

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 20 Issue 4 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info January 2016

TOP EVOLUTION STORIES IN 2015

Three science tabloids picked the top evolution stories.

Here's our review of 2015's top evolution stories as determined by three science tabloids.

The three stories about evolution that made *Science News*' list of top 25 science stories in 2015 were #3 (*Homo naledi*), #8 (Lokiarchaeota) and #22 (*E. coli* mistake). *Discover*'s top 100 list included #2 (*Homo naledi*), #6 (prehistoric tool making), #12 (Brontosaurus), #20 (Chilesaurus), #28 (oldest *Homo* fossil), #38 (frilled dinosaurs), #40 (SETI), #53 (Little Foot), #61 (Pulanesaura), #65 (*Australopithecus deyiremeda*), #71 (life on Europa), #73 (soft dinosaur tissue), #75 (octopus genome), #81 (*Ichibengops*), #99 (four-legged snake fossil). Not content to limit itself to 2015, *Scientific American* looked back over their entire 170 years of publishing in their retrospective of most important science articles.

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN'S PICKS

Scientific American picked only 11 significant evolution stories over the past 170 years—none of which were less than 10 years old, and none of which were very important, so let's mention them briefly just to get them out of the way.

(1) In 1877, they reprinted an article from *Mind* in which Charles Darwin noticed that some children develop their intellect faster than others. (2) In 1950, Dobzhansky discovered that creatures are influenced by heredity and environment; which is significant, but hardly qualifies as an evolution story. (3) In 1958, Lorenz claimed that behavior evolves, too. (4) In 1978, they published an article saying that natural selection operates on groups rather than individuals. (5) In 1959, they examined how much public acceptance of evolution had increased since the 1925 Scopes Monkey Trial. (6) In 1982, they did a story on the Leakey family and their fossil discoveries. (7) In 1994, they presented Stephen Jay Gould's Punctuated Equilibrium theory, which was an attempt to explain why the

fossil record isn't consistent with Darwin's notion of gradual evolution. (8) In 2000, *Scientific American* published Tattersall's controversial notion that there wasn't a simple, linear evolution from ape-like ancestor to modern man. (9) In 2002, their Editor-in-Chief, John Rennie, published his "15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense," in which he presented 15 good arguments against the theory of evolution, and failed to refute any of them.¹ (10) In 2005, they covered the troubling (to evolutionists) discovery of *Homo floresiensis* months after we reported how it was inconsistent with the prevailing theory of human evolution.² (11) Also in 2005, they claimed that penguins are a poor example of intelligent design, because it is stupid for them to live in Antarctica the way they do.

Apparently, they thought their January, 2008, inane article titled, "Cooking Up Bigger Brains," wasn't worth mentioning—but we did!³ Were they too embarrassed to mention their January, 2009, "SPECIAL ISSUE on the Most Powerful Idea in Science" devoted to evolution? We had a field day with that one!⁴ What about their 2014 "Special Evolution Issue" devoted to "How We Became Human," in which they said practically everything previously believed about human evolution was wrong? We loved that issue!⁵

¹ Please see our July and August, 2002, issues of *Disclosure* titled "No Nonsense", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v6i10f.htm> and "No Nonsense - Part 2", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v6i11f.htm>

² *Disclosure*, November 2004, "*Homo floresiensis*", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v9i2n.htm>

³ *Disclosure*, February, 2008, "Half-baked Evolution", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v12i5n.htm>

⁴ *Disclosure*, January 2009, "*Scientific American's* Evolution Issue",

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v13i4f.htm>

⁵ *Disclosure*, September 2014, "Wrong All Along",

Scientific American began publishing 14 years before Darwin's theory was published, and they thought only 11 of their evolution articles were worth mentioning in their 170-year retrospective. Maybe they are finally realizing that twenty-first century scientific evidence is overwhelmingly against the theory of evolution! They didn't mention any of the stories *Science News* and *Discover* thought were important last year.

HOMO NALEDI AND STONE TOOLS

Science News thought that the third most important science story in 2015 had to do with the discovery of new hominid fossils. The printed version of the story, on page 19 of the December 26 issue was titled, "New *Homo* species hauled from a cave in South Africa—Origins of the genus remain fuzzy." The on-line version of the story was titled, "Year in review: Early human kin could shake up family tree—Origins of the genus remain fuzzy." They were talking about the discovery of *Homo naledi*, which we told you about in October.⁶ The first paragraph of the story is fascinating.

