

# Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 19 Issue 7 [www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info](http://www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info) April 2015

## COLLEGE TEXT RIGHTER

*This year's song honoring National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1) addresses the need to correct college biology textbooks. It should be sung to the tune "Paperback Writer" by the Beatles.*

College Text Righter.

Dear Sir or Madam, will you read my book?  
It took me years to write, will you take a look?  
It disproves a theory that Charles Darwin had.  
Students need to know, so I want to be a  
College Text Righter, College Text Righter.

It debunks the story of descent of man  
From an unknown ape we don't understand.  
Darwin's theory is a silly tale  
That must be destroyed, so I've got to be a  
College Text Righter, College Text Righter.

College Text Righter.

It's a thousand pages, give or take a few,  
Proving life didn't start in a pool of goo.  
It disproves his theory in convincing style,  
'Cause my logic's sound, and I want to be a  
College Text Righter, College Text Righter.

There's no question. Darwin wasn't right.  
So, I'm not going to give up without a fight.  
If you must return it you can send it here  
But I need a grant and I want to be a  
College Text Righter, College Text Righter.

College Text Righter. <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hear it at <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/music/Righter.mp3>. Vocals, lead guitar, rhythm guitar, bass guitar, keyboard and drums performed by Death Valley Dave.

## Evolution in the News

### THE FIRST HUMAN

*Evolutionists have discovered an even earlier human ancestor named "LD 350-1".*

According to the British Broadcasting Corporation,

**Scientists have unearthed the jawbone of what they claim is one of the very first humans.** [emphasis in the original]

The 2.8 million-year-old specimen is 400,000 years older than researchers thought that our kind first emerged. The discovery in Ethiopia suggests climate change spurred the transition from tree dweller to upright walker. The head of the research team told BBC News that the find gives the first insight into "the most important transitions in human evolution". <sup>2</sup>

Here's what they actually discovered, in rocks they believe to be 2.8 million years old:



The full report was published in the respected journal, *Science*. Most of the report deals with measurements of the teeth, and the soil where the jaw was found. Here are a few key sentences

<sup>2</sup> Pallab Ghosh, *BBC News*, 4 March 2015, "First human' discovered in Ethiopia", <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-31718336>

from that report.

In the majority of traits that distinguish it from this species [*Australopithecus afarensis*, AKA “Lucy”], LD 350-1 presents morphology that we interpret as transitional between *Australopithecus* and *Homo*. ... By ~2.0 Ma, at least two species of the genus *Homo* were present in Africa, *H. habilis* and *H. rudolfensis*, but primitive anterior corpus morphology distinguishes LD 350-1 from both of them.<sup>3</sup>

The article ends with this summary:

The time period 2.8 to 2.5 Ma witnessed climatic shifts that are frequently hypothesized to have led to the origin of the *Homo* lineage. Although the open habitats reconstructed for the Lee Adoyta faunal assemblages provide a new window on these changes, too little is known of the pattern of hominin evolution during this period to forge causal links to specific evolutionary events. The Ledi-Geraru specimen confirms that divergence from australopithecid dental and mandibular anatomy was an early hallmark of the *Homo* lineage. Additional discoveries are needed to determine whether or not these dentognathic changes were accompanied by neurocranial expansion, technological innovation, or shifts in other anatomical/behavioral systems that are familiar components of the *Homo* adaptive pattern.<sup>4</sup>

Of course, “additional discoveries are needed.” The primary purpose of most peer-reviewed articles is to get more funding for research. ☺

The *Science* article says “too little is known” to connect the hypothetical climate shift to the origin of upright walking; but the BBC claims this partial jaw, from one of “the very first humans,” gives insight into this “most important transition in human evolution.” So, the BBC contradicts the study it is reporting about! Who do you believe, the scientists or the journalists?

