

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 18 Issue 12 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info September 2014

WRONG ALL ALONG

Scientific American says the theory of human evolution needs revision.

The cover of this month's issue of *Scientific American* promised to be a "special evolution issue" about "Evolution, the human saga," which tells "the remarkable 7-million-year story of us." We strongly encourage you to run right out and buy the issue because it basically says that practically everything ever written about human evolution in the past is wrong.



The whole issue is a gold mine of admitted evolutionary mistakes, too many to include in our "six-page newsletter" (which is eight pages this month), so we will have to settle with sharing a few summary statements.

We observers may not yet know how these fossils will rewrite the story of our origins, but history tells us that they will indeed rewrite it. ... Awash in this flood of fresh insights, scientists have to revise virtually every chapter of the human saga, from the dawn of humankind to the triumph of *Homo sapiens* over the Neandertals and other archaic species.¹

Notice that the "scientific" account of human origins is actually a "story." Furthermore, it is a historic fact that the story keeps changing, because the story has always been wrong.

The article then presents a "CliffsNotes" summary of what evolutionists have traditionally believed about human evolution. You can read it for yourself, but it will just waste your time because,

As it turns out, fossil and genetic evidence amassed since then has cast doubt on or downright disproved every element of that CliffsNotes accounting of our origins.²

That's what makes it so hard for us to write about human evolution. Whenever we say, "Evolutionists believe ..." the evolutionists counter with, "No, we don't believe that any more."

BROKEN LIMBS

So, what do evolutionists believe now about human evolution? Honestly, it is hard to say because their theories are so confusing and inconsistent; and we don't want to be accused of misrepresenting what they believe. *Scientific*

¹ Kate Wong, *Scientific American*, September 2014, "The Human Saga", page 38

² *ibid.*, page 39

American published a diagram of the human evolutionary tree on pages 40 and 41 of their special evolution issue, but it looks more like a pile of broken branches lying on the ground than a tree.



The fact that this tree doesn't look like previous trees is not new. We published a comparison of the various speculative human trees more than a decade ago,³ which you may wish to review.

Of particular note is that *Scientific American's* September 2014 tree shows *Homo rudolfensis*, *Homo habilis*, *Homo ergaster*, and *Homo erectus* as separate species. Last November, the scientific consensus seemed to be that they were all one species, based on the analysis of Skull 5.⁴ Does *Scientific American* not agree with the consensus, or **has the consensus changed?**

We don't want to sound like we are complaining; but it makes it really hard for us to write about what evolutionists believe about human evolution when they keep changing their minds. **It would make our life so much easier if they would just pick one lie and stick with it!** ☺

Unfortunately, *Scientific American* says we aren't going to get a consistent story for decades.

In Brief

Tracing the evolutionary ancestors of *Homo sapiens* was once thought to be a relatively straightforward matter: *Australopithecus* begat *Homo erectus*, which begat Neandertals, which begat us.

Over the past 40 years fossil finds from East Africa, among other things, have completely shattered that hypothesis.

The latest evidence shows that several different hominin species shared the planet at different times. **Figuring out how they are all related**—and which ones led directly to us—**will keep paleontologists busy for decades to**

come.⁵

Keeping paleontologists busy for decades is really all that matters, isn't it? ☺ We would not want them to be unemployed!

Surprisingly, they admit,

Just because two fossils have similarly shaped jaws or teeth does not mean they share a recent evolutionary history.⁶

But paleontologists construct evolutionary histories based on similarly shaped jaws or teeth all the time!

SPECULATION AND CONSENSUS

Despite the fact that there isn't any real evidence that evolution actually happened, that doesn't stop paleontologists from speculating about how it happened.

Such climate changes may have played a big role in shaping human evolution, a growing number of scientists believe.⁷

If more scientists believe it now, that must mean fewer scientists believed climate played a role in the past. Given the view that anyone who doesn't believe the consensus isn't a "real scientist," does the fact that they did not agree with current consensus (if that is, in fact, the current consensus) mean that they weren't "real scientists" then? If anybody who doesn't believe in evolution isn't a "real scientist," does that mean that anyone who doesn't believe in a particular evolutionary mechanism isn't a "real scientist?"