Scientists trying to untangle the human evolutionary family's ancient secrets welcomed a new set of tantalizing and controversial finds this year. A series of fossil discoveries offered potentially important insights into the origins of the human genus, *Homo*. Most notably, a group of South African fossils triggered widespread excitement accompanied by head-scratching and vigorous debate.⁷

This introduction was amusing because, as we told you last October, professional scientists didn't welcome the discovery at all. The two main professional journals, *Science* and *Nature*, dismissed it as unimportant. Yes, *National Geographic* and *Nova* made a big deal about it—but they were the ones who paid for the research, so they weren't biased at all! ☺

Because it was a year-end review, most of the *Science News* article was a reprint of previously published material; but they did throw in one new piece of information.

There's one big discovery this year that scientists can agree on: The making of stone tools originated before the *Homo* genus did. Sonia Harmand of Stony Brook University in

New York led a project that unearthed 3.3-million-year-old stone implements in Kenya (*SN*: 6/13/15, p. 6), clear evidence that East African hominids from Lucy's era made them too. Until Harmand's report, stone tools had been dated to no more than about 2.6 million years ago.⁸

Here's the picture that "proves" it:



It is obviously a tool that is obviously 3.3 million years old! ☺ It must have been a really good tool because it held its edge so well for 3.3 million years! (I wish the tools in my workshop would stay sharp for 3.3 million years! ☺)

The casual reader might not notice that the *Homo naledi* fossils were found in South Africa, and this "tool" was found in Kenya (which is nowhere near South Africa), so it has absolutely nothing to do with *Homo naledi*. Why connect the two stories the way *Science News* did?

Discover thought both stories were important, but correctly treated them separately as stories #2 and #6 on their list. *Discover* gave a better summary of the *Homo naledi* discovery.

Media hoopla surrounding speculation about *H. naledi*'s behavior distracted attention from what made the discovery so scientifically important: the unprecedented quantity of bones. Ancient hominin fossils are rare, and those from early members of our own genus, *Homo*, are rarer still. So it is all the more astonishing that Berger's team recovered more than 1,500 fossils, from 15 individuals, including a fully articulated hand — the first ever found for early *Homo*.

H. naledi has a mix of primitive and modern anatomy, with an upper body suited for climbing trees and a lower body, particularly its

<http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v18i12f.htm>

⁶ *Disclosure*, October 2015, "Homo naledi",

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v20i1n.htm>

⁷ Bruce Bower, *Science News*, December 15, 2015, "Year in review: Early human kin could shake up family tree",

<https://www.sciencenews.org/node/191200?mode=pick&context=166>

⁸ *ibid.*

feet, capable of walking long distances. The stunner is *H. naledi*'s cranium: It's shaped like the later, more advanced *Homo erectus*, but — with less than half the volume of our own — is tiny for its 5-foot-tall body.

...
The team will attempt to establish the fossils' age through alternative methods in the coming months. The information is crucial for understanding whether *H. naledi* is a primitive human displaying a behavior otherwise unknown until much later in hominin evolution, or a relatively modern human with a primitive anatomy that challenges conventional ideas about how our genus developed.

Regardless of the age, Berger said earlier this year, before publishing the *H. naledi* discovery, the fossils will force paleoanthropology to rethink long-held theories about human evolution.⁹

Regarding the rock found in Kenya, if this rock really is a tool (as *Discover* believes it to be) and if the rock really is 3.3 million years old (as *Discover* believes it to be) then man was not the first primate to use tools. Apes beat us to it!

"The main point," says Skinner, "is that there was no *Homo* around [3.3 million years ago], so it would either need to be *Australopithecus* or *Kenyanthropus* who made those tools."¹⁰

In summary, 2015 was a bad year for the theory of human evolution because everything discovered was inconsistent with the previously held story.

LOKIARCHAEOTA

Science News' eighth most important science story had to do with the discovery of Lokiarchaeota last May. The title for the printed version of the story was "Reinventing the treetop of life." On-line, the story was given the title, "Microbe discoveries spur rethink of treetop of life." We didn't tell you about it last May because we thought it was too stupid to report. It didn't make *Discover*'s list of the top 100 stories of 2015, either.

