

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 6

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

March 2008

SEVENTY-FIVE THESES

We hold these truths to be undeniable.

Science Against Evolution is a California Public Benefit Corporation whose objective is to make the general public aware that the theory of evolution is not consistent with physical evidence and is no longer a respectable theory describing the origin and diversity of life. Since we don't believe the theory of evolution, it is sometimes asked, "Well then, what do you believe?" Here is our answer.

WHAT IS EVOLUTION?

Since there are many definitions of "evolution," some of which describe actual scientific processes, we must begin by making it clear that the only evolutionary process we are talking about is the controversial one taught in American public schools. A famous court case regarding whether or not evolution can be taught in public schools used the following six-part definition of "the theory of evolution."

1. Emergence by naturalistic processes of the universe from disordered matter and emergence of life from nonlife;

2. The sufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing about development of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds;

3. Emergence by mutation and natural selection of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds;

4. Emergence of man from a common ancestor with apes;

5. Explanation of the earth's geology and the evolutionary sequence by uniformitarianism; and

6. An inception several billion years ago of the earth and somewhat later of life.¹

This is what we are talking about when we talk about "evolution." This is not the same process

as the evolution of the Model T Ford into a Ford Mustang. It is not the same process as breeding horses or corn. When we talk about evolution, we are talking about what children are taught in the public schools regarding the origin and transformation of life on Earth.

OUR THESES

1. Initially, the Earth was a lifeless planet.
2. There is life on Earth now.
3. At some time in the past, life either originated on Earth, or came to Earth from outer space.
4. Regardless of where or when life originated, it had to originate sometime, somewhere, somehow.
5. Life either originated by purely natural processes, or else some supernatural element must have been involved.
6. Science, as defined by the American public school system, excludes supernatural explanations.
7. Science depends upon the "Scientific Method" for determining truth.
8. The Scientific Method involves testing hypotheses using repeatable experiments.
9. If there is a scientific explanation for the origin of life, it must depend entirely on natural, repeatable processes.
10. If life originated by a natural process under certain specific conditions, it should be possible to create life again under the same conditions.
11. For more than 50 years scientists have tried to find conditions that produce life, without success.

¹ McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education January 5, 1982

12. Fifty years of failed attempts to create life have raised more questions than answers about how life could have originated naturally.
13. Living things have been observed to die from natural processes, which can be repeated in a laboratory.
14. Life has never been observed to originate through any natural process.
15. "Abiogenesis" is the belief that life can originate from non-living substances through purely natural processes.
16. The theory of evolution depends upon abiogenesis as the starting point.
17. If the theory of abiogenesis is false, then the theory of evolution is false.
18. The American public school system teaches that somehow the first living cell formed naturally and reproduced.
19. There is no known way in which the first living cell could have formed naturally.
20. The first living cell would have needed some mechanism for metabolism.
21. There is no known natural process by which metabolism could originate in a lifeless cell.
22. The first living cell would have to grow and reproduce for life to continue past the first cell's death.
23. Growth and reproduction require cell division.
24. Cell division is a complex process.
25. There is no known natural process by which cell division could originate by chance.
26. According to the theory of evolution, single-celled life forms evolved into multi-cellular life forms.
27. Multi-cellular life forms consist of an assembly of cells that have different functions.
28. There is no scientific explanation for how a single cell could or would naturally change function.
29. Single-celled organisms have a membrane which allows the cell to exchange some substances ("nutrients" and "waste", for lack of better terms) with the environment.
30. Not all cells in larger multi-cellular organisms are in contact with the external environment.
31. Larger multi-cellular organisms need some method for the interior cells to exchange nutrients and waste with the external environment.
32. Very large multi-cellular animals require a complex system (typically including teeth, saliva, throat, stomach, and intestines) for absorbing nutrients from the environment.
33. Very large multi-cellular animals require a complex system (typically including lungs, intestines, heart, arteries, and veins) for distributing nutrients and oxygen to interior cells.
34. Very large multi-cellular animals require a complex system (typically including lungs, heart, arteries, veins, kidneys, and bladder) for removing waste from interior cells.
35. There is no satisfactory explanation how complex systems such as these could have originated by any natural process.
36. According to the theory of evolution, an invertebrate life-form evolved into the first vertebrate life-form.
37. Vertebrates have, by definition, a spine containing a nervous system.
38. The nervous system detects stimuli and reacts to them.
39. There is no satisfactory explanation for how the simplest nervous system could have originated by any natural process.
40. According to the theory of evolution, some of the first vertebrates were fish, which have eyes and a brain connected by a nervous system.
41. There is no satisfactory explanation how optical elements (typically including a lens, an iris and light sensors) could have assembled themselves by any natural process.
42. There is no satisfactory explanation how image processing algorithms could have originated in a fish brain by any natural process.
43. If the theory of evolution is true, then every characteristic of every living thing must be the result of a random mutation.
44. Mutations have been observed that increase or decrease the size of some portion (or portions) of a living organism.
45. Mutations have been observed that change the shape of a living organism.