### BE SKEPTICAL

Suppose someone found a plank of wood that archeologists confidently dated to be 4,000 years old, and a creationist claimed it must have come from Noah’s Ark, which proves the Bible is true. Just because the wood is believed to be the same age as the time when some people believe there was a global flood, only someone with blind faith would believe that the wood had to have come from a ship, that ship had to have been Noah’s

<sup>3</sup> Villmoare, *et al.*, *Science*, 20 March 2015, “Early Homo at 2.8 Ma from Ledi-Geraru, Afar, Ethiopia”, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/347/6228/1352.full?sid=3a1f6b3e-2595-4f41-84fe-900afe1babfe>

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*

Ark, and that it proves a global flood.

Someone actually did find half of a jaw in soil some people believe is 2.8 million years old. Only someone with blind faith would believe that the jaw had to come from a human ancestor, and the existence of that human ancestor proves the theory of evolution is true.

### THE SHAPE OF THE JAW

If you need dentures, we doubt you would buy some used dentures from a thrift store because (beyond the fact that putting used dentures in your mouth is disgusting) you know used dentures probably would not fit very well. Everyone’s mouth is different (within a certain range).

If you took LD 350-1 to a dentist or orthodontist, he would either say, “These teeth are within normal limits, so they could have come from a modern human,” or he would say, “These teeth are too different to have come from a modern human.” There is no other possible answer he could give. They are either within normal modern human limits, or they are not.

If the jaw is within normal modern limits, then there are only two possibilities. (1) Human jaws have not evolved in 2.8 million years, or (2) the rocks they were found in really aren’t 2.8 million years old.

If the jaw is not within normal human limits, then why believe it is a human jaw?

If it isn’t a human jaw, why believe it came from something that evolved into a human?

These are questions that reasonable people should ask! Only fools believe without asking.

Email

## JENN’S CONCERNS

*It is time to address Jenn’s concerns about our review of Why Evolution is True.*

Last month we shared portions of some emails from Jenn<sup>5</sup> about our review of Why Evolution is True by Jerry Coyne. We didn’t have space last month to address her specific issues because there was a broader issue that needed to be discussed.

The broader issue last month was, “If the scientific evidence is so strongly against evolution, why is there still a controversy about it?” Our answer was, “Because it often isn’t about

<sup>5</sup> *Disclosure*, March 2015, “Jenn”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v19i6e2.htm>

science—it's about religion and politics.” That topic was inspired by the comments of a politician about evolution, and portions of Jenn's email telling us about her experience at a Catholic university. We tried our best to remain politically and religiously neutral while explaining how politics and religion can affect one's belief about evolution. This month we want to return to our usual approach of looking at evolution from a purely scientific standpoint.

Before we share Jenn's specific concerns, let's set the stage with this background. Our two-part review of *Why Evolution is True* was published in the 2009 April and May newsletters. It has been more than six years since I wrote it. That was so long ago that reading it again was, for me, like reading it for the first time. It was almost as if I were reading something someone else had written. This allows me to make the honest, unbiased, objective, and modest observation that it is one of the best articles ever written! ☺ There isn't much room for improvement.

Here's the last paragraph of Jenn's first email to us, which we did not share with you last month.

It also appears you contradict yourself and provide unfounded criticisms of the book. Will you be publishing another, more substantial, critique of the book? I am curious to read your more educated and thoughtful views on this book if you have any. It was a little fascinating to me that you attacked his relatively minor assaults on creationism yet attacked him directly. Still, you state that "creationists are more polite". Sorry, I'm not seeing the "politeness" there.

The four areas we need to address are creationism, politeness, contradictions, and unfounded criticisms.

## CREATIONISM

We believe the main argument of Coyne's book can be accurately summarized in this one sentence. "Evolution is true because creationism is nonsense." Our main observation about his book is that, despite the title, hardly any of the book attempts to explain why evolution is true. It would be better titled, "Why Creation is False." We still invite our readers to go to the library and check out the book (don't waste your money buying it) and see for yourself. You will see his assaults on creationism are not "relatively minor."