Researchers discovered the new phylum of microbes, dubbed Lokiarchaeota, by screening

⁹ Russ Juskalia, *Discover*, January/February 2016, "#2 *Homo naledi* and the Chamber of Secrets", <http://discovermagazine.com/2016/janfeb/2-homo-naledi>

¹⁰ Hillary Waterman, *Discover*, January/February 2016, "#6 History's New Oldest Tools", <http://discovermagazine.com/2016/janfeb/6-tool-times-new-start-date>

DNA from sediment (*SN*: 5/30/15, p. 6). Though no one has identified an actual cell yet, the new phylum appears to mingle genes similar to those in modern eukaryotes and genes from archaea, the sister group to bacteria. Analyses suggest the cells have dynamic structures that could have engulfed bacteria long ago.¹¹

According to *Science News*, nobody found a cell, but the structure of the cells they didn't find was analyzed! ☺ We had to go back to the actual report in *Nature* to get the straight scoop. The abstract of the *Nature* article says,

The origin of the eukaryotic cell remains one of the most contentious puzzles in modern biology. Recent studies have provided support for the emergence of the eukaryotic host cell from within the archaeal domain of life, but the identity and nature of the putative archaeal ancestor remain a subject of debate. Here we describe the discovery of 'Lokiarchaeota', a novel candidate archaeal phylum, which forms a monophyletic group with eukaryotes in phylogenomic analyses, and whose genomes encode an expanded repertoire of eukaryotic signature proteins that are suggestive of sophisticated membrane remodelling capabilities.¹²

Despite what your college biology textbook says, nobody knows how eukaryotic cells originated. They didn't know when the textbook was written, and they still don't know now. Here's what they did to try to find out:

A 2-m long gravity core (GC14) was retrieved from the Arctic Mid-Ocean Ridge during summer 2010 (approximately 15 km north-northwest of the active venting site Loki's Castle; 3283 m below sea level; 73.763167 N, 8.464000 E) (Fig. 1a). ... To obtain sufficient amounts of genomic DNA for sequencing library preparation, new sample material was obtained from the 75-cm-b.s.f. layer of gravity core GC14 in summer 2013.¹³

Scientists took a sample of mud from under the Arctic Ocean in 2010, and extracted DNA from

¹¹ Susan Milius, *Science News*, December 15, 2015, "Year in review: Microbe discoveries spur rethink of treetop of life", <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/year-review-microbe-discoveries-spur-rethink-treetop-life?mode=pick&context=166>

¹² Anja Spang, *et al.*, *Nature*, 14 May 2015, "Complex archaea that bridge the gap between prokaryotes and eukaryotes", <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v521/n7551/full/nature14447.html>

¹³ *ibid.*

the mud in 2013. DNA is notoriously fragile—but they believe they kept it preserved well enough for three years for their results to be valid. They admit,

The amount of genomic data obtained for the Loki2/3 lineages was too low to perform detailed gene content analyses.¹⁴

Although phylogenetic analyses failed to resolve most of the deeper nodes, several of the eukaryotic small GTPase families appear to share a common ancestry with Lokiarchaeal GTPases (Fig. 3c), suggesting an archaeal origin of specific subgroups of the eukaryotic small GTPases, followed by independent expansions in eukaryotes and Lokiarchaeota. This scenario contrasts with previous studies that have suggested that eukaryotic small GTPases were acquired from the alphaproteobacterial progenitor of mitochondria.¹⁵

A major portion of the article tries to justify their statistical approach to guessing heritage; but every poker player knows that even though the statistics correctly say his opponent probably won't draw to an inside straight, his opponent might draw the card he needs to do it. Even when statistics are correct, the result might not be the most probable outcome.

The “take-away” from this article is, “The origin of the eukaryotic cell remains one of the most contentious puzzles in modern biology.”

THE *E. COLI* MISTAKE

Number 22 on *Science News*' list of top 25 news stories has to do with “The Long Term Evolution Experiment (LTEE)” which we told you about in August, 2008.¹⁶ *Discover* magazine did not include it in their top 100 stories.

