

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 13 Issue 3

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

December 2008

A BAD YEAR FOR EVOLUTIONISTS

2008 was a bad year for evolutionists, which ironically made it a tough year for us.

A reader who calls himself, "Atari" sent us an email which said, in part,

Each new article for the year 2008 seems to be, more or less, about politics and personal views than about scientific facts. Is it a slow month, or is that the theme therefore?

You once stated that your box of material to write about was filling up faster than you could possibly write about it, and thus it would not deteriorate for a long time, therefore; I am loath to think that you may simply have nothing remaining to refute.

We were hoping nobody would notice, but since he did, we dare not duck the issue.

THINGS THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN

The Mars missions did not find any hint of past or present life on Mars. Nobody discovered a new human ancestor. They didn't discover any missing links of any kind, for that matter. They didn't create life in the laboratory again this past year. There wasn't even any new DNA evidence. For evolutionists, 2008 was a total bust.

Since evolutionists didn't make any new outrageous "scientific" claims, we didn't have anything to refute.

We've never had a grand outline of topics for our newsletter. It's a newsletter—that means we react to what's in the news. If there is no misleading news, there is nothing for us to put into proper perspective.

The evolutionary news of 2008 was mostly political rather than scientific. Ben Stein's movie *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* examined evolution from an academic freedom point of view rather than from a scientific point of view. Jerry Bergman's book, [Slaughter of the Dissidents: The Shocking Truths about Killing the Careers of Darwin Doubters](#) offers more evidence in the

same vein. We mention them only in passing because there isn't much we can say other than, "They're right."

WAIT UNTIL NEXT YEAR

Perhaps the news media's understandable interest in the American presidential election diverted their attention away from the theory of evolution. We expect things to change next February 12, which is "[Darwin Day](#)."

Darwin Day is a global celebration of science and reason held on or around Feb. 12, the birthday anniversary of evolutionary biologist Charles Darwin. This year [2009] marks the 200th anniversary of Charles Darwin's birth.¹

Evolutionists will certainly do something spectacular to celebrate Darwin's birth. Perhaps they haven't published much in 2008 because they are holding it for a big blitz in 2009. Meanwhile, the Discovery Institute wants to protest evolution by making [February 12, 2009, