

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 20 Issue 2 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info November 2015

A “NOBEL” ARGUMENT AGAINST EVOLUTION

This year's Nobel Prize for chemistry spells trouble for evolution.

Tomas Lindahl, Paul Modrich, and Aziz Sancar won this year's Chemistry Nobel Prize in recognition of their mechanistic studies of DNA repair. Their discoveries raise issues about some of the fundamental assumptions of the theory of evolution.

There are two fundamental assumptions at the base of the theory of evolution. One has to do with the origin of the genetic code. The other has to do with genetic mutation. The fallacies in both of these assumptions are evident in light of the research that won this year's Nobel Prize in chemistry.

ORIGIN OF DNA

Since evolutionists always complain when we talk about the impossibility of the spontaneous origin of life, let's give them the first living cell. We generously grant the assumption that Frankencell somehow came to life all by itself (without the aid of a mad scientist and deformed lab assistant), and allow that Frankencell had some DNA. Would the DNA in a primitive cell last long enough to keep the cell alive all by itself? This year's Nobel Prize makes it doubtful.

Life has survived through the ages because enzymes inside every cell ensure that DNA remains in proper working order. This year's Nobel Prize in chemistry, announced 7 October [2015], recognizes three scientists who discovered key mechanisms for fixing the damage. “These are classic studies and a great prize for DNA repair,” says Jacqueline Barton, a chemist at California Institute of Technology in Pasadena.

The discoveries were made in the 1970s and

1980s by Paul Modrich of Duke University School of Medicine in Durham, North Carolina; Aziz Sancar of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill—the first Turkish scientist to receive a Nobel—and Tomas Lindahl of the Francis Crick Institute at Clare Hall Laboratory in Hertfordshire, U.K.¹

These discoveries were made 41 years ago, and are just being recognized now. What took so long?

Biologists have long known that DNA wasn't rock solid. Blasts of xrays [*sic*], for example, could cause mutations in cells. Yet most researchers believed that the molecule was inherently stable. After all, cancer and other genetic malfunctions are the exception, not the rule.

As a postdoc in the late 1960s, however, Lindahl began to have doubts. Samples of RNA in his experiments rapidly degraded when heated. Further experiments showed that even under normal conditions, DNA quickly suffered enough damage to make life impossible.²

In other words, inside a cell, DNA is stable; but outside the cell, DNA and RNA degrade quickly. There has to be something inside the cell that protects the DNA from falling apart.

Lindahl began to search for enzymes that might repair this unseen damage. ... Lindahl discovered a process, now called base excision

¹ Stokstad, *Science*, 16 October 2015, “DNA's repair tricks win chemistry's top prize”,

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/350/6258/266.full>
² *Ibid.*

repair, in which enzymes continually spot and replace such interloper bases. He and colleagues described the mechanism in 1974.

At about this time, Sancar, ... uncovered another repair mechanism, **nucleotide excision repair**, which allows cells to fix a different kind of damage from the one Lindahl studied, using different enzymes.

Modrich tackled **a third source of error**: mistakes that happen during replication, when the two strands of DNA unzip and are copied. ... Enzymes efficiently fix these errors—and Modrich helped figure out how it happens. In the late 1970s ...

Many other mechanisms also fix faulty DNA, and many other researchers have made **key contributions** to their study. That fact has raised the inevitable question of **who should have won the Nobel for DNA repair**.³

DNA is so fragile that it needs more than three different enzyme processes to keep it from falling apart. Therefore, **when Frankencell miraculously came into existence**, it not only had to have functional DNA, it also needed several kinds of enzymes working to hold the DNA together long enough to survive.

The indisputable, observational evidence is that a living cell needs several complex processes operating simultaneously to keep it alive. It is hard enough to believe that these processes could come about by chance sequentially over a long period of time. It is even **harder to believe that all the necessary processes happened simultaneously by chance at exactly the right time**. There is no simple step-by-step way in which primitive life could have evolved. Several enzymes had to be there, fully functional, in order to hold the DNA together long enough for the simplest life to continue to live.

This has been known for decades. Not only that, it has been known **by so many scientists** that it was hard to decide who should get the credit for discovering it.

GENETIC MUTATION

The theory of evolution depends upon genetic change filtered by natural selection to produce **organisms more capable of survival**. **Darwin believed that diet, exercise, and climate caused adaptations that could be inherited**. Scientists now know acquired characteristics are not inheritable. Working out at the gym might make my muscles bigger and my tummy tighter, but it won't affect the physique of my children. That's why **Darwinian evolution was replaced by Neo-Darwinian evolution**.

In Neo-Darwinian evolution, random mutations to the DNA are assumed to produce the variations which are filtered by natural selection to produce organisms more capable of survival. But **what scientists have known for decades** (which has now finally been acknowledged by the award of the Chemistry Nobel Prize) **is that most mutations are fatal, and cells need several complex enzyme mechanisms which repair most mutations as soon as they occur**.

The Neo-Darwinian Theory depends upon lots of random mutations for evolution to occur. Why would cells have evolved methods to prevent DNA changes? **Why would cells evolve a defense against evolution?** That doesn't make much sense!

Email

ZOMBIE EVOLUTION

Some evolutionary arguments are like undead zombies, which never really die.

If George's email had not come a few days before Halloween, we might not have made the connection between belief in the theory of evolution and belief in zombies—but it did. We also realized that lots of people search for information on zombies on the Internet, which gave us a brilliant idea.

This essay is not a vile attempt to malign evolutionists by comparing people who believe in evolution with people who believe in zombies. No, no, no! **This is a clever attempt to get Internet search engines to put this article at the top of their list** by using words like "undead", "zombie," "apocalypse," and the phrase "zombie apocalypse" gratuitously and unnecessarily as many times as possible in the title, abstract, and first two paragraphs! ☺ Hopefully, many people who would not otherwise read this article will stumble on it by accident because it compares obsolete evolutionary arguments to undead zombies in an apocalyptic manner.

UNDEAD ZOMBIE ARGUMENTS

It all began when George wrote us this email:

I cannot tell you where all life came from.

What I can tell you is

a) one can measure evolution in a

³ *Ibid.*

laboratory in an afternoon
b) most DNA is blank and unused, as a pre-caution against replication errors propagating into living organisms.
This is demonstrated in any American Chemical Society program in undergraduate biochemistry program[s] since the 70's.
Stick to electronics.

OBSERVABLE EVOLUTION

Macroevolution has never been measured in a laboratory over any period of time, certainly not in a single afternoon. George has been misled by evolutionists' intentionally inconsistent use of the word "evolution." They use the word "evolution" to mean "any kind of change," which certainly can be seen and measured in nature and in the laboratory. Having established the fact that "evolution has been observed," the word "evolution" is also used to mean a different kind of change—specifically the change of one form of life into another form of life. That's the kind of evolution we are talking about, which has never been observed or measured.

The Model-T Ford evolved into the Ford Mustang. You can easily see and measure the differences—but that doesn't mean the Model-T. rex evolved into the Mustang horse. The fact that a primitive car evolved into a more advanced car does not prove any primitive animal evolved into a more advanced animal.

It is true that the Long Term Evolution Experiment (LTEE) observed changes in characteristics of a particular kind of bacterium; but even that experiment never observed bacteria changing into any other forms of life. (We wrote about that experiment in detail seven years ago.⁴) If a bacterium could evolve into something other than a bacterium, the LTEE had the best chance of observing it because of the huge number of generations which arise in a short period of time, and the intense, artificial efforts to induce mutations.

JUNK DNA

George is right that, in the 1970's, most people did think "most DNA is blank and unused."

The term "junk DNA" became popular in the 1960s. According to T. Ryan Gregory, a genomic biologist, the first explicit discussion of the nature of junk DNA was done by David Comings in 1972 and he applied the term to all noncoding DNA.⁵

⁴ *Disclosure*, August 2008, "The Long Term Evolution Experiment",

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v12i11f.htm>

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noncoding_DNA

The fact that some parts of the DNA molecule don't contain the code for producing protein doesn't mean it is "blank and unused."

Many noncoding DNA sequences have important biological functions.⁶

The fact that biologists didn't know what function the noncoding DNA sequences performed in the 1960's doesn't mean that those sequences are blank and unused. It just means arrogant biologists in the 1960's didn't recognize their own ignorance. We addressed this issue years ago, too.⁷

We sent a short email to George politely telling him that he is a little bit behind the times. Here are the pertinent portions of his response.

Gregor Mendel measured evolution in his garden. Every human being born is evolutionarily different than either of their parents.

...
To not believe in evolution is to reject science. Science is the best predictor of the future based on current knowledge, religion is the worst. It has always been a plague on mankind. The Bible and Quran have zero correct predictions and measureable [sic] events. No one ever killed someone for believing in quantum field theory.

There is just enough religion in the world to make men hate, but not enough to make them love. ~Louis Cyphre in AngelHeart

Gregor Mendel discovered and measured some laws of heredity—but not evolution. You can see from the first part of his response that he is confusing any kind of change with evolution. The second part of his response gives some insight into why he believes what he believes.

Although Uriah Smith made a compelling argument that the Bible really has made some correct predictions⁸, that's irrelevant. The famous psychic Jeanne Dixon made a correct prediction about the assassination of JFK; but that doesn't mean everything she said was true. The fact that scientists correctly predicted how much fuel it would take to fly to the moon and back doesn't prove that everything a scientist says is true. So, we ignored his irrelevant attacks on religion in our response, and just tried to point out that he was confusing heredity with evolution. His response was,

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Disclosure*, October 2012, "Another Man's Junk", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v17i1n.htm>

⁸ Uriah Smith, 1912, *Daniel and the Revelation*, http://www.amazon.com/Daniel-Revelation-Uriah-Smith-ebook/dp/B0086NEVSA/ref=sr_1_3?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1444922011&sr=1-3&keywords=uriah+smith+daniel+and+revelation

Heredity is part of evolution, but the hereditary changes at the enzymatic level have only been quantifiable ion [sic] the last 40 years or so.

I am not confuse at all in order to have macroevolution microevolution is a necessary criteria. When England started burning coal as the primary fuel instead of wood the soot output was prodigious. Many specious [sic] of moths evolved to be greyish-black when they were much lighter before. Individuals do not evolve populations evolve.

Man is evolving both sexes are slowly but surely getting taller and women are getting their periods years earlier now. Smacks of evolution to me.

When he brought up the peppered moths, we realized he was stuck back in the 20th century. The peppered moth story was debunked years ago. To our knowledge, no modern evolutionist uses that argument. It has been over a decade since we addressed that issue⁹ because we don't want to be accused of flogging a dead horse. Setting aside the questionable aspects of the experiment, the obvious fallacy is that black moths and white moths both existed at the beginning of the experiment, and black moths and white moths existed at the end of the experiment, so the experiment sheds no light at all on the origin of black or white moths. It just shows that the relative percentages of existing variations can change.

His statement that individuals do not evolve, but populations do, is correct—but not in the way he means. We've dealt with this issue in detail in the past^{10 11}, so we don't need to say much about that again. Let's just say that the German population became much less Jewish during World War II—but that doesn't mean Jews evolved into Nazis. Moths don't change color because they are eaten by birds.

We aren't bringing up the peppered moths because we want to shoot fish in a barrel. The point is that some dead arguments just won't stay dead, and hang around like zombies. We wanted to know why these arguments just won't die, so we asked George where he was getting his information. Here is his answer.

I am a mathematical physicist by training. I am just using what I remember from undergraduate chemistry I took at U of M medical school 40 years ago, but no serious scientist will lend any credence to your views which ultimately are based on religion which is belief in the absence of proof or in this case denial of truth.

