

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 18 Issue 5 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info February 2014

A TALE OF TWO PRIZES

Evolutionists lack facts, not motivation.

From time to time, evolutionists offer prizes to anyone who can prove the theory of evolution is true. They fail because the theory isn't true. Here are two examples.

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE PRIZE

We first discovered the existence of the Origin of Life Prize in 2005, and told you about it in our August ¹ and September ² newsletters that year. At first, we assumed the prize was just a cheap creationist trick, using one million dollars to bait evolutionists, and taunting them every year it was not awarded. But, when we investigated the organization offering the prize, we discovered it was a sincere attempt by evolutionary scientists to produce a plausible explanation for the origin of life through purely natural processes. Furthermore, the rules for awarding the prize honestly described the scientific obstacles to the natural origin of life that would have to be overcome.

In our past newsletters, we told you about their excellent description of the characteristics of life, and what is necessary for something to be "alive." We don't want to repeat all that excellent information here, so please go back and reread our August and September, 2005, newsletters.

By chance, we happened to go back to the Origin of Life website a few days ago and found this shocking announcement on their home page.

Late News:

On October 26, 2013 the Governing Board of the Origin of Life Science Foundation, Inc. voted to put on hold the Origin of Life Prize Program, and to temporarily suspend the Origin

of Life Prize offer. Over the 13 years since The Origin of Life Prize was first announced in NATURE and SCIENCE, no submission has ever made it past the screening judges to higher-level judges. No submission has ever addressed, let alone answered, any of the questions below, for which the Prize offer was instituted. Most of these Prize-offer questions centered on: "How did inanimate, prebiotic nature prescribe or program the first genome?"

Life origin literature continues to circumvent and ignore this problem, if not deliberately sweep it under the rug. The Prize Program did much to raise consciousness and stimulate more consideration of the real problem of life origin - Prescription of future biofunction that was not yet selectable by the environment.³

We are sure that the Origin of Life Science Foundation still believes that life did originate through unguided natural processes—but they apparently no longer believe that modern science can explain how that happened. If another biological breakthrough (equivalent in importance to the discovery of the DNA molecule) is made, they may offer the prize again; but 13 years of intense investigation has convinced them that the origin of life cannot be explained by current scientific knowledge.

We applaud the Origin of Life Science Foundation for their honesty. In particular, we are impressed and grateful that they have chosen to leave their description of the problem on their website. It would have been easy to take the cowardly way out by simply deleting the website.

So, let us state as clearly as we can our deep admiration and respect for the sincerity and integrity of the Origin of Life Science Foundation.

¹ Disclosure, August 2005, "Looking For Life", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v9i11f.htm>

² Disclosure, September 2005, "One Million Dollars!", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v9i12f.htm>

³ <http://lifeorigin.org/>

EVOLUTION IN TWO MINUTES

On the other hand, we have no respect whatsoever for *Discover* magazine. They are as far from the Origin of Life Science Foundation on the integrity scale as they can be.

In April, 2009, *Discover* magazine announced a mean-spirited contest to put creationists in their place. We told you about it in our June, 2009, article, "Evolution for Intellectuals."⁴ Their website said,

The Challenge

Can you communicate the most important idea in biology, and one of the most controversial ideas in our society, in a mere 120 seconds? Think you can convince even the most hard-headed creationist that Darwin was right? If so, show us—and that creationist—how it's done.

Your task is to create a video of no more than two minutes that will get the idea and significance of evolution across to an educated lay audience. Along the way, you can touch on points like how evolution works, how we know it to be true, the evolution of humanity, and the future of evolution.

In June, 2009, we gave you a link to that quote, but, unlike the Origin of Life Science Foundation, *Discover* magazine has tried to cover its tracks by purging all references to the contest from their website. The link to that quote is no longer active.

Feeling a little bit devilish, we entered the contest and submitted a video mocking the theory of evolution by making the argument in favor of evolution as badly as possible. We knew we would lose, so we didn't spend much time on it, but it was fun to make the video.

We waited to lose the contest so that *Discover* magazine would not have the rights to it, so we could post it on our own website in June. But the contest didn't end on June 1 as scheduled. The deadline was extended five more months. It finally ended in November.

Discover never explained why the contest didn't end on time. Perhaps they were so overwhelmed by so many excellent entries that they could not process them all by June 1. ☺ (But, if that were the case, why extend the deadline?)

We suspect, but certainly can't prove, that they had less than five entries by the time the contest was supposed to end, so we would have had to

⁴ *Disclosure*, June 2009, "Evolution for Intellectuals", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v13i9f.htm>

have been one of the winners! We suspect, but can't prove, that they extended the deadline in a futile attempt to get five satisfactory entries.

Finally they did announce the five winners (in a private email to us). There was no big fanfare in the magazine, and the five "winning" videos were not prominently featured on the website. They were posted there, but they were very hard to find.

We did tell you about the five winning videos in our January, 2010, newsletter.⁵ The videos were so embarrassingly bad that none of them are still on the *Discover* website. On the other hand, a link to our losing video is proudly displayed on our home page, and we have also posted it on YouTube.⁶ (Several other people posted our video on YouTube without our knowledge—but that's fine.)

