

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 22 Issue 2 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info November 2017

GETTING THE SHOT

National Geographic admits to photographic malpractice.

We were shocked by pages 33 and 34 of the October, 2017, issue of *National Geographic*. We weren't shocked by what they said—we were shocked that they admitted it. They admitted that Jane Goodall's late husband, Hugo van Lawick, in addition to documenting real chimp behavior, also took staged pictures demanded by *National Geographic* in order to keep the funding flowing for Jane's research.

The admission was deleted from the on-line version of the article, so we scanned the pages to show them to you. (Of course, you can go to a public library and look at the magazine yourself).



The caption says,

GETTING THE SHOT These frames are from reels of film outtakes that were found in storage in 2015. They were shot in the early 1960s at Gombe Stream Game Reserve, in what is now Tanzania, by cinematographer Hugo van Lawick. National Geographic assigned Hugo to document chimp behaviors but also to film and photograph what they called “human interest” – Jane playing with the chimps and even washing her hair. Hugo and Jane disliked such frivolous scenes, but they went along with the requests, to

keep the funding for Jane's research flowing from the National Geographic Society.¹

How many other authors and photographers distort reality in order to produce content that *National Geographic* demands from them?

Great scientists of the past, Newton, Kepler, Kelvin, Galileo, Thomas Edison, and Alexander Graham Bell were self-funded. They spent their own time and money to discover the truth. They didn't have to adulterate their work to please a sponsor.

Today there are only a few self-funded scientists. J. Craig Venter² and Richard Branson come to mind. They are honestly searching for scientific truth because they can recoup their investments selling gene sequences or trips into space only if their gene sequencers or rocket ships really work.

Most of today's scientists depend on pleasing their sponsors to continue their work. Many of these sponsors are politically motivated. They rely upon *National Geographic*, PBS, the tobacco industry, or government bureaucrats for funding. If the scientists don't produce the results the sponsors desire, they don't get funded any more. It doesn't really matter if the pictures of Jane Goodall or the tall tales told by Neil deGrasse Tyson and Bill Nye the Bow-Tie-Guy are true or not, as long as they please the sponsors.

That's why there is so much fake science about astronomy and evolution. Quasi-scientific stories that advance a political agenda are an easy source of income.

¹ *National Geographic*, October 2017, “Becoming Jane”, pages 33-34

² *Disclosure*, October 2015, “Big Science”, <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v20i1f.htm>

LUNACY

Oxygen “from the Earth to the Moon.”

People who don't believe everything scientists say are labeled, “science deniers.” But when scientists make crazy claims, how can one help but deny that what the scientist has said is really science?

A Japanese spacecraft orbiting the moon recently made a surprising find: oxygen that came from Earth. Scientists think this oxygen could provide a historical record of our planet's ancient atmosphere. ... The discovery of terrestrial oxygen on the moon now suggests another way to get at the atmospheric history of Earth's first two billion years. ... A team led by planetary scientist Kentaro Terada of Osaka University in Japan reported the result earlier this year in *Nature Astronomy*. “Our new finding is a direct link that ions from Earth's atmosphere are transported to the moon,” where they could remain in the lunar soils for billions of years, Terada says.

This result excites scientists interested in a transition coinciding with the beginnings of photosynthesis in simple microbes, the planet's primeval life-forms. Somewhere around 2.45 billion years ago Earth's atmosphere changed from oxygen-poor to oxygen-rich under still mysterious circumstances that scientists call the Great Oxidation Event. Could some of the atmospheric oxygen produced at that time linger on the moon today? If scientists can collect and analyze samples of the terrestrial oxygen embedded in lunar soil, it could provide insights into how Earth's atmosphere has evolved over the eons.³

The article explains how,

The moon is constantly bombarded by a stream of highly charged particles emanating from the sun, called the solar wind. But for five days about every month our lunar neighbor is shielded by Earth's magnetosphere—a bubblelike [*sic*] region where the planet's magnetic field dominates. During this time, a

window opens for slower oxygen ions from Earth to arrive at the moon.⁴

What more proof could you need that the oxygen came from Earth? ☺ Perhaps, if they examined the oxygen atoms more closely, they could find a label from a tailor shop in Brooklyn (the one where the Emperor's New Clothes were made). ☺

The story is so ridiculous we feel foolish refuting it. A spacecraft orbiting the Moon looked down and saw oxygen in the lunar soil that looks like it came from Earth. Really? They think that if they could just bring back samples to Earth, they could analyze them and figure out what caused the Great Oxidation Event! Go ahead and call us “science deniers” because we really do deny their claim is real science!