⁹ Disclosure, February 2002, "Horses and Peppered Moths", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v6i5f.htm>

¹⁰ Disclosure, July 1997, "Pigeons and Sparrows", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v1i10f.htm>

¹¹ Disclosure, June 2002, "Individual Evolution", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v6i9e.htm>

Evolution is no less real because you form ridiculous arguments against it. Complex problems have simple easy to understand wrong answers. Have you ever dissected a pig? They have all the same biological structures performing the exact same functions that we do yet they are not human even though [sic] are [sic] DNA agree to more than 90%. This is some accident or intelligent design? No, it is the slow but sure process of biological evolution.

We replied,

OK. That explains why you are still using arguments that evolutionists haven't used for decades (because they were proved to be wrong long ago).

Which of our arguments are ridiculous?

No, I have never dissected a pig, but I know their anatomy is similar to humans' anatomy (and cows', and most other mammals'). That doesn't prove evolution (or intelligent design, either).

Did you read our last newsletter about The Genetic Case Against Evolution?

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/voll9-12.pdf>

The last we heard from him was,

My whole point is that all mammals have 90% or so of human DNA. Chimpanzees, our closest relative have more than 99%. This is an accident? No, it is evolution and evolutionary time scales are on the same order as very large gas giant blue stars. One can say that whales speak French at the bottom of the sea a viable assertion that science cannot refute because it has never been measured, yet I suspect it is untrue.

I will read your arguments before I refute them but I suspect serious questionable statistical conclusions. If you cannot measure it, it is not science. I personally despise all faith[s] which are nothing but superstition in fancy dress, and I only believe in what is measureable [sic]. Just what you would expect over the last 40 years of some serious scientific work.

Twice he says it isn't an accident—but evolution is based on the belief that living things are the result of accidental mutations, not design.

He says he has not yet read our arguments—but he is sure they are wrong. He is sure we are using "questionable statistics" to prove that human DNA isn't similar to chimp DNA—and he is wrong about that. We have never questioned the amount of similarity. We just question the reason for the similarity.

His statement, "If you cannot measure it, it is not science," echoes this statement by one of my favorite scientists:

If it ain't repeatable, it ain't science.¹²

The theory of evolution isn't repeatable or measurable. Therefore, it isn't science!

Email

TOYING WITH AN EVOLUTIONIST

Sometimes it is fun to see how far down the rabbit hole an evolutionist will go.

This email column summarizes 15 emails we received from Manuel. Manuel lives in Peru, and his native language is not English. Occasionally we will quote him directly, mistakes and all; but for the most part we will simply tell you what he said so his grammar mistakes will not be distracting, and unfairly make him appear to be stupid. You have to cut him some slack because he is trying to state his position in a foreign language.

There is no science in any of Manuel's emails. We repeatedly asked him for examples of scientifically inaccurate statements we have made in our newsletters, but he never gave any. His arguments in favor of evolution are all unscientific. That's because science is against evolution. He believes in evolution despite the scientific evidence against it. This column documents the irrational, irrelevant, non-scientific arguments he gave us for his belief in evolution.

AN IRRELEVANT QUESTION

The email exchange began when he asked an irrelevant question. He asked if I am the same R. David Pogge who wrote the book Turbo Charge Your Church.¹³ I told him that I am.

He responded by saying that it is terribly dishonest of us not to say that prominently on the Science Against Evolution website. I told him that we don't use Science Against Evolution to promote my personal activities. We don't use the website to advertise my other book, Ada in Action. That's why we never say that although the first edition is out of print, it still can be purchased from Amazon.com,¹⁴ and an electronic version of the

¹² Jamie Hyneman, Mythbusters, S10|E9 "Accidental Ammo", about 45 minutes into the program.

¹³ Available on-line (for free) at <http://krsf.net/tcyc/index.htm>.