The LTEE was investigating whether or not *E. coli* bacteria would consistently evolve the ability to digest citrate. Unlike most evolutionists, they were trying to use real science to do a repeatable experiment! (Bravo to them!) They were trying to get the same evolutionary event to happen twice. They thought they succeeded—but it turned out that they didn't.

A die-off of bacteria that had been growing for thousands of generations in a carefully controlled lab experiment offered an evolutionary lesson this year: Survival depends

not only on fitness but also on luck.

For more than a quarter century, evolutionary biologist Richard Lenski and colleagues have been growing 12 flasks of *E. coli* at Michigan State University. About 31,000 generations in, some of the bacteria in one flask evolved the ability to use a chemical called citrate as an energy source. Bacteria in that flask that couldn't eat citrate went extinct, seemingly because they had been outcompeted, the scientists thought.

But when Lenski and his team replayed evolution, reviving samples stored before the non-citrate eaters vanished, these bacteria survived 40 out of 40 times in a mixed population. An unknown lab accident probably finished them off the first time around, the team concluded this year (*SN*: 9/19/15, p. 11). Unlike in the real world, these bacteria are getting another shot at survival. A 13th flask has been added to the experiment.¹⁷

Let's give them credit for admitting their mistake.

SOFT DINOSAUR TISSUE

The 73rd most important story on *Discover*'s list had to do with a surprising discovery of a dinosaur claw with tissue that had remained soft for 75 million years. We've been following stories like this one since May, 1999.¹⁸ “Real” scientists (not creation scientists ☺) have been finding dinosaur fossils with soft tissues for 25 years, and still won't consider the obvious conclusion—that the bones aren't millions of years old. Instead, they keep looking for the Fountain of Youth which keeps these ancient bones so young-looking.

THE OCTOPUS GENOME

The 75th most important story on *Discover*'s list was the decoding of the octopus genome. We thought it was much more important than that,

¹⁷ Tina Hesman Saey, *Science News*, December 25, 2015, “#22 Year in review: Fluke extinction surprises lab—Accident, not competition, wiped out *E. coli*”, page 32, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/year-review-fluke-extinction-surprises-lab?mode=pick&context=166>

¹⁸ *Disclosure*, May 1999, “Dinosaur Blood and DNA”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v3i8f.htm>; *Disclosure*, October 1999, “We Dug Dinos - Part 2”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v4i1f.htm>; *Disclosure*, April 2005, “Surprising Dinosaurs”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v9i7n.htm>; *Disclosure*, May 2008, “No Longer Expelled”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v12i8n2.htm>; *Disclosure*, September 2008, “Sliming Soft Tissue”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v12i12f.htm>

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *Disclosure*, August 2008, “The Long Term Evolution Experiment”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v12i11f.htm>

which is why we covered it in our *Evolution in the News* column last September.¹⁹ The octopus genome wasn't anything like evolutionists expected it to be.

LIFE IN OUTER SPACE

Stories #40 and #71 on *Discover's* list had to do with the search for life on other planets—as if finding life on other planets would prove that it evolved there and wasn't created there. Spoiler Alert: They still haven't found any life out there.

FOSSILS

Eight of the stories on *Discover's* list (#12, #20, #38, #53, #61, #65, #81, and #99) had to do with fossils. They were all pretty much the same. Somebody found a bone fragment somewhere that looked a lot like—but not exactly like—something else. So, they imagined the unknown creature from which it supposedly came.

Discover's description of what happened with *Brontosaurus* is somewhat disingenuous.

In 1883, *Brontosaurus excelsus* — the first long-necked, whip-tailed sauropod to be reconstructed from a fossilized partial skeleton — captured the public's imagination. But that specimen was found at the peak of the heated "Bone Wars," when scientific rigor often took a back seat to finding and naming the most fossils the fastest.

As early as 1903, paleontologists began questioning the validity of *Brontosaurus* as a species. Skeptics claimed the animal was merely an adult *Apatosaurus*, another sauropod.²⁰

It wasn't just a few skeptics who believed *Brontosaurus* was simply an *Apatosaurus* body with a *Camarasaurus* skull. That's been the orthodox scientific consensus for a long time.