THE GREAT OXIDATION EVENT

Since they brought it up, let's briefly mention The Great Oxidation Event. Evolutionists believe (quite correctly) that life could not possibly have originated in the presence of oxygen. Therefore, they are forced to believe that, once-upon-a-time, Earth had no free oxygen in the atmosphere.

Now, of course, life depends upon oxygen, and 20% of the atmosphere is oxygen. When and where did it come from? Evolutionists really have no clue, but they assume there must have been some mysterious Great Oxidation Event about 2.45 billion years ago which caused the rise of oxygen in the atmosphere. Perhaps the most common explanation is that algae in the ocean separated carbon dioxide into carbon and oxygen. You ask, “Where did the carbon dioxide come from?” It must have come from oxygen in the atmosphere which combined with carbon (as a result of forest fires, animal respiration, and gas-guzzling vehicles ☺) just like it does today. But wait—there wasn't any oxygen in the atmosphere to begin with, and there weren't any trees to burn, and no breathing animals, and no evil men polluting the planet back then. So, where did the carbon dioxide come from?

We are just joking, treating The Great Oxidation Event with all the seriousness it deserves. The truth is that scientists make up fanciful stories to explain the unexplainable, and expect those stories to be believed by people they think are too stupid to question them.

Real science doesn't depend upon unverifiable stories about what happened in the unobserved past, fortified by intellectual bullying. Real science uses repeatable experiments to determine the truth.

³ Saswato R. Das, *Scientific American*, August 29, 2017, “Newfound Material on the Moon Could Offer Clues to Our Planet's Early Years”, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/newfound-material-on-the-moon-could-offer-clues-to-our-planets-early-years/>

⁴ *ibid.*

THE GIRAFFE GAFFE

Every time they tell the giraffe myth, it gets funnier.

You know how evolutionists say the giraffe got its long neck, don't you? No, you don't. You know how evolutionists previously said how the giraffe got its long neck; but they don't say that any more.

How did the giraffe get its long neck? The obvious answer — and some of you are probably shouting it at the page or screen right now — is that it evolved as a benefit that allowed the animals to reach and eat higher leaves. Perhaps. Probably, even. That was certainly Charles Darwin's explanation. But it's not certain, and other possible origins for one of the animal kingdom's most distinctive features are still a topic of debate among zoologists and evolutionary biologists alike.

...

That idea stood largely unchallenged until, in a letter to this journal in 1949, Chapman Pincher took issue and pointed out that the legs of a giraffe are also unusually long (all the better for a swift escape from predators) (C. Pincher *Nature* 164, 29–30; 1949). The long neck, he said, must therefore have evolved as a way for the animal to be able to reach past its own legs when it leans to reach the ground to take a drink of water. (Never very popular, Pincher's suggestion lasted only as long as it took scientists to find and examine fossil ancestors of the giraffe, and point out that those animals had managed perfectly well with long legs and short necks for millions of years.)

...

Other, more credible, alternatives to the dominant 'competing browsers' idea have emerged. One of the most popular is that long necks help male giraffes use their heads to bash rivals, or that females prefer them. Both would suggest that long-necked males are sexually selected.⁵

So, head bashing was a more credible explanation for long necks than eating or

⁵ *Nature*, 12 September 2017, "Giraffes could have evolved long necks to keep cool", <http://www.nature.com/news/giraffes-could-have-evolved-long-necks-to-keep-cool-1.22595>

drinking!☺ It's not a zoo—it's a funny farm!

Looking for an even more credible explanation than head bashing, scientists have now come up with more ideas.

