinking and is supported by rhetoric and politically biased interpretation of data.

CONTRADICTIONARY CONCLUSIONS

Some scientists say eating a variety of raw grasses stimulated brain growth. Other scientists say eating cooked meat stimulated brain growth. Neither group has any experimental proof that they are right. It is all speculation, camouflaged by data interpreted by biased assumptions.

If evolution really was responsible for the origin of all the different forms of life, there would not be so many different, contradictory scenarios for how it must have happened.

When pointing out these contradictions, evolutionists usually retreat to an argument like this one: “Well, scientists may disagree on the details of whether it was eating meat, or eating grass, that caused man to evolve—but all scientists agree that diet caused man to evolve, so it must be true. The details don't really matter—it's the general principle that is important.”

Review

FLIGHT — THE GENIUS OF BIRDS

Teaching science without religion

We were given a copy of a 63-minute video by Illustra Media titled, *Flight—the genius of birds*. It is an excellent example of how to teach science.

What makes the video so good is that it just presents facts without mixing in speculation. For example, near the beginning of the video they say,

More than 9,000 species of birds have been identified in the world, and nearly all of them can fly. They thrive in every environment—each equipped to endure specific challenges of climate and geography. And each, the result of a biological process executed to perfection within an amazing vessel.

The “amazing vessel” is an egg. Then, using excellent photography, they illustrate that biological process by showing the step-by-step development of a chicken embryo. They don't

use artists' conceptions about what they think happens on each of the 21 days of incubation. They use actual observations!

They just stick to facts. The number of species is a fact. It is a fact that most species (but not all) fly. It is a fact that they live in diverse environments from wet cold ones (think penguins) to hot dry ones (think roadrunners), and they thrive there. They all develop from eggs. These are all indisputable, scientific facts that should be taught to biology students (and on their tests).

Evolutionists are prone to mixing the facts with speculation by saying that birds have evolved to live in every environment. Creationists are prone to mixing the facts with dogma by saying that birds were designed by God to live in every environment. This video does neither. It sticks to the facts (as public schools should).

When faced with gaps in knowledge, they acknowledge those gaps. For example, they say,

They [birds] have to have the instincts necessary to be able to do this [fly]. And, presumably, instinct is rooted somewhere in the genetics of the organism.

They wisely don't assert that instincts evolved through some unknown natural process, nor do they state it is a God-given ability. They just say that it seems plausible that genetics are involved somehow. To say more would be irresponsible.

They then say the flight requires that the bird's bones, feathers, and muscles all must have certain attributes. They use actual photographs and excellent computer graphics to show the hollow structure of bird bones, and animate the way in which the muscles move bird wings. It is all completely accurate and factual. They document the unusual features of feathers, and explain how they make flight possible.

They use excellent high-speed photography to show exactly how a hummingbird can fly forwards, backwards, or hover in place. The raw photography is augmented by computer graphics to show precisely how the motion of the wings differs for each type of motion. They examine the way a hummingbird's wings move compared to a hawk's wings.

The video is laden with many more facts about hummingbirds, including the unusual structure and motion of its tongue.

Then, there is some impressive photography of roughly 500,000 starlings returning to their roost, with analysis of how they can fly so closely without collisions.

Perhaps the best part of the video is the part about arctic tern migration because it illustrates

how real science works. Danish scientists caught 50 arctic terns and attached miniature data loggers to their legs. Then, a year later, after the birds had migrated to Antarctica and back, they (incredibly) managed to catch ten of the birds and retrieve the data loggers. Nine of the ten data loggers had usable data, telling the scientists exactly where the birds were at particular dates and times. Then they published the results.

I can imagine a high school student watching that segment and saying, "That's what I want to do when I grow up!" It really was that inspiring.

It was such a contrast to the ivory tower philosophy that passes itself off for science today. They actually dissected bird bones to determine exactly what their internal structure is, and presented photographic proof of what they had observed. A bunch of scientists didn't just sit around and throw out speculation for why birds are so light, and come to the consensus that their bones must be hollow—until another group of scientists came to the consensus that birds must be light because they are filled with helium—which was accepted as fact until another group of scientists came to the consensus that birds must be light because they are filled with hydrogen.

I know that sounds silly, but it is no sillier than the changing consensus that eating vegetables (no, no, eating meat!) caused apelike creatures to become human, as we saw in this month's feature article.

Real science depends upon experimentation and observation. That's what this video consists of.

The video ends by making the point that the existence of flight inspires a search for an explanation of how it originated. They encourage the viewer to consider the possibilities.

They mention the three most popular evolutionary explanations. (1. Birds learned to fly from the ground up by running and jumping. 2. Birds learned to fly by jumping out of trees and gliding down. 3. Birds learned to fly when they used their winged arms to catch insects, and accidentally flew as a result.) They suggest that it is "challenging to explain" how any of these three theories could be correct. Admittedly, they don't give equal time to these explanations; they simply acknowledge that they exist. But really, do these three silly stories merit any more discussion than that?

They end by simply noting that all other instances of flying (hot air balloons, dirigibles, fixed wing aircraft, rotary wing aircraft, and rockets) are the result of conscious design. Is it not reasonable to assume that biological flight is also the result of conscious design?

ANOTHER ROUND IN THE OLD “EVOLUTION VS. CREATION” DEBATE

<http://www.patheos.com/blogs/rogereolson/2013/09/another-round-in-the-old-evolution-vs-creation-debate/>

Controversy over public school textbooks

This month's web site review looks at a blog post that discusses the controversy that erupts over public school textbooks almost every year and sometimes throughout a year.

The controversy in this post is centered in Texas. “Texas is so large and its public schools are so populated that textbook publishers do not want to alienate the Texas state agency that approves textbooks. So, indirectly, anyway, Texas has the ability to sway national textbooks' contents.”

It is interesting to learn that a board actually examines public school textbooks to “make sure they are accurate and fair”. Some board members have complained about “some science textbooks' treatment of life's origins.” Some textbooks “strongly imply that all life began with chemical interactions”. This is the source of the controversy.

The author of the blog post states that he wants science textbooks to “stick to science.” For him the “issue is whether science, as *science*, can state that *all life began with chemical interactions*.” He believes that some, but not all, public school textbooks are full of biases.

He describes some interesting details about his daughter's ninth grade public school social studies textbook. He “noticed that in almost every case *outside the U.S.* religion was a big part of the discussion of cultures.”

Beside the big issue of religion and how it is portrayed in public school textbooks, the author suspects “*most critics of public school textbooks are worried about a deeper issue—ethics.*” His discussion of this issue is quite interesting.

Another topic addressed in the blog centers around “community values”. The author's participation in a conference with one hundred community leaders to make up a list of “community values” that should be taught and promoted in schools makes for interesting reading.

As typical for blog posts, at the end of the post you will find many comments. The author also provides replies to questions raised by readers.



**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.info**.