¹⁴ http://www.amazon.com/ADA-Action-Practical-Programming-Examples/dp/0471607088/ref=sr_1_4?ie=UTF8&qid=

second edition can be downloaded for free from the Ada Belgium website.¹⁵ © And, I never, never, never, would even think of taking advantage of the Science Against Evolution website by mentioning my mildly amusing YouTube video in which I perform "All About That Bass"¹⁶ (guitar, that is) ☺

When I asked him to give examples of Christian bias on our website, he could not give a single example. He just insisted that since I wrote a Christian book, and produce a Christian radio program, that makes Science Against Evolution a Christian organization. I said that I also worked for the Department of Defense, the University of Nebraska, and Cerro Coso Community College—but that doesn't make those three institutions Christian organizations. That's when his email took a really bizarre turn. He wrote,

Worked for the Department of Defence, in which party administration, republican? A christian/xristian working for the same Department of "Defence" which disturb(ed) the peace of many growing nations?

Is it true that the Department of Defence isn't a christian organization, really? Aren't your page free of any christian intention or goal, are the content of your web page neutral of any christian devotional bias, are without christian bias?

The government of that Department of Defence you are talking about isn't nominally a christian organization, but it was Bush who said in his christian spirit that "Gd told him to invade Irak".

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/bush-god-told-me-to-invade-iraq-6262644.html>) using the same Department of Defence you are talking about in that purpose.

Maybe that is why We can see on the web some reports of some people claiming that they sent to you a response to some of your writings and didn't receive any reply from you about it.

He believes the U.S. Department of Defense is really a tool of the Christian church, spreading Christianity throughout the world, which must be my main motivation for working for the Navy. The fact that I needed a job when I graduated from college, and we were fighting communism in Viet Nam had nothing to do with my employment decision! ☺ I really wanted to design weapons which would drop Bible tracts all over Southeast Asia, and I knew that was what the Navy was really doing there. ☺

I decided to bait him some more (even though baiting him isn't a very Christian thing to do ☺) by

1446997889&sr=8-4&keywords=do-while+jones

¹⁵ <http://people.cs.kuleuven.be/~dirk.craeynest/ada-belgium/aia/contents.html>

¹⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6WyRlXmAVoo&feature=youtu.be>

asking, "Why can't we just examine the Theory of Evolution from a purely, secular, scientific perspective? Why bring religion into it?" His one-sentence reply was,

Are not religion here, not at all?

I told him the only time we address a religious issue is when someone emails us about it, and we say as little as possible about it as we can. I challenged him, "Do you see any Christian bias on our website? If so, what specifically?" He replied,

Did you see any christian bias in your christian brother Bush when he took his decision to destroyed many families, did you read his intentions? (Remember, that is a subtle internal phenomenon. That answer you may know better than me, because you know your intention) However I don't see scepticism in your christian-inspired patterns on your part., if so tell me: Why We can found some people claiming that you did reply their letters?

Our regular readers know we are very skeptical, and we strongly encourage our readers to question everything.

Clearly there was no point in trying to convince Manuel that the true mission of the American military is defense of the homeland, and not Christian ministry, so I didn't even try. Instead, I asked him to clarify his charge that we didn't respond to someone who wrote to us. He said that in 2006, an anonymous blogger claimed that I did not answer his email. That is most likely true; but I don't know because I don't know who that anonymous blogger was. We always respond to serious inquiries, but ignore profanity-laced hate mail from cyber-bullies trying to get us to stop publishing by telling us we are liars and fools. There is no point in writing back an email that says, "We aren't liars and fools." We just delete those emails.

That's probably what happened in 2006; but to make sure, we asked Manuel what charge the anonymous blogger made against our newsletter. If he thinks we made a factual error, we certainly will look into it. Just tell us what the error is.