One such idea is reported in the *Journal of Arid Environments* (G. Mitchell *et al.* *J. Arid Environ.* 145, 35–42; 2017). Long-necked giraffes, scientists argue, can point their heads and necks towards the Sun, exposing less of their skin and making it easier for them to keep cool and survive the hot, dry conditions they often endure.

Now you know the truth. Giraffes evolved long necks so they can point their heads at the Sun to keep cool. Why didn't anybody realize that before? ☺

Of course, you can point your head toward the Sun, and we will bet that you don't have a neck as long as a giraffe's. You don't need a long neck to point your head toward the Sun. And, because you have a shorter neck, you have less neck skin to expose to the Sun in the first place.

The prestigious, peer-reviewed, professional journal, *Nature*, has been publishing fanciful explanations for how the giraffe got its long neck since 1949! This explanation might be the dumbest, least scientific one yet!

LCA SIZE

How big was the Missing Link?

In keeping with this month's theme of scientists telling tall tales that please their sponsors, we offer this rather technical analysis of the size of the Last Common Ancestor (LCA) between apes and humans.

We put this one last because we know many of our readers will get bored with it and just skip to the end. Skimming through it is OK, as long as you promise to read our conclusion at the end.

You don't have to try to understand it. Just notice how the authors try to baffle you with buzzwords. Remember, they are analyzing the characteristics of an animal for which there is no evidence of existence. They just believe it must have existed because, well, it just must have existed if the theory of evolution is true.

Why is the size of the LCA important? They think it has a bearing upon whether the Missing Link between apes and humans swung from trees (that is, was "suspensory" in their jargon) or was a knuckle-dragger ("terrestrial") who eventually

attained upright posture.

Here are some excerpts from this very long, technical article.

Body mass directly affects how an animal relates to its environment and has a wide range of biological implications. However, little is known about the mass of the last common ancestor (LCA) of humans and chimpanzees, hominids (great apes and humans), or hominoids (all apes and humans), which is needed to evaluate numerous paleobiological hypotheses at and prior to the root of our lineage. Here we use phylogenetic comparative methods and data from primates including humans, fossil hominins, and a wide sample of fossil primates including Miocene apes from Africa, Europe, and Asia to test alternative hypotheses of body mass evolution. Our results suggest, contrary to previous suggestions, that the LCA of all hominoids lived in an environment that favored a gibbon-like size, but a series of selective regime shifts, possibly due to resource availability, led to a decrease and then increase in body mass in early hominins from a chimpanzee-sized LCA.⁶

This follows the common format for technical articles. They begin by saying that what was previously published before is wrong, and their new idea is right.

Though the timing, causes, and biological implications of the increase in body mass that took place during human evolution continue to inspire a wealth of research (e.g., refs. 1,2,3,4,5), the body mass of the last common ancestor (LCA) of chimpanzees and humans remains unexplored in any rigorous fashion. This omission is startling because numerous arguments over one of the most contested topics in hominin evolution—what were the selective regimes that led to the origins of bipedalism (but see ref. 10)—depend on inferences about body mass at and prior to the root of our lineage. Various classic models proposed a body mass increase as a proximate factor in the evolution of suspensory adaptations and the transition from an arboreal to terrestrial hominid (great apes plus humans and our fossil ancestors) as larger sizes dictated a switch between locomotor modes, while models based around an arboreal quadruped ancestor (e.g., ref. 14) implicitly assumed a

smaller-body mass in order to maintain balance and stability on deformable branches of different diameters. Note that here we define body size as body mass.⁷

The “most contested topic in hominin evolution” is whether the LCA lived in trees or on the ground. It is contested, of course, because there is no scientific proof one way or another, despite what you were taught in public school.