The *Discover* article says that a new analysis of the original skeleton, using different statistical analysis methods, shows that *Brontosaurus* was not an *Apatosaurus*.

We aren't going to take sides on this issue. Our point is simply that this article shows the classification of fossils is purely a matter of opinion. Different people, using different analysis methods, come up with different conclusions. There is no science here—just opinions.

¹⁹ *Disclosure*, September 2015, "The Octopus Genome",

<http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v19i12n1.htm>

²⁰ Gemma Tarlach, *Discover*, January/February 2016, "#12 Bully for *Brontosaurus*", page 22,

<http://discovermagazine.com/2016/janfeb/12-bully-for-brontosaurus>

The article blamed the controversy on "the heated 'Bone Wars,' when scientific rigor often took a back seat to finding and naming the most fossils the fastest," as if it doesn't still happen today. But the other seven stories about fossils (#20, #38, #53, #61, #65, #81, and #99) weren't written during the "heated Bone Wars" of the nineteenth century. They were written in 2015. In each of them, a paleontologist claims that the bone he found came from a previously unknown species, which he discovered and has the right to name. The Bone Wars are still going on in the twenty-first century!

But even if these bones came from previously unknown species, they don't prove evolution. They prove extinction. They prove that something that lived in the past has gone extinct because it wasn't able to evolve enough to survive.

Evolutionists claim that these extinct creatures really did evolve, and they evolved so much we don't even recognize them in their evolved form! Our feeble intellect prevents us from realizing that a hummingbird actually evolved from a huge theropod dinosaur! ☺

Email

MICHAEL'S CLARIFICATIONS

Did Michael really say that?

Joseph thought we misrepresented Michael's position in our last newsletter. He wrote to say,

In "Anti-science," you wrote, "He thinks there have been scientific experiments which prove all known gods don't exist."

I think you are misrepresenting his position, since what he wrote is, ". . . it is the scientific [sic] method that can prove that all known Gods (if they can be precisely [sic] defined) are just myths."

I think he is saying that, if you can define a god precisely enough, then the scientific method could prove its existence or lack thereof. Even if he is wrong, I do not think he means that we have done experiments to prove that thus and such god does not exist.

Joseph might be right; but rather than argue with Joseph about it, we asked Michael. We forwarded Joseph's email to Michael (with the address headers removed for privacy) and added, "Is he right? Or am I?" Here is his complete response:

I don't know if God/s have been put to thorough scientific analysis as this could only be done after we define what God is. i.e. what are the

characteristics that can be tested?

Most atheists have in fact put God (as they understand him) to a loose scientific analysis (along the lines of my previous email) and have come to the conclusion that he is just a myth.

I personally would love for a God to exist, and for Him to bring justice and fairness to this world, in our lifetime rather than after we die (the later of which can't be tested).

Most (if not all) atheists including myself (Greek Orthodox) started out [sic] as Christians/Muslims/etc, due to parental indoctrination, but after growing [sic] up and thinking for themselves, come to the conclusion that what they were told was just a myth.

The reality is that all animals (including humans) survive by killing other animals, sometimes of their own kind. What sort of justice is that?

Is that the perfect design of a powerful [sic] loving God?

Think about it and see what conclusion you reach. Don't just blindly believe what is in the Bible or the Koran or whatever.

His first paragraph seems to agree with Joseph, but his second paragraph seems to agree with me. So, just to be perfectly clear, I wrote back, "So, you think there COULD be scientific experiments to prove no gods exist; but they haven't been done. Is that correct?" He replied,

I am saying that **if the characteristics of a God can be precisely defined** [bold emphasis is his] then the scientific method can be applied to see if such characteristics are supported by real life observations (evidence).

eg: 1. The Christian God supposedly [sic] created the world in seven days.

But what solid evidence is there to verify that (other than words in a book)? None. Hence FAILs on this proposition. [Color emphasis is his.]

2. God created the world for us and loves us and is powerful [sic] (can do anything). But just look at the real world: We live on a crust (plates) that are in constant motion, leading to earth quakes, tsunamis and other natural disasters. Thousands of innocent [sic] people die every year and God is overseeing all this mayhem and is doing nothing about it. Hence FAILs on this proposition. [Color emphasis is his.]

If you can define God's characteristics and put them to such scrutiny, my guess is that he/she will fail and be proven to be a hoax.