## POLITENESS

Here is the passage about politeness to which she was referring:

We hoped there might be some merit to Coyne's book, but were somewhat skeptical when Pigliucci made this comment about what

he thought was the most compelling argument in the book: "But it takes a particularly obtuse mind to look at the figure [showing human, *Australopithecus afarensis*, and chimpanzee] and reject the notions that *A. afarensis* is a member of the human lineage and that we and chimps have evolved from a common ancestor. Then again, there is no dearth of obtuse minds when it comes to creationism."<sup>6</sup> A creationist might well say, "But it takes a particularly obtuse mind to look at the complexity of living things and reject the notions that life is the product of conscious design. Then again, there is no dearth of obtuse minds when it comes to evolutionism." But a creationist probably would not say that, because creationists tend to be more polite.<sup>7</sup>

Pigliucci's comment about "no dearth of obtuse minds" struck me as being rude, and I tried to point that out by turning it around. Almost all of the email we get from evolutionists is rude. (Jenn's email is the rare exception.) If you read creation/evolution blogs, I think you will find that evolutionists tend to make many more personal attacks than creationists do. You can judge for yourself whether the generalization is true or not.

Despite that, we must admit Jenn's point is valid. "No generalization is worth a damn—including this one!"<sup>8</sup> Even if it is generally true that evolutionists tend to be less polite than creationists, it isn't relevant. I could have found a way to note Pigliucci's rudeness without being rude myself. I apologize.

## CONTRADICTIONS

I re-read our review, looking carefully for contradictions. I could not find any, so I asked her for a specific one. She wrote,

There are several unfounded, and even contradictory, comments made in the article on Coyne's book. For example, it is stated, "He thinks he sees macroevolution in the fossil record. This is remarkable because he spends so many pages trying to explain why there are no missing links in the fossil record!" This is absolutely false as it is stated repeatedly in the book that there are indeed missing links in the fossil record.

Unfortunately the statement, "There are no

<sup>6</sup> Massimo Pigliucci, *Science*, 5 February 2009, "EVOLUTION: The Overwhelming Evidence", page 716

<sup>7</sup> *Disclosure*, April 2009, "Why Evolution is True", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v13i7b.htm>

<sup>8</sup> This quote has been attributed to Mark Twain and Oliver Wendell Holmes. We don't know who actually deserves the credit.

missing links in the fossil record,” is ambiguous. It can have two opposite meanings. One could understand that sentence to mean, “All the expected evolutionary links are in the fossil record—none are missing,” or “There are none of the expected links in the fossil record.”

As Jenn correctly points out, Coyne said repeatedly that the presumed evolutionary links in the fossil record are all missing, and tried to explain why. That’s what we meant to say; but we didn’t realize the confusion until Jenn brought it up.

In the section, “Why There Are No Missing Links,”<sup>9</sup> we tried to point out Coyne’s contradictions. For example, in one sentence he said the fossil record is “indisputable evidence” for evolution, and in the next sentence he said the fossil record is so sparse and incomplete that “we can’t yet trace out a continuous lineage.” We reported that (1) he said the fossil record is good enough to prove evolution beyond any doubt and (2) he said the fossil record isn’t good enough to actually show evolution.—It is easy to see how it might appear that we were making contradictory reports. One would naturally assume that Coyne consistently said the fossil record is sufficient or insufficient. So, when we reported Coyne’s contradictory positions on the fossil record, it might have appeared that we were the ones making contradictory statements.

### SARCASM

Sometimes we use sarcasm to point out the invalid logic of evolutionists. For example, near the end of *Why Evolution is False* we quoted Coyne’s foolish argument about why all the disagreement among evolutionists proves the theory must be true, and then summarized his argument by saying, “The fact that there is so much ignorance and controversy about evolution proves how true it must be. 😊” The smiley face is intended to convey the notion, “This is silly.” It is silly to say that ignorance and controversy prove that evolution is true—but Coyne said it with a straight face. He really meant it. We were pointing out the contradiction sarcastically. We don’t think ignorance proves evolution is true.

Perhaps we use sarcasm too much. It is easy to misunderstand. But sarcasm is a powerful tool for exposing foolish arguments. We would hate to give it up.