One important reason for this omission is the paucity of African fossil hominids during the period when the chimpanzee and human lineages are believed to have diverged, perhaps 4–6 Ma (million years ago) or earlier at 6–8 Ma, with the notable exceptions of putative basal hominins *Orrorin tugenensis* (~6 Ma), *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* (6–7 Ma), *Ardipithecus kadabba* (5.5–6.4 Ma), and the later *Ardipithecus ramidus* (4.4 Ma). In addition, body sizes in the more well-sampled Miocene hominoid (all living and extant apes and humans) taxa (e.g., Proconsul) appear to be extremely variable (e.g., refs. 24, 25), and questions about how these species relate to one another and to crown hominoids (reviewed in ref. 26) further complicate the usefulness of these data.⁸

This is an example of the second characteristic of the common format of evolutionary arguments. Specifically, the “paucity” (lack) of fossils, and their “putative” (questionable) interpretations. The fossils are “extremely variable” with no orderly pattern. These excuses are made to give them cover when later articles prove them to be wrong. They did the best they could with the inadequate data available at the time, so it isn't their fault that they were wrong.

However, a few recent findings argue caution with acceptance of a chimpanzee-sized series of LCAs stretching back to before the divergence of hylobatids [gibbons] from other hominoids [human-like creatures] around 19.5 Ma. First, this hypothesis coincides with the assumption of an overall chimpanzee-like morphology for the chimpanzee-human and hominid LCA, a topic of much debate, with some researchers suggesting that current fossil evidence and analyses point to a generalized monkey-like ancestor. Chimpanzee-like postcranial morphology and body mass are not necessarily linked, although this is often implied by many models that suggest a chimpanzee-like LCA. Second, the description of *Pliobates cataloniae*, a small-bodied (4–5 kg) hominoid from the Miocene of Spain (11.6

⁶ Mark Grabowski & William L. Jungers, *Nature Communications* 8, 12 October 2017, “Evidence of a chimpanzee-sized ancestor of humans but a gibbon-sized ancestor of apes”,
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-017-00997-4>

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

Ma), argues for a gibbon-sized common ancestor of all crown hominoids, rather than an extant great ape-sized ancestor with hylobatids evolving as a dwarfed lineage. Finally, a large-scale analysis of hominin body mass found earlier hominins were smaller-bodied than previously thought (Table 1, Supplementary Table 1), with no evidence for an orderly increase in body mass from *Australopithecus* to early (non-*erectus*) *Homo* to *Homo erectus* as has been suggested. Average body mass for the well sampled *Australopithecus afarensis* was ~5 kg less than an average common chimpanzee, and many other well sampled later hominin taxa (*Australopithecus africanus*, possible *Paranthropus boisei*, *Paranthropus robustus*, *Homo habilis sensu stricto*) are ~5–10 kg below *Au. afarensis* (Table 1). While body mass predictions for the earliest undisputed hominin, *Australopithecus anamensis* (46.3 kg), and the earliest putative hominins *O. tugenensis* (35–50 kg), and the later *Ar. ramidus* (~50 kg) (but see refs. 3, 7), are all in the range of common chimpanzees, these estimates are based on single fossils, and overall these findings argue that the pattern of body mass evolution in our own lineage may be more complicated than either stasis or a steady increase in body mass from a chimpanzee-like ancestor. Taken together, while a chimpanzee-sized LCA has been hypothesized as the phenotype from which all hominoid branches diverged, to the best of our knowledge this has not been tested in any quantitative, phylogenetically informed fashion. In addition, the data underlying these hypotheses appear to be problematic and further compounded by poor understanding of the Miocene fossil relationships, and likely heavily influenced by the view that chimpanzees provide fairly clear windows into our evolutionary past (see Supplementary Note 1 for taxonomic scheme used here).⁹

As is typical, the article is full of weasel-words. One needs to be “cautious” about “acceptance” of “assumptions” about “topics of debate” which “suggest” things which are “not necessarily linked” but “often implied.” Things that were “previously thought” are based on “no evidence” and are just “estimates” that “have not been tested” and are “problematic” because they are “poorly understood” and “heavily influenced” (that is, biased) by a previous “view.”

The article continues with a very boring, technical explanation of their methods of analysis. We are not so cruel as to make you read it. (Gluttons for punishment may use the link in the footnotes.) Let’s just skip to their conclusion.