Did climate change cause evolutionary change because of a changing diet? Or, did climate change cause evolutionary change because of exercise? (It has been claimed that when the forests gave way to grasslands because of climate change, ape men had to switch from swinging through the trees to walking upright.)

Abandoning the trees lies at the origin of our vastly altered anatomy and **undeniably** set the stage for later adaptations in our lineage, but it did not step up the evolutionary tempo of events.⁸

Undeniably? Really?

Or, did climate change actually have nothing to do with it? **Did intellectual challenges force us to**

⁵ Bernard Wood, *Scientific American*, September 2014, "Welcome to the Family", page 43

⁶ *ibid.*, page 47

⁷ Peter B. deMenocal, *Scientific American*, September 2014, "Climate Shocks", page 50

⁸ Ian Tattersall, *Scientific American*, September 2014, "If I Had a Hammer", page 57

³ *Disclosure*, January 2000, "Human Evolution", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v4i4f.htm>

⁴ *Disclosure*, November 2013, "Skull 5", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v18i2f.htm>

evolve instead?

Why has evolution in our family been unusually rapid? By what mechanism did this acceleration take place? ... Almost certainly the answer involves our ancestors' ability to meet challenges by producing stone tools, clothing, shelter, fire, and so forth—objects referred to as material culture because they reflect how their users lived.⁹

The comment about human evolution being unusually rapid refers back to the previous point in the article that the presumed rate of evolutionary change in human beings isn't consistent with the presumed rate of evolutionary change in other animals—but let's not let that distract us from the notion that making tools caused us to evolve. How did that happen?

This radical new behavior implies that hominin diets had broadened rapidly, from being primarily vegetarian to relying more on animal fats and proteins—though whether by scavenging or by active hunting at this stage is unknown. This richer diet underwrote the later rapid expansion of the energy-hungry brain among members of *Homo*.¹⁰

If animal fats are so much better for the brain than vegetables, why is Michelle Obama trying to get school lunch programs to cut out pizza and hamburgers, and serve more vegetables instead? Doesn't she want our brains to evolve even more? ☺

But seriously, it was war that really caused us to evolve! ☺

The rate of brain gain ... hints at an arms race of sorts, as the adoption of projectile weapons made human groups one another's most dangerous predators even as they competed economically for resources.¹¹

Or, maybe it was social cooperation, not war, which caused us to evolve.

The traditional explanation of rapid brain development in hominins, favored by evolutionary psychologists, is known as gene-culture coevolution. This process involves the steady operation of natural selection on successive generations of individuals, with powerful positive feedback between innovation in the biological and cultural spheres.

...

A little thought, however, suggests there

⁹ *ibid.*, page 56

¹⁰ *ibid.*, page 57

¹¹ *ibid.*, pages 57-58

must have been more to it than that.¹²

The "more to it" is "chance." We just evolved by accident, without any cause at all.

Ian Tattersall ends his article with a semi-religious observation.

This perspective on our evolution, in which our admittedly remarkable species emerged from a rapid sequence of random external events entirely unrelated to our ancestors' specific qualities, is substantially less exalting than the traditional idea of stately improvement over the eons. ...

Seeing our amazing species as an evolutionary accident, though, contains a profound lesson. For if we were not shaped by evolution to be something specific—fitted to our environment and tailored to a purpose—then we have free will in a way that other species do not. We can indeed make choices about the ways in which we behave. And this means, of course, that we must accept responsibility for those choices.¹³

Tattersall's view of free will is connected with his belief in evolution. We won't go any farther than the simple observation that there is a connection in his mind. We won't make any judgments about which one caused the other, or whether his personal beliefs are right or wrong—but we will make this observation:

When I was a child, I had a dog that was left in our basement for what we thought was going to be a short time. Unfortunately, our family was unavoidably delayed for a very long time. When we returned, we discovered him cowering in a corner because he could not hold it any more and had answered the call of nature. He knew it was wrong to defecate there, and he accepted responsibility for his choice. At least one species other than humans makes choices and accepts responsibility for those choices, so Tattersall is factually wrong on that point.