46. Mutations have been observed that duplicate existing features (cows with two heads, flies with extra wings, etc.).
47. No mutation has ever been observed that provides a new function (sight, hearing, smell, lactation, etc.) in a living organism that did not previously have that function.
48. Cross-breeding and genetic engineering can transfer existing functionality from one living organism to another.
49. Cross-breeding cannot explain the origin of any new functionality in the first place.
50. Artificial selection enhances desired characteristics by removing genetic traits that inhibit the desired characteristics.
51. Artificial selection is more efficient than natural selection.
52. There are limits to the amount of change that can be produced by artificial selection.
53. Mutation and artificial selection have not been demonstrated to be sufficient to bring about new life forms from existing ones.
54. Similarity of features is not definite proof of common ancestry.
55. Similarity of features is often observed in objects designed by man.
56. The fact that one individual was born later than another individual died is not proof that the later individual is a biological descendant of the earlier one, especially if they are of different species.
57. Many different human evolutionary trees have been proposed.
58. There is disagreement about hominid lineage because the "evidence" is meager and highly speculative.
59. Darwin was correct when he said, "Any variation which is not inherited is unimportant for us."²
60. Acquired characteristics are not inherited because they do not cause any change in the DNA.
61. Explanations for how apelike creatures evolved into humans are fanciful speculations without experimental confirmation.
62. There is no evidence to suggest that offspring of animals that eat cooked food are smarter than offspring of the same species that eat raw food.
63. There is no evidence to suggest that mental exercises performed by parents will increase the brain size of their children.
64. There is no evidence that if apelike creatures sometimes stand upright to see over tall grasses, it will increase the brain size of their children.
65. There is no evidence that if apelike creatures sometimes stand upright to see over tall grasses, it will make it easier for their children to stand upright.
66. Sedimentary layers are formed in modern times by such things as floods, mudslides, and sandstorms.
67. The fossils in sedimentary layers formed in modern times contain the kinds of things living in that location.
68. The concept of geologic ages is based upon the evolutionary assumption that the kinds of fossils buried in sedimentary layers are determined by time rather than location.
69. All sedimentary layers formed in modern times are of the same geologic age, despite the fact that they contain different kinds of fossils.
70. Radiometric dating depends upon assumptions that cannot be verified about the initial concentrations of elements.
71. Radiometric dating of rocks brought back from the Moon is not a reliable method of determining the age of the Earth.
72. "Dark matter" and "dark energy" were postulated to explain why astronomical measurements don't match predictions of the Big Bang theory.
73. When measurements don't agree with theoretical predictions, it is generally because the theory was wrong.
74. "We didn't see it happen, we can't make it happen again, and we don't know how it could possibly have happened, but it must have happened somehow!" is never a satisfactory scientific explanation.
75. Public schools should not teach any fanciful speculation that is inconsistent with experimentally verified laws as if it were true.

² Darwin, 1859, On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life, Chapter 1

FLOGGING THE FLAGELLUM

Evolutionists are still trying to explain the bacterial flagellum.