⁹ *ibid.*

The results of our novel comparative phylogenetic analysis of body mass evolution in primates have large consequences for the paleobiology of hominoid and hominin origins. First, our results suggest that the LCA of chimpanzees and humans lived in an environment that favored a body mass similar to modern chimpanzees (either *Pa. troglodytes*, *Pa. paniscus*, or both depending on the data set used), and this optimal body mass was shared with the earliest hominins. Consistent with fossil evidence of large body sizes, our results support earlier suggestions that this LCA had a body mass close to that of modern chimpanzees. It should be noted that this regime persisted in the earliest hominins until shifting to a smaller-bodied regime near or following (depending on the data set used here) the origins of *Au. afarensis* at 3.77 Ma. While this reduction in the optimal average body mass could be due to a reduction in female body mass resulting from differential effects of ecological stresses—such as caused by climate variability at Hadar 3.4–2.9 million years ago—recent findings suggest that later early hominins from South Africa (*Au. africanus*, *P. robustus*) were smaller bodied both on average than earlier *Au. afarensis*, and purported males may have had a slightly larger decrease in body mass than females (~4%). Thus, if an increase in sexual dimorphism in *Au. afarensis* was the result of ecological stresses affecting females to a greater extent than males (e.g., refs. 47,48,49), it appears that these stresses affected the sexes in a more similar manner in later australopiths. In fact, the estimated optimal body mass for the later smaller-bodied early hominin regime was slightly below 30 kg (Table 2), which is about 10 kg smaller than the earlier *Au. afarensis*, and later early hominins (starting with the 30.5 kg *Au. africanus* at 3.03 Ma), including the small-bodied *H. habilis*, appear to be evolving towards this new smaller optimal body mass. The origin of *Au. africanus* coincides with the shift towards more open environments after 3 Ma in South African sites, as well as apparently increased greater climatic variability in East Africa, which likely imposed new selective pressures on early hominins and led to a regime shift at this time. The regime shift to larger optimal body sizes near the origins of *H. erectus* (Fig. 1b, c) as well as larger body mass in this taxon (Table 1) could signify the combination of environmental changes to more favorable conditions or behavioral differences leading to shifts in the ability to use available resources (e.g., a greater reliance on high-quality sources such as meat). Of course, this sequence of body mass evolution (and the

results of this analysis) depends on the relationships among taxa, but at the very least there **appears** to be a substantial decrease in both the species average as well as average male and female body mass for hominins between 3.0 and 2.0 Ma with the extinction of *Au. afarensis*. It is also **suggestive** that the optimal body mass for the regime that contains *H. heidelbergensis* and *H. neanderthalensis* is slightly below the average mass of *G. gorilla* and *G. beringei* in **almost all** iterations here, and **these hominins may in fact be evolving toward a selective regime that favored increasingly large body sizes** due to factors such as colder climates or hunting larger-bodied prey. **No doubt hominin body mass was constrained and influenced by a wealth of factors**, such as sexual selection, food availability and other ecological influences, tool-use, and physiological constraints that are **not tested in the current model**.

Second, our results indicate that the LCA of all hominoids shared a selective regime with hylobatids and was **likely** the mass of a modern gibbon, arguing against the view that hylobatids are a dwarf lineage from a great ape-sized ancestor of all hominoids (*e.g.*, ref. 29). Larger mass apparently did not evolve until after the divergence of hylobatids, with two regime shifts to increasingly larger body mass optima prior to the LCA of hominids. While we include stem ape *Pliobates cataloniae* in our main analyses, our findings without Miocene ape taxa (Supplementary Fig. 3) independently support Alba *et al.*'s recent claim, and earlier **suggestions** of a gibbon-sized ancestor of hominoids based on the type specimen of *Pliobates cataloniae*. We also note that this body mass regime is also shared by the majority of Old World Monkeys and by the distantly related New World Monkey family Atelidae, and **may be** the plesiomorphic (ancestral) condition for catarrhines. While it was **suggested** that that suspensory behavior in hominoids evolved as a necessary locomotor shift coinciding with increasing body mass, a gibbon-sized ancestor of all apes argues against this hypothesis—**it could be** that antipronogrady first evolved in a gibbon-sized early ape, further adapting in the lineage that led to hylobatids. An adaptive shift favoring a larger body mass **could have** led some early hominoids—already adapted to a rudimentary form of suspensory locomotion—to adapt their morphology and behavior to deal with this change, leading to some of the differences between great ape and gibbon locomotor behavior. In this model, there is no need for the independent acquisition of suspensory behavior among the hominoid