THE REST OF THE ISSUE

The special issue was divided into three sections. So far, we have only discussed the first section addressing "Where We Came From."

After saying that all previous answers to the question, "Where did we come from?" have been wrong, and that the answer will continue to change, and they don't have good explanation right now, *Scientific American* then goes on to discuss "What Makes Us Special."

Evolutionists are in the difficult position of

¹² *ibid.*, page 58

¹³ *ibid.*, page 59

trying to have it both ways. On one hand, evolutionists generally want to claim that humans are just animals, no different from any other animal. On the other hand, they have to acknowledge that we really are different from animals.

The final section addresses the question, "Where Are We Going?" It is just a lot of speculation about how we will evolve in the future. If one doesn't know how evolution worked in the past, how can one possibly know what it will do in the future? Just because a scientist says something is going to happen doesn't mean it will actually happen.

We don't dispute the value in pondering what the future might hold, and how one might prepare to meet that eventuality. We only dispute the value of basing those thoughts on something that didn't really happen in the past. If the premise is wrong, the conclusion can only be right by accident.

We really encourage you to read the whole *Scientific American* issue from cover to cover because we feel that the most compelling arguments against the theory of evolution actually come from evolutionists themselves. It is hard for us to imagine anyone reading this issue without asking themselves, "Are they really serious?"

Please, as you read it, ask yourself, "How do they know that?" Or, perhaps a better question is, "Why do they think they know that?"

TRUE SCIENCE

The theories of evolution in general, and human evolution in particular, are theories that Leonardo da Vinci would say, "begin and end in the mind." Leonardo was one of the greatest scientists of all time. He knew what true science is. Here is what he said about true science.

No human investigation can be termed true science if it is not capable of mathematical demonstration. If you say that the sciences which begin and end in the mind are true, this is not conceded, but is denied for many reasons, and foremost among these is the fact that the test of experience is absent from these exercises of the mind, and without these there is no assurance of certainty.¹⁴

There is no assurance of certainty regarding human evolution because it isn't true science—it is just an "exercise of the mind." The transformation of one kind of creature into another has never been observed in nature or in the

¹⁴ Leonardo da Vinci quoted by Carlo Pedretti, *Leonardo Art and Science*, TAJ Books, 2004, page 168.

laboratory. It has not passed the "test of experience."

It isn't "anti-science" to be against the theory of evolution because the theory of evolution isn't scientific. Science is against evolution.

Evolution in the News

IF IT WALKS LIKE A FISH ...

Have scientists really discovered how fish evolved into land animals?

One reader alerted us to this shocking statement in *The Australian*.

THE emergence of fish on to land was a pivotal transition in evolution. Now scientists have attempted to re-create it in a remarkable experiment, in which 100 fish were reared from birth on land. The study used an African fish, the polypterus, that has lungs and can "walk" between pools, but normally spends its entire life in water. The creatures survived "happily" out of water for nearly a year, suggesting ancient marine creatures may have made the leap to land more readily than previously thought.¹⁵

Another reader told us about news report in *Science Daily* about the same study.

About 400 million years ago a group of fish began exploring land and evolved into tetrapods – today's amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. But just how these ancient fish used their fishy bodies and fins in a terrestrial environment and what evolutionary processes were at play remain scientific mysteries.

...

The fish showed significant anatomical and behavioural changes. The terrestrialized fish walked more effectively by placing their fins closer to their bodies, lifted their heads higher, and kept their fins from slipping as much as fish that were raised in water. "Anatomically, their pectoral skeleton changed to become more elongate with stronger attachments across their chest, possibly to increase support during walking, and a reduced contact with the skull to

¹⁵ Hannah Devlin, *The Australian*, August 29, 2014, "Fish out of water can quickly find their feet", <http://m.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/fish-out-of-water-can-quickly-find-their-feet/story-fnb64oi6-1227040527711?nk=fad28d9161b24929422b6d27fec9324f#>

potentially allow greater head/neck motion," says Trina Du, a McGill Ph.D. student and study collaborator.