(Let's digress for a moment to stress the fact that we rarely get emails questioning any of the facts in our newsletters, and we always address them when we do. Last August, Jim sent us an email questioning the equations in our February, 2001, article about "The Earth Moon System."¹⁷ He thought he had found an error and sent us his reasoning. We checked his equations, and found where he had misplaced a decimal point. We wrote back to him, and he agreed that it was his mistake, and confirmed our calculations are

correct. Since we had not made an error, there was no reason to publish Jim's email. If we had made an error, we certainly would have publicly corrected it.)

Getting back to Manuel's charge that we ignored a legitimate criticism, we asked Manuel to tell us specifically what that legitimate criticism was because we don't know.

Why are you asking me about the claims that he made (to you) to respond you? Who received his email/message? Was it me or you who received it? Or would you respond to me the claims that he sent to you? and would you do that privately? Is it not irresponsible to do that? If you respond to me, where is he to reply your claims, here? It is very easy to do that in that manner, very easy.

What is the justification now, still trivial emotional ones? If we are speaking about science, that emotional issues are irrelevant.

Manuel does not know what the anonymous blogger claimed was incorrect in one of our articles—but he is sure that blogger's claim is legitimate. Why? Because Manuel is biased. He has nothing upon which to base his belief that we are trying to cover something up.

We really don't know what the anonymous blogger said nine years ago. We hate to sound like Hillary Clinton,¹⁸ but we deleted all the irrelevant emails on our server. ☺ We are unable to produce the allegedly incriminating email.

(Digressing again, we really wish we had kept all the email received over the past 19 years so that we could do some analysis on it. It seems to me that the ratio of fan mail to hate mail has improved greatly over the past few years—but it is hard to remember exactly how many emails of which kind we received 5, 10, or 15 years ago. But, anecdotally, I can say that it seems like we get less hate mail and more fan mail now than we used to, and we do know for sure that the number of visits to the web page have remained generally constant over the last few years.)

MY PEN NAME

Since Manuel could not come up with the anonymous blogger's unsubstantiated claim that we failed to respond to a legitimate criticism, he moved on to a personal attack on my honesty.

You are not using your original name, but a pen name. Why if you are a spokesperson of a supposed scientific work would you use another name than the original one?

¹⁷ <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v5i5f.htm>

¹⁸ At the time of this writing, Democrat presidential candidate Hillary Clinton was accused of destroying incriminating emails.

He also failed to see the humor in my self-deprecating tongue-in-cheek biography.

In 1971, Do-While Jones received the degree of Bachelor of Science (with distinction) in Electrical Engineering, from a midwestern university better known for its football team than its engineering school. Since graduation he has been employed in the defense industry of a well-known free-world nation. During the course of that employment he was granted a patent for a radar signal processing algorithm.

He began his career in analog circuit design, but shifted to digital circuit design when he discovered it was easier to design digital circuits than analog circuits. Some of the digital circuits he designed were microcomputers, which he programmed in assembly language. He switched to full-time software design when he discovered programming computers was easier than building them. He then transferred to an organization that was planning a large software project because thinking about programming is easier than programming. Then he began lecturing about software engineering in general, and the Ada programming language in particular, because talking is much easier than thinking. He is now retired, doing nothing, because nothing is easier than talking.¹⁹

He knows that Do-While Jones is the pen name of R. David Pogge because it is right there on our web page. How can he say we were hiding that fact when he found it on our website? (Now I feel like Ben Carson!²⁰ ☺)

Whether or not I have used a pen name has absolutely nothing to do with whether or not the theory of evolution is true. The theory of evolution should stand or fall on its scientific merits (or lack thereof). But, to people like Manuel, my use of a pen name seems dishonest, and seems important, so it needs to be explained.

When I was employed by the Navy, the Navy encouraged its civilian engineers to publish articles to enhance the prestige of the Navy—but anything I published as a Defense Department employee had to be approved by my branch head, division head, department head, and Technical Information Department, to make sure it did not tarnish the reputation of the Navy. The approval process was so slow I would not have been able to meet the deadlines for my column in the *Journal of Pascal, Ada, and Modula-2*. Some of what I wrote was critical of the Navy software

¹⁹ <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/dwj/index.htm>

²⁰ At the time of this writing, Republican presidential candidate Ben Carson was falsely accused of making up false stories in his biography—but Carson's stories about his youth were easily proved to be true.

development process, and certainly never would have been approved for that reason alone.