lineages—the series of morphological changes that allow for suspensory behavior evolved once and the combination of continued use and possibly phylogenetic inertia (resistance or slowness in adaptation) in these characters led to their persistence while body mass **appears** to be extremely evolvable in this clade. Taking a step back, suspensory behavior and increased body mass **have been argued** to be hominoid adaptations to a foraging strategy allowing them to compete with increasingly numerous old world monkeys since the Middle Miocene (reviewed in ref. 60). Our results **suggest** that these two adaptations occurred independently of each other and **could have been** part of an arms race with monkeys for fruit resources—suspensory behavior to access ripe fruit on compliant branches at the edges of foliage evolved first, followed by larger body sizes when direct physical competition was required. Sexual selection in hominids **likely** further increased optimal average body sizes. We also note that although hominin and hominoid evolution is the focus of this analysis, our complete results **suggest** that the basal euprimate lived in a selective regime that favored an optimal body mass between 1.4 and 1.6 kg (*e.g.*, Fig. 1). Though this **estimate** is close to previous suggestions, it is far above an analysis that included body mass estimates for early primate fossils (~55 g) (but see ref. 62).

Finally, our results provide evidence of a complex and changing adaptive landscape in the hominin and hominid clades—while almost all other primates are evolving toward two body mass optima in our sample (*e.g.*, 1.4 and 7.0 kg; Fig. 1a), hominids (including proconsuloids) had a substantially greater number of adaptive optima due to distinct regime shifts than any other group (Fig. 1c). While these results are **preliminary**, they **suggest** that most of primate evolution has taken place within a small number of ecological niches—one small-bodied regime principally based around arboreal quadrupedalism and leaping, one larger bodied regime, members of which evolved toward suspensory behavior (Hylobatidae and Atelidae) and continued arboreal quadrupedalism and leaping (most Cercopithecidae). Larger-bodied species adapted to terrestrial locomotion—*Pa. cynocephalus* and *Pa. anubis* here, are near their own body mass optima (Regime “k”—17.7 kg; Table 2). Within each group is variation in locomotor behavior, as well as diet, social structure, and so on—differing local selective pressures that **likely** led to the variation around the optimal body mass within a given regime. Together, the greater number and greater complexity of body mass optima for

hominids and hominins supports the hypothesis that dramatic and uncommon shifts in the adaptive landscape drove human evolution.

YOU CAN STOP SKIMMING NOW

We regret that we had to subject you to so much boring, technical material—but we wanted you to see for yourself that their lengthy conclusion is nothing more than speculation about what could have happened, and why it may have happened.

Real science is conclusive. The experiments produce the same results no matter who does them. There is no speculation about what happened.

Fake science uses scientific terminology to appear scientific. It is academic identity theft in an illegitimate attempt to give scientific credibility to a fallacious philosophy.

Real science has value because it accurately and reliably reveals the truth about the world we live in. Knowing how things work allows us to succeed by working with nature, and prevents us from trying to violate absolute physical or biological laws. Real science has real value.

Many of the things that make life better are simply copies of natural designs. Radar and sonar are human applications of the echo location used by bats and whales. Birds had wings long before airplanes did. Even something as simple as Velcro is patterned after biology.

Because it is built on a lie, fake science doesn't make life better. Physical laws cannot be violated, no matter how skillfully the lie is presented. The laws of nature don't change because of anything a silver-tongued scientist says.

In our feature article, we gave an example of how photographic data was manipulated to present a false view of nature because it advanced *National Geographic's* belief that animals and humans are equal. Even if animals and humans are equal, it does not justify taking misleading photographs in order to secure funding.