In case you tuned in late, here's the simplified background. The flagellum is a little tail that bacteria spin to move from place to place. This little tail is driven by a very complex, incredibly tiny biologic motor. Intelligent Design proponents claim that there is no way such a complex motor could have evolved by chance. The basis of their argument is that all the parts have to be in place and functional for the parts to provide any survival advantage.

Proponents of ID [Intelligent Design] argue that the bacterial flagellum is exactly such a case: each of its interacting components is essential for the system to function, they claim, and if you remove any one of them the whole thing grinds to a halt. ID claims that because of this irreducible complexity, such systems cannot be explained by the stepwise process of natural selection and therefore must be the handiwork of an "intelligent designer".³

It is a compelling argument that evolutionists are trying hard to refute.

In an oft-quoted passage from *On the Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin wrote: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." (In anti-evolution circles, the following line is often omitted: "But I can find no such case.")⁴

Darwin could not find such a case because 19th century science was inadequate to discover DNA, metabolic pathways, and the flagellum. Perhaps Darwin wasn't highly motivated enough to prove himself wrong. But Darwin was certainly correct to recognize that such a case would disprove his theory.

The more we learn about complex biological systems, the more examples of irreducibly complex systems will be discovered. Of course, it is difficult to give simple explanations of these

complex systems because they are (duh) complex! ☺ But anyone, even someone without any scientific background, who cares to look at anything in nature (from the spinning of a spider web to the life cycle of the butterfly caught in that web) can see complex systems. The more you know about nature, the more reasons you discover not to believe that evolution could have caused it.

THE EVOLUTIONARY EXPLANATION

Dan Jones tried very hard to present an evolutionary explanation for the bacterial flagellum in *New Scientist* last month. This, presumably, is the best explanation the evolutionists have.

Biologists have been interested in the bacterial flagellum for decades, not least because it is a prime example of a complex molecular system - an intricate nanomachine beyond the craft of any human engineer. Explaining the origin of such systems is one of the most difficult and important challenges in evolutionary biology.⁵

Right off the bat, evolutionary bias starts him down the wrong path. He thinks explaining the origin of such a system is an important challenge. No, figuring out how it works is the important challenge. As an engineer, I'm not ashamed to admit that engineers often look to nature for better design ideas. The flagellum can tell us a lot about how to design tiny mechanical devices. It is important to discover all that we can about how it works. But trying to guess how it could have evolved is a waste of valuable scientific resources.

The flagellum is certainly complex, but is it really too complex to have evolved through natural selection? Until recently it has been surprisingly hard for biologists to answer this question satisfactorily. ... In the absence of this knowledge [about how the flagellum works], biologists all too often fell back on the assertion that "bacterial flagella evolved and that is that", according to Mark Pallen, a microbiologist at the University of Birmingham in the UK.⁶

There is a lot we can agree with in this paragraph. Yes, it is complex, and yes, biologists have not previously come up with a satisfactory explanation for how it could have evolved. It is typical for evolutionists not to admit their explanation is unsatisfactory until they have another explanation that has not yet been shown to be unsatisfactory. As we will see, their new explanation is also unsatisfactory, but

³ Dan Jones, *New Scientist*, 16 February 2008, "Engines of evolution", pages 40-43

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

evolutionists haven't admitted that yet.

The assertion that "bacterial flagella evolved and that is that" is still the foundational assumption, as we can see in the following explanation.

Variants of at least seven T3SS proteins are also found in the flagellum ... Such similarities, or "homologies", are strong evidence that the two systems evolved from a common ancestor - analogous to the way that the arrangement of bones in the limbs of horses, bats and whales reveal their common ancestry despite their very different outward appearance and function. Similar homologies can be seen in the DNA sequences of genes, and in the amino acid sequences and 3D structures of proteins - all are clear evidence of shared descent.⁷

Similarities are equally clear evidence of a common designer, but that possibility is never even considered by evolutionists because "bacterial flagella evolved and that is that."