At the time, I had an after-hours software engineering business. Since “do-while” has a positive connotation in software development, and is unusual as a proper name (and therefore easy to remember) and because Pogge is almost always mispronounced, I used the pen name Do-While Jones. I had a checking account and credit card in the name of Do-While Jones to keep my personal finances separate from my business expenses for tax purposes. Since I wanted to enhance the reputation of my software business, not the reputation of the Navy, I always published software articles as Do-While Jones.

Ada is an obscure computer language used primarily in large-scale mission-critical applications because it facilitates development by a large team of programmers, and prevents many interface mistakes. In 1990, if you had asked someone, “Name five Ada programmers,” most people would not have been able to name a single one. But if you found a computer programmer who actually could name five Ada programmers, three of the five names certainly would have been John Ichbiah, John Barnes, and Do-While Jones. I was an internationally known software celebrity, so posting a serious resume on my web page would have been like Meryl Streep trying to convince people she is a famous actress. Hence the whimsical biography on the website.

Because I write technical articles as Do-While Jones, perform on stage as Death Valley Dave, and produce *The Word With Us* radio programs as R. David Pogge, you might think I suffer from multiple personality disorder—but that's not true. I actually enjoy having multiple personalities! My time on Earth is too short to spend it living just one life!

NON-SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTS ARE IRRELEVANT

Let's be careful not to miss the point. The issue is, “Why does Manuel believe in evolution?” It isn't because of the science, because in 15 emails he never made a single scientific argument for evolution, despite my frequent requests that he do so. He believes in evolution because he hates George Bush and Christians.

You can't argue with closed-minded people like Manuel—so we usually don't. Month after month, we just report the most current scientific evidence against evolution so that people with open minds can make an informed decision. Occasionally, it is necessary, however, to point out that the arguments for evolution aren't scientific.

REFLECTIONS ON EVOLUTION VS. CREATION

<http://www.ichthus.info/Evolution/evol-vs-creation.html>

“The mind, like a parachute, works best when it’s OPEN.”

This month’s website review looks at a website whose writer presents a number of evidences that he feels are highly relevant for the Evolution vs. Creation debate.

The website starts by making some observations about the bias that most people have based on their personal beliefs. It is pointed out that these beliefs may be right or wrong and it is important “to have an open mind that allows one to re-examine one’s bias in the light of new evidence that one learns.”

Next there is a brief discussion about intelligence. “You should USE it...and form your own opinions BASED on FACTS.” You should “get ALL the facts – and when NEW FACTS are discovered, include them and RE-EVALUATE your evidences.”

This is followed by a discussion of Irreducible Complexity and Random Converging Evolutionary Processes. Under the heading of “Irreducible Complexity: Very Very Unlikely CHAIN of Evolutionary Events,” you will find a description of Irreducible Complex Systems. The Biochemist Dr. Michael Behe, in his book Darwin’s Black Box, described the characteristics of these types of systems. “Behe used the mouse trap to illustrate his concept of ‘irreducible complexity.’” All parts (hammer, hold-down bar, spring, catch and platform) are required for a mouse trap to function. “Behe (and many other researchers) have found systems in living organisms that consist of MANY different components and the omission of ANY ONE component renders the system ENTIRELY USELESS.”

Another example of “Irreducible Complexity” is the Bombardier Beetle and it is described in detail in the web page.

Several examples of Random Converging Evolutionary Processes are presented next. This term may be new to some readers but you will find a plain explanation why evolutionists now use it to try to explain why animals that look alike can have a completely different genome.

Near the end of the web page you will find a description of the *E. Coli* bacterium’s flagellum. This super-power molecular engine is indeed a marvel of nature. To believe it came about by random processes seems very unlikely.



**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.