MOTIVATION ISN'T THE PROBLEM

We have said on several occasions that the creation/evolution controversy could be solved simply if evolutionists just put forth a scientifically plausible defense of the theory. They don't do that because they can't. That's why they resort to legal action to prevent scientific evidence against evolution from being presented in public schools.

Prizes for compelling scientific evidence for the natural origin of life, or evolution of new phyla through natural selection will never be won regardless of the size of the prize because the scientific evidence doesn't exist. Offering more, or bigger, prizes won't change the facts.

Evolution in the News

LIFE MADE EASY

Despite the evidence, evolutionists still believe in abiogenesis.

Despite the quiet suspension of the Origin of Life Prize we told you about in our feature article, science tabloids continue to proclaim that scientists are just about to discover how life began.

New Scientist ran an article on page 10 of their 25 January 2014 print issue with the title,

⁵ *Disclosure*, January 2010, "Evolution Video Finalists",

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v14i4f.htm>

⁶ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NHodXgM52tw>

“Fountain of life may be a shower of dust.” When they published the article on their website, they changed the title to, “Water found in stardust suggests life is universal”. We don’t know why they changed the title. Both titles suggest a breakthrough in the search for the origin of life has been made. Regardless, the article begins,

A sprinkling of stardust is as magical as it sounds. The dust grains that float through our solar system contain tiny pockets of water, which form when they are zapped by a blast of charged wind from the sun.

...

Combined with previous findings of organic compounds in interplanetary dust, the results suggest that these grains contain the basic ingredients needed for life. As similar dust grains are thought to be found in solar systems all over the universe, this bodes well for the existence of life across the cosmos.⁷

Inadvertently, they admit that the origin of life depends upon something “magical.” Don’t they know that life originated through natural (not supernatural) processes? ☺

They claim “the basic ingredients needed for life” have been found in outer space. What are these basic ingredients?

What’s more, interplanetary dust in our solar system – and in others – contains organic carbon. If stardust contains carbon and water, it means the essentials of life could be present in solar systems anywhere in the universe and raining down on their planets.⁸

All you need for life to begin is carbon and water! That’s amazing!

There’s nothing new here. Scientists detected carbon and water outside Earth’s atmosphere long ago. Besides, did anyone ever believe that the only place in the universe where carbon and water might be found is on planet Earth?

If all it takes for life to begin is to “take carbon and add water,” why hasn’t anyone produced life in the lab?

Granted, *New Scientist* is just a supermarket science tabloid. They sensationalize stories in order to sell magazines. *New Scientist* isn’t a peer-reviewed technical journal, so we should not take what they say too seriously. Instead, let’s look at what a real science journal said on the

⁷ Catherine Brahic, *New Scientist*, 20 January 2014, “Water found in stardust suggests life is universal”, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn24907-water-found-in-stardust-suggests-life-is-universal.html#.UwAFHfuKKS0>

⁸ *ibid.*

subject last month.

The origin of life remains a daunting mystery in part because rather than knowing too little, we increasingly know about too many possible mechanisms that might have led to the self-sustaining replication of nucleic acids and the cellularization of genetic material that is the basis of life on Earth.⁹

Yes, the origin of life is a daunting mystery, more so now than in the past because we know more now than we did in the past. But it isn’t that we know so many plausible methods that we can’t choose the most likely one. We know now that all proposed methods are implausible. That’s why the Origin of Life Prize is no longer being offered.

But, one can’t get research funding if one admits there is no chance of success, so Gollihar had to spin the article this way:

It is possible that it is not a knowledge of prebiotic synthesis that is wanting, but knowledge of prebiotic replication. Simple organic replicators can be generated with varying degrees of efficiency and fidelity, and it is easy to imagine how such simple replicators might have evolved in complexity. However, what remains unknown is the degree to which the replication cycle would have led to the purification of materials (such as ribose) from otherwise complex mixtures of prebiotic chemicals.¹⁰

He admits there is “not a knowledge of prebiotic synthesis.” In other words, nobody knows how chemicals were synthesized (put together) in a prebiotic (before life) environment. But he just skips over that insurmountable obstacle, and moves on to the problem of “prebiotic replication”. In other words, assuming something was somehow synthesized before there was any living thing, how did that thing reproduce itself? It wasn’t alive yet, but somehow it reproduced itself. If he just knew how it reproduced, he says, that would be a great breakthrough. Here is his suggestion:

Biochemistry occurred on geochemical time scales, in which millions of years of a poor replicator (a blink on the geological time scale) might well have been necessary to craft a feedback cycle that led to a slightly better replicator, or to a replicator that could better feed itself by directing the chemistry around it. Of course, none of these speculations even

⁹ Jimmy Gollihar, *et al.*, *Science*, 17 January 2014, “Many Paths to the Origin of Life”, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/343/6168/259.full?sid=23a84300-91c6-4245-93ab-34ea7478d896>

¹⁰ *ibid.*

touches on key issues relative to surface chemistry and nascent cellularizations.¹¹

So, since it is inconceivable that a good reproduction process happened by chance, one must assume that a poor reproduction process happened by chance, and natural selection must have made the process better. There is no evidence that the unknown inefficient reproduction process evolved into an unknown efficient reproduction process, but it must have happened. © But, he admits, there is more to life than just reproduction. In particular, life needs to be encased in some sort of membrane (cell) which allows fuel to enter the cell, and waste material to exit the cell. And “none of these speculations even touches on” this problem.