So how exactly is the flagellum's protein export system related to the T3SS? One possibility is that the T3SS evolved first and was later co-opted as part of the flagellum. A second is that the flagellum evolved first and its protein-export system gave rise to the T3SS. It is also possible that both evolved in parallel from a common ancestor.⁸

Possibilities? He is talking about possibilities? This is supposed to be a scientific explanation, not speculation! Notice that all three possibilities presuppose that evolution is even possible.

There is no evidence to support the first possibility, that T3SS evolved from something else and somehow magically found a use in the flagellum.

The second possibility, that the flagellum evolved first, is just begging the question. He is supposed to be explaining how the flagellum could have evolved, and his answer is that the flagellum evolved and then created T3SS proteins.

The third possibility, that it somehow evolved in some unknown ancestor in some unknown way, is simply desperation.

The evolutionary events linking flagella and T3SSs are not clear, but the homology between them is a devastating blow to the claim of irreducible complexity.⁹

The evolutionary events aren't clear. No

kidding! They have no idea what the supposed evolutionary events were. They simply believe by faith that there must have been some evolutionary events because bacterial flagella evolved and that is that.

HOMOLOGY

They believe that homology is a "devastating blow to the claim of irreducible complexity" because they believe similarity must be the result of a common ancestor.

Taken together, this abundance of homology provides incontrovertible evidence that bacterial flagella are cobbled together from recycled components of other systems - and vice versa - through gene duplication and diversification. In other words, they evolved.¹⁰

They won't even consider the possibility that similarity is the result of a common designer. All these parts that work so well together were "cobbled together from recycled components of other systems" by accidental gene copying errors. It makes the "Luck of the Irish" pale by comparison! (Sorry, this newsletter was published the day after St. Patrick's Day.)

Creationists, on the other hand, consider homology to be a devastating blow to the claim of evolution. They look at the arrangement of bones in the limbs of horses, bats and whales, and it reveals their common designer despite their very different outward appearance and function. The fact that the same solution can be used to solve so many different problems testifies to brilliant conscious effort.

Since homology can be viewed as proof for evolution, and also as proof for creation, it can't really be proof for either.

THE MILLION-DOLLAR QUESTION

Although *New Scientist* would like you to believe that the questions surrounding the origin of the flagellum have been solved, they do make this admission:

The million-dollar question now is this: to what extent is it possible to reconstruct the entire sequence of evolutionary events that led to the flagellum? Last year Ochman and his colleague Renyi Liu made the most ambitious push yet in this direction. ... Liu and Ochman even inferred the order in which these genes evolved. Duplication and divergence, they argue, initially created the rod proteins, which in turn gave rise to the hook proteins and, finally, the filament.

Yet biologists have been quick to point out

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ *ibid.*

potential problems with these conclusions. One is that Ochman assigned homology based on gene sequence even when the proteins the genes code for were completely different shapes. "This is strong evidence against homology," says Pallen. "The prevailing wisdom is that [protein] structure is a better guide than sequence." Another criticism is the emphasis Liu and Ochman gave to gene duplication as the principle source of genetic novelty. While the majority of new bacterial genes arise in this way, bacteria also pick up genes by lateral gene transfer from unrelated species. Previous studies suggest that lateral gene transfer has played an important role in flagellum evolution, says Uri Gophna, a geneticist at Tel Aviv University in Israel. Furthermore, geneticists W. Ford Doolittle and Olga Zhaxybayeva of Dalhousie University in Halifax, Canada, argued that Liu and Ochman probably overlooked some documented events of lateral gene transfer (*Current Biology*, vol 17, p R510).¹¹

Ultimately, it all comes down to this:

Ultimately, though, it is unrealistic to hope to unravel every twist and turn of the bacterial flagellum's 3-billion-year-plus evolutionary journey. "That is impossible," says Doolittle. But he argues that the scientific imperative is not to reconstruct the entire process but simply to prove that the evolution of the flagellum is plausible using well-established natural processes.¹²

They are never going to be able to figure out how the flagellum evolved because it did not, in fact, evolve. But for some reason (which you can surmise for yourself) it is imperative to prove that the evolution of the flagellum is plausible using well-established natural processes.