"Because many of the anatomical changes mirror the fossil record, we can hypothesize that the behavioural changes we see also reflect what may have occurred when fossil fish first walked with their fins on land," says Hans Larsson, Canada Research Chair in Macroevolution at McGill and an Associate Professor at the Redpath Museum.¹⁶

These two stories seem to indicate that experiments had been done in which fish evolved the ability to live on land, so we had to check out the peer-reviewed study in the professional technical literature ourselves. We discovered that the news reports weren't exactly accurate.

To be politically correct, the study assures us that "Animals were acquired through the pet trade (Mirdo Importations)," and "All experiments were conducted under Carleton University animal care protocol B09-28 and McGill University animal care protocol #6000." Now that we are comfortable knowing that the poor little fish were humanely studied, let's read what the scientists did to them.

Because this study addresses how environment influences growth, animals were acquired as young as possible, but after gill absorption to ensure survival during shipping. All animals possessed juvenile markings on arrival, suggesting that they were less than 70 days old.¹⁷

Before arrival, all fish had been raised in fully aquatic environments ($n = 149$). Although most fish still exhibited strong juvenile markings upon arrival, any fish that had fainter stripes were assumed to be older and were left in the aquatic control group, as they had been in an aquatic environment from their beginning.

Rearing habitats

All fish were kept in a 300-gallon recirculating aquarium system that provided the control and treatment groups with identical water quality conditions over time. The water was kept at 78 ± 2 °F and cleaned with an active bio-filter. Fish were fed a high protein diet, and both groups received the same amount of food

¹⁶ *Science Daily*, August 27, 2014, "Walking fish reveal how our ancestors evolved onto land", <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/08/140827131547.htm>

¹⁷ Standen, *et al.*, *Nature*, 4 September 2014, "Developmental plasticity and the origin of tetrapods", <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v513/n7516/full/nature13708.html>

daily. Control animals were kept in an aquatic environment with a water depth maintained at 210 mm [about 8 inches]. Treatment group animals were raised in a terrestrial environment (water depth 3 mm [about 1/8 inch]). Water misters provided a continual mist in the terrestrial environment to prevent desiccation [drying out]. The terrestrial environments also had a mesh flooring scattered with pebbles to stimulate climbing and navigating non-uniform surfaces and to provide habitat complexity, reducing negative fish interactions. The terrestrial and aquatic environments had plants to provide habitat complexity.¹⁸

So, in the "remarkable experiment, in which 100 fish were reared from birth on land" (according to *The Australian*), all 149 fish used in the study were actually born and raised in the water for less than 70 days before being purchased for the study. During the study (which began after they had grown sufficiently to breathe air), 111 of them were raised in water too shallow to swim in ("on land"), and 38 were raised in deeper water.

It is important to realize that the fish they purchased were the offspring of fish that were already able to breathe air and move (with difficulty) on land (if the terrain isn't too challenging). The experiment did not cause the fish to evolve the ability to breathe air or walk on land. Their ancestors had been doing that for generations. No evolution took place. If they had taken ordinary goldfish and tried to raise them in such a shallow aquarium that they could not swim, and had learned how to walk and breathe air, that would have been newsworthy!

Getting back to the article, they purchased fish and let them grow for an unspecified period of time, 111 in very shallow water, and 38 in deeper water. (If I had been a peer reviewer, I would have asked them to specify the length of time they were allowed to grow in the two different environments before testing them. That's an important fact that was omitted from the report.)

They picked 20 "volunteers" from the shallow tank, and 10 from the deep tank, to compete in a land obstacle course, and the results were filmed.

P. senegalus (control, $n = 10$; treatment, $n = 20$) was filmed walking freely across a rough plastic surface (30 cm × 30 cm) to assess the kinematic performance of body and fin motions during terrestrial locomotion. The filming area (~22 cm × 20 cm) was located in the centre of the walking surface. Sequences in which fish walked steadily, demonstrating a minimum of

¹⁸ *ibid.*

three consecutive fin beats, were selected for analysis (control, $n = 6$; treatment, $n = 12$). Fish were randomly removed from their rearing tanks and, to avoid exhaustion artefacts, each fish was only walked once and then returned to a holding tank until the experiment was completed. Cameras were situated above the walking platform, with one directly above the surface and one at an angle, to provide clear views of at least one pectoral fin during walking.¹⁹

The researchers were more concerned about exactly how they moved their fins than which fish completed the obstacle course first—but they did say,

... the terrestrialized *Polypterus* has a more efficient gait.²⁰

These differences in timing between the control and treatment fish groups may indicate that the fish raised on land have a conditioned 'training' advantage.²¹

They concluded,

These performance differences suggest that walking is energetically more expensive than swimming.²²

In other words, fish find it easier to swim than walk. Who would have guessed that? 😊

Then, they dissected some of the fish from each group to compare their anatomy.