The "scientific" explanations of how giraffes got long necks, how oxygen got to the moon, and how much a mythical ancestor weighed, are just stories posing as science. These stories are designed to advance an agenda unethically.

Exposing fake science does not make us anti-science—we are promoting real science. Real science doesn't have an agenda, other than to discover and explain natural laws (which cannot be violated).

THE AGENDAS

There are economic, religious, and political agendas behind the Theory of Evolution.

The economic agenda is driven by the religious and political agendas. People with religious and political agendas spend money on scientists who will produce quasi-scientific arguments that support their agendas.

Universities depend upon research grants. People with a political or religious agenda will pay for research that "proves" that the theory of evolution is true. In order to keep the stream of money flowing, it is necessary to produce papers which satisfy sponsors while leaving the door open for further research.

There are people who are afraid of a judgmental god, and they need to disprove the existence of the God of Abraham to calm their fear. To do that, they need to disprove the book of Genesis. They need to establish an alternative to the Genesis account of creation which does not involve a supernatural force capable of inflicting punishment on sinners. The theory of evolution is such an alternative.

There are people who believe that man is no better than animals, so animals should have equal rights. The theory of evolution supports that belief.

There are people who believe that Mother Earth is alive, and that people are hurting her. The theory of evolution supports the notion that natural processes make things better, and unnatural human activity makes things worse.

Historically, there has always been a power struggle between the church and the state. Leaders of the state would like to weaken the opposition from the church. In the United States, the various branches of Christianity have the most voters. Since Christianity has political power, it must be defeated so that political leaders can make decisions unopposed.

The support for evolution is not really based in science. As we have been showing for more than 20 years, science is against evolution. The theory of evolution starts with abiogenesis (the spontaneous generation of life) which has been proven impossible in numerous laboratory experiments. It then depends upon random mutations, filtered by natural selection, to produce incredibly complex biological systems. This is simply wishful thinking, contrary to actual observations of how the natural world works.

The real reasons for believing the theory of evolution are rooted in religious and political agendas, not science. Science is against evolution.

Debunking Evolution

<http://www.newgeology.us/presentation32.html>

Scientific evidence against evolution – the clash between theory and reality

The website review for this month looks at an extensive article that I recently discovered while searching for information about scientific evidence against evolution on the Internet. The article I found has the title, “Debunking Evolution.” You can read the complete article on the Internet or download the whole article as a PDF file to read offline. You will also find a link to download a PDF file that contains the main points of the article.

From the main points PDF, the reader can obtain a summary of the topics discussed in detail on the main webpage. The topics include: A) A discussion of “micro-evolution” versus “macro-evolution; B) The role of mutations; C) The requirements for the formation of new, working organs; D) The lack of more transitional creatures in the fossil record; E) Did life begin by chemicals coming together; F) Evolutionists “tree of life” charts; G) Parallel or Convergent evolution; H) A discussion of “orphan genes”; I) Implications of the Second Law of Thermodynamics; J) The Law of Biogenesis (life only comes from life); K) The problem of chirality for evolution theory; L) Minimum level of complexity that must be met for a cell to exist; M) Protein formation; and N) Gene Regulatory Networks (GRNs).

One interesting concept discussed on the main page of the article is “It’s Story Time”. When you read the literature, either in books or on the Internet about evolution, you will often find stories that try to explain things we see in the natural world. Rather than using science, storytelling is used to explain topics such as metamorphosis of insects and why giraffes have long necks. Many high school textbooks in biology state that giraffes “got long necks to browse the leaves at the tops of acacia trees”. The late Stephen Jay Gould, one of the most influential biologists of the 20th century, tried to set the record straight by noting that “Giraffes provide no established evidence whatsoever for the mode of evolution of their undeniably useful necks.”

In the article, you will also find a long section on Origin of Life Research. Here you learn about the difficulties researchers have in trying to explain how chemicals assembled themselves into the first living thing.

There is much to explore on this website. Beside the main article you will find links to another article called “No Time for Evolution” and many links to videos which cover many of the topics from the article and additional material (such as, carbon dating of dinosaur bones).



**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.