Unfortunately many good people have fallen for this hoax which is self perpetuating [sic], because one of the duties of any Christian (or Muslim/Hindu? etc) is to spread their beliefs to others.

I am sure you are a very good person and genuinely believe in your God, but that is only because you have not put your beliefs to scientific scrutiny.

I can also tell you that if you accept reality and come to the realization that there is no God, you will continue to go [sic] a good person (maybe even a better person), and you

will not become a savage or go to hell. You don't need the fear of God to be a good person.

Regards,
Michael

UNNECESSARY EXPERIMENTS

He guesses the experiments could be done, but probably haven't been done. But that doesn't really matter because he thinks he knows what the results of the experiments would be if they were done. If you know what the result of the experiment will be, you don't really need to do the experiment, do you? That's what passes for "science" these days. Experimental proof isn't necessary if you have enough faith.

Michael's email brings up two other issues we want to discuss. If we eliminate all the religious aspects of his argument, it boils down to just two things. First, how can you prove or disprove something you can't define? And second, how can you prove or disprove something you read in a book?

THE DEFINITION PROBLEM

We are all too familiar with the problem of trying to disprove something with a slippery definition. What is evolution? Is it Darwinian evolution, Neo-Darwinian evolution, Punctuated Equilibrium, Context-driven Actualization of Potential (CAP), Self-organization, Natural Genetic Engineering, Lamarckism, Neo-Lamarckism, Sybiogenesis, Evolutionary Developmental Biology, Neutral Evolution, or Facilitated Variation? We've dealt with aspects of all of these various evolutionary theories to one degree or another over the years.

To prove evolution is false, must we prove all of these different, contradictory evolutionary theories are false? No, the burden of proof is on the evolutionists. If one wants to teach children in public schools that "evolution is a fact and has been proved," then one must prove which one of the contradictory evolutionary theories is correct. Evolutionists can't do this, so they censor the science curriculum and omit any valid scientific criticism of any evolutionary theory.

Furthermore, proving any particular evolutionary theory is wrong does not prove any of the other evolutionary theories right. Nor does it prove any particular religious belief is correct. That's why we never try to prove any particular religious view is correct to disprove evolution, and never claim that any religion is true because evolution is false. We examine all the various evolutionary theories to see if they are consistent with scientific observation. So far, we haven't found any evolutionary theory that stands up to scientific scrutiny.

BELIEVING BOOKS

Michael raises a valid point when he says, "What solid evidence is there to verify that (other than words in a book)?" Let's address that issue, leaving religion out of it, by rephrasing Michael's point this way:

Columbus supposedly discovered America in 1492. But what solid evidence is there to verify that (other than words in a book)? None.

Can the scientific method prove that Columbus discovered America? No, it can't, regardless of whether he did it or not. There is nothing anyone can do in the laboratory that can replicate the discovery of America. Nor can the scientific method say anything about what must have motivated Columbus. You either have to accept or reject what the books say about Columbus by faith.

The scientific method can be used to discover natural laws, but it can't be used to prove historical narratives. You can make a compelling case that Columbus did sail to America in 1492, but you can't do it using the scientific method.

The scientific method can only be used to determine plausibility of historical narratives. The classic example is described in the book *Kon-Tiki*.

Kon-Tiki is the record of an astonishing adventure -- a journey of 4,300 nautical miles across the Pacific Ocean by raft. Intrigued by Polynesian folklore, biologist Thor Heyerdahl suspected that the South Sea Islands had been settled by an ancient race from thousands of miles to the east, led by a mythical hero, Kon-Tiki. He decided to prove his theory by duplicating the legendary voyage.

On April 28, 1947, Heyerdahl and five other adventurers sailed from Peru on a balsa log raft. After three months on the open sea, encountering raging storms, whales, and sharks, they sighted land -- the Polynesian island of Puka Puka.²¹

Heyerdahl's experiment proved that his theory about the origin of the Polynesia people is plausible, but his experiment did not prove his theory is correct.

The expedition came perilously close to failure several times. If it had failed, it would not have proved that the Polynesian people didn't come from South America. The Polynesian people

could have been better raft builders and sailors than Heyerdahl.