Fish from the treatment and control groups were randomly chosen and sacrificed.²³

The report is filled with tables, charts, photographs, and diagrams comparing the fin motion and anatomy of both groups of fish. The point of all that data seems to be that the fish raised in shallow water were more muscular than the control group that just floated around in the deeper aquarium.

WHAT DID WE LEARN?

The three simple lessons to be learned from this experiment are:

- 1) Working out makes fish stronger. (Any athlete could tell you that.)
- 2) Performance improves with practice. (Any piano teacher could tell you that.)
- 3) A good press agent can make obvious test

results appear to be stunningly important.

A MORE INTERESTING TEST

The fact that strong fish raised in shallow water for a long period of time can move better on land than weak fish that have never tried to do that before is not surprising. In a race, always bet on the strong, experienced competitor rather than the weak novice.

What would have happened if the fish had competed on an aquatic obstacle course? Would the strong fish that hadn't been in water deep enough to swim in for most of their lives beat the weaker fish that had spent their entire lives swimming? Of course, that single test would not prove anything more than a single baseball game would answer the classic question, "Does good pitching beat good hitting?"—but at least it would have been interesting!

It isn't surprising that fish raised in shallow water would beat fish raised in deep water on a shallow water obstacle course. But what would have happened if they had to swim against a strong current in a recirculating pool? They didn't test that. They did, however, do this:

P. senegalus (control, $n = 10$; treatment, $n = 20$) was filmed swimming freely through a still water aquarium (1.5 feet wide \times 6 feet long \times 1 foot deep) to assess the kinematic performance of body and fin motion during steady swimming.²⁴

It was a pretty easy test for both groups. The result was:

The minimal differences in the kinematic variables between the treatment and control groups during swimming indicate that there was minimal 'loss' of swimming function associated with being raised in a terrestrial environment without the ability to 'practise' swimming after gill absorption.

Apparently, swimming (for fish) is like riding a bicycle (for people)—they never forget how to do it. But, how well do they do it after not doing it for a long time? Because they used still water instead of a strong current, we don't know.

There were interesting aspects of the experiment. They should not have claimed they had learned something about evolution to make it interesting. It wasn't about evolution. It was really a valuable study about instinct, learning, and exercise. But, because they focused on evolution, they didn't learn all they could have.

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ *ibid.*

²² *ibid.*

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*

WHY LIE?

What is to be gained by making up stories about planets outside our solar system?

In response to last month's article about the admission that some of the habitable planets discovered outside our solar system don't even exist, ²⁵ Atarii wrote:

Great articles this month. I really love when you interject a bit of your own personality and history into the articles, and perhaps it is only human nature's love of sensationalism, but when you talk about non-science (such as the claimed detection of planets) I am thoroughly enthralled.

The question is, however, WHY? Sure, evolution is a huge life question, so it is only obvious that people are going to delude themselves into believing it; global warming has several obvious agendas; but whether or not a planet exists light-years away? Why lie about that? If they're not lying, then they have deluded themselves. Or is it that we are hearing sensationalism, but in the lab, they talk amongst one another in great dejection, wondering if they will ever have the equipment to actually see a planet or a star?

What on earth is happening?

The reason why scientists claim to have discovered planets is the same reason why they claim to have found fossils of human ancestors, and so on. But, before we tell you what that reason is, let's take a stroll down memory lane.

ASTRONOMERS ON STRIKE

Do you remember the Great New York Garbage Strike of 1981? It was settled after 17 days. ²⁶ Even if you don't remember it, you can probably imagine what New York City smelled like after two weeks, and why the residents were so anxious to get the dispute resolved.