### UNFOUNDED CRITICISMS

We don’t know what Jenn thinks the “unfounded criticisms” are. We always document

<sup>9</sup> *Disclosure*, May 2009, “Why Evolution is False”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v13i8f.htm>

the evolutionary position carefully. There were 12 footnotes in part one of our review, and 22 footnotes in part two. We do this so that you can read the source material for yourself to verify that we are not misrepresenting the evolutionary position. We have no reason to challenge anything evolutionists don’t really believe. We strive to accurately portray the current evolutionary thinking, and then explain why we think it is wrong. In the end, it is really up to you to decide whether our criticisms are valid or not.

We criticize ideas—not people. Granted, some ideas are closely associated with certain people—but we don’t attack the idea by attacking the honesty, intelligence, education, or religion of the people who champion that idea. Unfortunately, it is hard to show how foolish an idea is without some of that foolishness transferring accidentally to the people holding that foolish idea. That’s why we use humor to try to soften the blows.

### JENN’S SPECIFIC ISSUES

We really appreciate email from evolutionists like Jenn who have sincere comments or questions. Unfortunately, most of the email we get from evolutionists is too vulgar to print. We asked Jenn to elaborate on the debates she heard in her class, and she kindly obliged.

There are also unexplainable issues in creationism that have sparked debates. Atavism and vestigial features, as well as homologous features, were among these issues. There is absolutely no reason a creature would possess such features were it created. As an example, some snakes are born with tiny pelvic bones. What would the point of this be? If every creature were truly created, would they not be perfect? Of course, I am biased since I do not believe in a creator.

### GOD WOULD NOT DO THAT

The fundamental proposition that sparked debates in Jenn’s biology class is, “I don’t believe that the God I don’t believe in, would have done it that way.” It is a religious, not scientific, argument. She asks, “If every creature were truly created, would they not be perfect?” Biblical creationists have a religious answer for that. They say that every creature was created perfect, but when Adam and Eve sinned, the world was cursed (causing thorns and weeds to appear). Biblical creationists use Genesis 3 to explain imperfection. We don’t.

What does any speculation about the God of Abraham have to do with evolution? Why isn’t Zeus mentioned? Why don’t evolutionists argue that evolution must be true because Zeus would not have put certain bones in a snake? What one

thinks of Zeus, or the God of Abraham, has nothing to do with whether or not the theory of evolution is true. But evolutionists can't help bringing religion into it because if they are constrained to defend evolution with purely scientific arguments, they don't have much to say.

That's why we, on the other hand, use the Second Law of Thermodynamics to answer Jenn's question. The Second Law encapsulates the scientific observation that things naturally fall apart—they don't naturally fall together. For example, my old truck has an entertainment system in which the CD player no longer works (but the radio still does). The CD player doesn't work anymore because of the Second Law, not because of God's curse. Why did Ford put a CD player that doesn't work in my truck? Ford didn't. The CD player just broke because things naturally break.

The living things we observe today are imperfect because every generation provides an opportunity for imperfection to creep in and make them fall apart. Just as every time a manuscript is copied, it creates an opportunity for an error to be made. Every time a cell reproduces there is an opportunity for a mistake to be made in the DNA.

Vestigial organs (such as the human appendix, which now seems to play only a minor role in human health) might at one time have served a much greater purpose, but no longer do because of devolution (not evolution). That is, some random mutation to a particular gene might have prevented the appendix from reaching its full potential, and that random mutation was inherited by subsequent human beings because the degradation was not sufficiently harmful for natural selection to weed it out.

It is certainly possible that a future mutation might reverse the genetic error which has inhibited the original function of the appendix, causing the appendix to regain the ability to do something it cannot do now. Sometimes two wrongs do make a right. (This is called "atavism" or "throwback.")

But even if a mutation restores a capability that previously had been lost, the question still remains, "How did that functionality arise in the first place?" The functionality had to exist before a minor genetic error caused it to be lost before an opposite genetic error corrected the mistake.