Email

THEISTIC EVOLUTION

We usually ignore theistic evolution. Here's why.

Brian has friends who are theistic evolutionists. He was unable to find anything on our website that he could send to them. Here's what he wrote.

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *ibid.*

Subject: Theistic evolutionists
From: Brian
Date: Fri, 08 Feb 2008 17:31:31 -0800

I'm about 3/5 done with all the articles here. I have chosen creationism and have found your writing to be very enjoyable.

I just began to notice today that you tend to write about evolutionists with the assumption that they are atheists. This came out of a desire to send on an article or two to one of my theistic evolutionist friends, and I couldn't find one that would specifically apply to him. I know I could send him any article regarding a lack of transitions, age of the rocks, how long it takes to form fossils, diamonds, caves, etc., but it seems to me that there should be more pointed discussion about those that would say that God did it. If I missed it, please forgive me.

I found this quote online:

"In saying that the system is atheistic, it is not said that Mr. Darwin is an atheist. Nor is it meant that everyone who adopts the theory does it in an atheistic sense...His theory is that hundreds or thousands of millions of years ago God called a living germ, or living germ, into existence, and that since that time God has no more to do with the universe than if He did not exist. This is atheism to all intents and purposes, because it leaves the soul as entirely without God, without a Father, Helper, or Ruler, as the doctrine of Epicurus or of Comte." - Charles Hodge, Princeton Theologian

I know you don't really deal with religion on your site, but a theistic evolutionist is still an evolutionist. If you can think of anything interesting to say about this, I'd be happy to hear it. If not, thanks for what you do anyway.

Brian

Brian did partially answer his own question. We don't deal with religion here. Brian's email prompts us to explain why we don't.

Yes, a theistic evolutionist is an evolutionist who believes in God. Yes, we always discuss evolution as if God is not involved in the process. We argue that random chance could not have caused the changes in DNA that result in novel structures, such as vision systems and mammary glands. Arguments like these are irrelevant to a theistic evolutionist because he doesn't believe that random chance was involved. He believes that God intentionally made the changes. Luck had nothing to do with it. He believes that God used the process of evolution to create all the living creatures on Earth.

Some of the well-known creationist organizations attack theistic evolution on theological grounds. They are uncomfortable with the notion of a God who isn't competent enough to create things correctly in the first place, and has to push development along using trial and error. They are uncomfortable with a God who uses death and suffering to create new forms of life. They realize that if Adam's sin didn't really cause death to enter this world, then Jesus' death didn't really remove sin from the world.

Creationist organizations sponsored by Christian, Jewish, or Islamic churches therefore oppose the notion of theistic evolution.

Science Against Evolution is not connected with any church. It is a secular non-profit corporation. We presume that most, maybe even all, of our members believe in the God of Abraham; but we don't ask, and they don't tell. The corporation has no religious belief, even though the officers and members of the corporation do have religious beliefs. The corporation examines the theory of evolution through a purely scientific point of view.

Theistic evolution cannot be evaluated from a scientific standpoint because theistic evolution involves miracles. Perhaps this is easier to understand by looking at a similar example. Christians believe that Jesus turned water into wine instantaneously at a wedding banquet. It was a miracle. Therefore, it is pointless to examine the scientific plausibility of it happening. Yes, it is true that there is a purely natural process by which water can turn into wine. (Water is absorbed by roots, travels up a vine to a grape, where sugar produced by photosynthesis in the leaves is added, which eventually ferments into alcohol.) But the existence of this natural process is irrelevant because that's not the process that was alleged to have happened at the wedding feast. A supernatural process was said to have happened.

Similarly, any scientific argument against evolution is irrelevant to a theistic evolutionist because he believes supernatural, not natural, processes were involved. Theistic evolution is a religious belief. Science Against Evolution takes no stand on religious beliefs.

SCIENCE AGAINST RELIGION

In anticipation of next month's flood of emails, let us immediately acknowledge that the theory of evolution is the creation myth of secular humanism (a.k.a. atheism), which is certainly a religion. When we attack the theory of evolution, we are attacking secular humanism, so we are using science to take a stand against a religious belief. Yes, you've got us there—sort of.