Although there are many ill-defined paths (in some ways all equally plausible and all equally implausible) to life on Earth, recent research has begun to expand the likelihood of several of these paths.¹²

If some paths to life are becoming less implausible, why did the Origin of Life Foundation suspend their prize?

Finally, he alludes to Stanly Miller’s classic experiment in 1953.

The great benefit of the demonstration of prebiotic amino acid synthesis from a simple gas mix and an electrical spark was not that it was a cookbook for how things occurred, but rather that it was the identification of a plausible path to an origin of life that would continue to bear experimental fruit.¹³

Miller’s famous experiment did not identify a plausible path to the origin of life. Miller recognized that, and spent the rest of his life (more than 50 years) looking for another plausible path as we told you when he died.¹⁴ His subsequent research never bore experimental fruit (and neither did anyone else’s research).

Dr. Miller, and the Origin of Life Foundation, both deserve our admiration and praise for honestly discovering and documenting the scientific obstacles to the natural origin of life. The insurmountable problems they discovered should be presented in (not censored from) public school science classes.

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *Disclosure*, June 2007, “Stanley Miller’s Final Word”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v11i9n.htm>

HAM ON NYE

Perhaps this was the most disappointing debate ever!

Creationists and evolutionists should be equally ashamed of the horrible debate on February 4 between Ken Ham and Bill Nye. We would really like to pretend it never happened; but since it was so widely publicized, we are obligated to address it.

Watching this debate was like watching two professional football players go head-to-head in an Olympic men’s figure skating competition. How do you choose a winner when both skaters spend most of their routines sitting on the ice? It was just ugly and embarrassing.

Creation/evolution debates are rare these days because most evolutionists are smart enough not to participate. When they do agree to debate, evolutionists generally get soundly defeated because science is on the side of creationists.

Creationist Ken Ham suckered Bill Nye the Bowtie Guy into debating him. (Ham agreed to donate an undisclosed sum of money to Nye’s unspecified charity.) Ham thought that Nye would be the weakest possible opponent; and Nye lived down to expectations. Every time he opened his mouth, Nye displayed his colossal ignorance of science and the Bible. But Ham’s strategy backfired when he failed to address Nye’s stupid, erroneous statements, which have been refuted time and time again by creationists. Instead, Ham stuck primarily to his three main points: (1) the definition of science; (2) some great scientists believe in creation; and (3) the Bible is true.

There was no winner that night—just losers. Perhaps the biggest loser was the poor audience in Kentucky which spent two and a half hours sitting in the auditorium, and then had to drive home in a terrible snowstorm.

Since we don’t want to say any more than we absolutely have to about this awful debate, let us refer you to a half-hour video on the Internet by Creation Ministries International titled “Ken Ham / Bill Nye Debate Analysis.” It summarizes all of Bill Nye’s errors, and gives links to well-known refutations of those errors. You can find it at <http://creation.com/ham-nye-debate>.

HOW OLD IS THE EARTH?

<http://creation.com/how-old-is-the-earth>

*From Refuting Evolution, a handbook for students, parents, and teachers
countering the latest arguments for evolution*

This month's web site review looks at an article about the age of the earth that was suggested by a reader of our newsletter. The article was first published in Refuting Evolution, Chapter 8. You can find detailed information about this handbook from links on the web page. The chapters of the handbook provide links to a lesson study guide that can aid the reader in understanding the various material that is presented.

In discussing the age of the earth, the topics covered are 1) Rocks, 2) Radiometric dating, 3) Anomalies and 4) Evidences for a young world.

The section on rocks focuses on the "vast thicknesses of sedimentary rocks around the world". Evolutionists use this as evidence for vast age. This leads into a discussion about *uniformitarianism* as contrasted with *catastrophism*. In this section you can also learn about sedimentation experiments that have been performed to determine how layers settle under water flowing at different speeds.

Radiometric dating is often used by evolutionists to support "deep" time. It is believed that "by measuring the quantities of radioactive elements and the elements into which they decay in rocks, geologists can determine how much time has elapsed since the rock has cooled from an initially molten state." It is pointed out that the deep time 'determination' is an *interpretation* and it is based on a number of assumptions. To explain other possible interpretations, an illustration is presented by using an hourglass.

The anomalies presented in the article deal with the many examples of rocks "where the dating methods give 'dates' that are wrong for rocks of *known* historical age."

The article points out that a number of methods provide evidence for a young world. These include 1) Red blood cells and hemoglobin found in some (unfossilized!) dinosaur bone, 2) Earth's magnetic field decay rate, 3) Amount of helium in the atmosphere, 4) Expanding galaxies, 5) Moon receding rate and 6) Salt in the sea.

On the bottom of the web page you will find links to YouTube videos that discuss the Age of the Earth and links to references and notes.



**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**.