If the CD player in my truck doesn't work because a connection came loose, it is possible that a bump in the road might make the loose wires touch, and the CD player might start working again. That's atavism—but that doesn't prove that driving over a bumpy road created the CD player in the first place.

Jeff's excellent response to the atavism argument is found in his email, "Does Atavism Prove Evolution?" in our January, 2013, newsletter.<sup>10</sup>

Jenn's question, "Why would God create something imperfect?" can be turned around. Why would evolution create something imperfect? Evolutionists generally argue that, since evolution is an unguided, accidental process, one should not expect it to produce anything perfect. If evolution stumbles upon something that is good enough to survive, there is no reason for it to continue on toward perfection. (That was the evolutionist's point in last month's *Evolution in the News* column.<sup>11</sup>) Good enough is good enough. But then, at other times, evolutionists recognize the amazing ability of some living thing, and then claim this is proof of how powerful evolution is—it can produce something far better than "good enough to survive."

## HOMOLOGY

The homology argument just says things that are similar must have evolved from a close common ancestor. The last several newsletters have addressed the homology issue, usually at the genetic level. We devoted an entire article<sup>12</sup> to the issue 11 years ago, so there isn't anything more we want to say about it this month.

## OLD ARGUMENTS

We've been publishing this newsletter for more than 18 years. The answers to all the old standard evolutionists' arguments (like atavism, vestigial organs, and homology) can be found in past newsletters. You can go to the Topical Index of our website<sup>13</sup> and use the search box to search our website for keywords (like "atavism"), or take one of the links to 9 topic areas (Age of the Earth, Astronomy, Biology, Evolution in General, Faith or Science?, Human Evolution, Humor, Origin of Life, or Rocks and Fossils) for lists of titles of well over 600 articles in past newsletters.

Each month we like to alert you to the latest research, rather than rehashing the same old arguments. But, if you are a new reader, and those old arguments are new to you, we hope you will go back and read our past issues dealing with old evolutionary problems.

<sup>10</sup> <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v17i4e.htm>

<sup>11</sup> *Disclosure*, March 2015, "Unchanging Bacteria", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v19i6n.htm>

<sup>12</sup> *Disclosure*, March, 2004, "Comparative Anatomy", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v8i6f.htm>

<sup>13</sup> <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/topics.htm>

# HUMAN EVOLUTION PROVED!

(APRIL FOOL)

<http://crev.info/2014/04/human-evolution-proved-april-fool/>

## *Creation Evolution Headlines*

This month's web site review looks at an article from the Creation Evolution Headlines website. Since April 1<sup>st</sup> is April Fool's Day, I thought it would be interesting to find an article about creation and evolution and April Fools. This is the article that appeared in a web search.

The article begins with the observation that "Anyone who thinks the evidence for gradual human evolution is unmistakable should look at recent literature by secular experts." What follows is a discussion that racial characteristics are recent. References and links are presented from *PNAS* (*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*), *Science Now*, *Science Daily* and *Nature*. Interesting observations are made regarding the observed changes in European skin color in the past 5000 years.

The next topic discussed is that domestication is recent. An article from *PhysOrg* is referenced that "places the domestication of cattle within the last 10,000 years in the Middle East." The article states, "one wonders what cavemen were doing for many tens of thousands of years before that."

Neanderthal news is presented next. Numerous links to papers are presented to assert that "Neanderthal is a questionable category."

Many other interesting topics are addressed in this article. Near the end of the article you will find a section with the title the story goes on. As the reader probably knows, evolutionists are not giving up. To show this, articles for *Nature* and *PhysOrg* are referenced.

The article discussed for this web site review was published on April 1, 2014. If you want to read more recent articles found on this web site just click on the home tab found on the top page of the site. Here you will find the NEWEST HEADLINES. There is a link to view excerpts that provides a brief summary of the article mentioned in the headline.

As with most web sites, there is much to explore on this web site. Just select a topic of interest such as Space, Physical Science, Biology, Microbiology, Humanity, Origins and others to begin a search for articles you may find interesting.



**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](http://ScienceAgainstEvolution.info).