Our slippery escape is permitted by the fact that secular humanism claims not to be a religion. The U.S. Constitution prohibits the government from establishing a religion. Therefore, secular humanists claim that secular humanism isn't a religion in order to allow their religious indoctrination to permeate the public school system. They claim that the theory of evolution is nothing more than science.

If secular humanists want the benefits of not

being a religion, then they can't claim constitutional protection for their religion.

Theistic evolutionists, on the other hand, proudly claim to be Christians. They believe evolution is a divinely guided miraculous process that turns one kind of creature into another. It wasn't a kiss, but God, that turned the frog into a prince over millions of years. One can't argue against that belief scientifically, and we have no desire to do so.

THE SHORT ANSWER

Now that you've suffered through that long explanation, here's the short answer to the question why we don't deal with theistic evolution: It isn't taught in the public schools. Our charter is to expose the scientific errors taught in American public schools and secular media. Theistic evolution isn't taught in the public schools, or on television, or in news magazines, so there is no reason to refute it.

STANDING FOR SCIENCE

Last month the general public was told that when hominids ate cooked food, it stimulated brain growth and made them evolve into modern humans. That's the kind of "scientific" nonsense we are concerned about that is being taught as fact to our children. Silly "scientific" stories like that cause smart children to doubt and reject science.

Scientific truth never changes. Yes, we know more about gravity now than Newton did, but our new scientific knowledge enlarges our understanding. It doesn't contradict what we previously knew about gravity. Science hasn't changed its position on whether or not gravity makes things fall up or down.

Scientific "truth" about evolution is often contradictory because it wasn't true in the past, or isn't true now, or both. Therefore, science students are being taught that scientific truth changes whenever anyone has a new opinion. Scientific truth has been redefined by the scientists in power to be the consensus of whatever scientists are in power.

It is important to make a distinction between what we know from scientific experiments and the personal opinions of people who perform scientific experiments for a living. When scientists claim that their opinions are scientific facts in an attempt to ride the coattails of scientific credibility, then we must point out the scientific errors in their opinions.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter.

by Lothar Janetzko

PHILOSOPHY/LIBERAL STUDIES 333: EVOLUTION AND CREATION

http://nsmsserver2.fullerton.edu/departments/chemistry/evolution_creation/web/

A Cal State Fullerton Course

This month's web site review looks at the course materials from the web made available for a course on Evolution and Creation taught at Cal State Fullerton. The course will be taught in the Spring 2008.

The home page of the site is just a Table of Contents of web links for the course material. The material is organized as follows: 1) Introduction, 2) General References on the Relationship of Religion and Theology to Science, 3) General References for Philosophy of Science, 4) Genesis, 5) General References for Evolutionary Theory, 6) Evolution as Fact and Theory, 7) Introduction to Evolutionary Theory, 8) Natural Selection, 9) Genetics and Mutation, 10) The Fossil Record, 11) Punctuated Equilibrium, 12) Anatomy and Physiology, 13) Molecular Evidence, 14) Evolutionary Developmental Biology, 15) Biochemical Complexity, 16) Biogeography, 17) Origin of Life, Information and Complexity, 18) Stephen Jay Gould and Richard Dawkins, 19) Legal and Educational Issues, 20) Intelligent Design, 21) General References for Geology and Radiometric Dating, 22) General References for Young Earth Creationism, 23) Young Earth Creationist Arguments for a Young Earth, 24) Young Earth Creationist Arguments for the Coexistence of Humans and Dinosaurs, 25) The Noachian Flood, 26) Progressive (Old Earth) Creationism, 27) Theistic Evolution, 28) Sociobiology, 29) Thermodynamics, 30) Human Evolution and 32) Evolution and Creation in the Popular Press.

As you can tell from the above list, a course on evolution and creation covers many different areas of science and religion. Just click on a topic of interest and you will find many links that will provide more details. Links have a brief description that makes it easy to determine additional interest topics.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of



**P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556**

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org