Heyerdahl's successful experiment proved that the Polynesian people COULD have sailed there from South America; but that doesn't prove that they did. They could have sailed there from some closer location much more easily.

Here's the important thing to recognize about the scientific method: It can prove or disprove natural laws; but it can't prove or disprove history. Historical accounts have to be accepted or rejected by faith. The scientific method is simply useful for discovering natural laws that help one evaluate the plausibility of historical accounts.

The theory of evolution seeks to explain the origin and diversity of life through natural laws. Scientists have investigated the plausibility of the theory of evolution, and have found the theory implausible. Scientists have discovered no plausible explanation for the origin of life. Scientific comparisons of the genomes of living things contradict the previously accepted evolutionary relationships. Scientific measurements of the ratio of uranium 238 and uranium 234 isotopes are inconsistent with a planetary age older than 2 million years, casting serious doubt on the time available for the origin and diversity of life to happen as proposed by the theory of evolution. The more science discovers, the less plausible the theory of evolution becomes.

MICHAEL'S SECOND EXAMPLE

In Michael's second example, he tried to use science and logic to disprove a commonly held misconception about the character of God. If he had known more about the Bible, he could have done a much better job of disproving that misconception using Biblical texts instead of science. Since the purpose of this column is not to expose Michael's ignorance of Christian theology, let's suppose that in his second example, he actually did use science to disprove an actual Biblical doctrine. As we have already said, disproving Christianity does not prove that Buddhism is true. Nor does it prove that Evolutionism, Hinduism, or any other religion is true. Disproving an erroneous belief about Christianity certainly doesn't prove evolution is true.

That's why it is important to evaluate the theory of evolution from a purely scientific viewpoint, and not allow religious misconceptions to influence the conclusion. The theory of evolution fails scientific evaluation.

²¹ http://www.amazon.com/Kon-Tiki-Across-Pacific-Enriched-Classics-ebook/dp/B00CK6KF5W/ref=sr_1_3?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1450081800&sr=1-3&keywords=kon-tiki+by+thor+heyerdahl

by Lothar Janetzko

THE ENCODE EMBROILMENT, PART I

<http://www.salvomag.com/new/articles/salvo31/the-encode-embroilment-part-i.php>

“Why Are Biologists Lashing Out Against Empirically Verified Research Results?”

This month’s web site review looks at the first of a six-part article about ENCODE. I discovered this information by performing a search for the top stories of 2015 regarding creation and evolution. For some background, the article begins by asking the question “Is the vast majority of the human genome useless junk or crucial for cellular function? Scientists are split over this question, with evolutionary biologists principally holding the former viewpoint, and molecular biologists the latter.”

The paper presenting the results of the ENCODE (Encyclopedia of DNA Elements) Project created quite a controversy. The ENCODE Project was a years-long research consortium involving over 400 international scientists studying noncoding DNA in the human genome. The Project produced a lead article along with 30 other groundbreaking papers. “The lead ENCODE article found that the ‘vast majority’ of the human genome shows biochemical function: ‘These data enabled us to assign biochemical function for 80 percent of the genome, in particular outside the well-studied protein-coding regions.’”

Of course this report was bad news for Darwinism. You can learn about the reaction of evolutionists from the sections entitled: 1) Bad News for Darwinism, 2) Evolutionists Strike Back and 3) What If ENCODE Is Right?

In the Evolutionists Strike Back section, the article author asks and answers the question, “How could they (Darwin defenders) possibly oppose such empirically based conclusions? The same way they always defend their theory: by assuming an evolutionary viewpoint is correct and reinterpreting the data in light of their paradigm—and by personally attacking those who challenge their position.”

Just from the first of the six-part article about ENCODE you can learn a great deal about the uproar the lead article of the Project has created.

The other articles of the series have the titles: Part II, Denying Data Won’t Change the Emerging Facts of Biology; Part III, Evolution Proves Our Genome Is Junky . . . Which Proves Evolution . . . ; Part IV, Post-ENCODE Posturing: Rewriting History Won’t Erase Bad Evolutionary Predictions; Part V, With ENCODE Results, Evolutionary Biologists Are Forced to Wait in Perplexity; and Part VI, Fear of Intelligent Design Prevents Some Biologists from Accepting ENCODE’s Results.



**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.