Now imagine how terribly you and your family would suffer if all the astronomers went on strike for 17 days! ☺ How could you live if nobody looked through a telescope for just two weeks?

You know how much you spend on garbage collection each month. How much do you spend on astronomers each month? Nothing? Really? Actually, you spend more than you think. Astronomers typically work for universities (and planetariums associated with universities).

²⁵ *Disclosure*, August 2014, "Undiscovered Planets", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v18i11n.htm>

²⁶ <http://www.buzzfeed.com/whatamess/the-worst-garbage-strikes-jdf/>

Tuition and admission fees pay part of their salaries; but the rest of their income comes from federally-funded research grants and subsidized tuition assistance. That means you are paying them with your tax dollars. You aren't paying them as much as you pay your garbage man—but you are paying them.

You may not realize how much you are paying astronomers—but the astronomers do! Last month, we quoted one of the astronomers who wrote about habitable planets outside our solar system. Remember, he defended his actions this way:

"I spend my days looking at squiggles on a graph," says Robertson. "But a lot of science is publicly funded, and the taxpayers who contribute to that deserve a return on their investment. I wouldn't say we should shy away from artist impressions or anything that helps us communicate the results of our work to the public." ²⁷

When government bureaucrats are handing out funding to astronomers, do they give it to the astronomer who has discovered a planet, or one who hasn't?

As Atarii pointed out, it doesn't really affect your life if a habitable planet is circling a distant planet or not. So, why would you pay anyone to tell you if it does or not? You have to be made to think that it is important. You have to be told that if we don't fund this research we will fall behind the Chinese in science.

In the private sector, research has to result in something that provides a good return on investment, or else the company goes out of business. They use real science to discover natural laws which they later exploit for financial gain.

Academics sometimes take the attitude that they are above engineers because academics aren't using science to get filthy lucre like engineers do. Their pursuit of knowledge is pure and virtuous. But the truth is they are getting paid, too. They don't sell products—they sell stories. Stories tend to have a shorter shelf life than products. They always have to come up with new stories to sell.

That's why the story about human evolution changes so much. Somebody always has to come up with a new story based on a new bone in order to get new funding.

²⁷ Aron, *New Scientist*, 3 July 2014, "First life-friendly exoplanet may not exist after all", <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn25842-first-lifefriendly-exoplanet-may-not-exist-after-all.html>

A LAYMAN'S GUIDE TO THE AMAZING BUT TOTALLY TRUE SCIENTIFIC FACTS OF CREATION

<http://truesciencefacts.com/>

“Are You Willing to Believe the Truth when it is made plain to you?”

This month's website review looks at a website that presents many interesting and amazing facts about creation. The main page of the website is very busy and provides little points to ponder about the wealth of information found in the complete Layman's Guide.

From the main page you learn that the “Layman's Guide lays down one challenge that evolutionists must answer in order to remain intellectually honest about origins of life and the universe.” The challenge is “Name *one* undisputed scientific fact that even *all* evolutionists agree substantiates evolution”, and excludes the Biblical Creation scientific model.”

On the main page you will find a link to *Begin Guide* which leads the web reader to the *Introductory Table of Contents Link*. From these links you can read the 1) Introduction, 2) The Challenge of Truth, 3) The Creation Model, 4) The Biblical Account, 5) Bias Dispensed and 6) Un-Discovered.

The Layman's Guide is organized by presenting facts of creation under the following subjects: 1) Physics, 2) Biology, 3) Fossils, 4) Geology and 5) Challenge Information. Each subject or unit begins with a table of contents and a brief list of facts.

A convention used throughout the Layman's Guide is to present Facts of Creation by using a bright blue font. This makes it easy to locate the information in the main body of the text.

The author of the website makes the following disclaimer: “The author of this guide is not a research scientist. This information has been compiled from the abundance of easily accessible and confirmed scientific authorities. The majority of the information is common knowledge in the scientific realm, while lesser known facts are cited. **Do not quote** the author as a scientific authority. This guide is intended to systematically build the case for Biblical Creation through the logical alignment and application of the abundance of established scientific facts.”



**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.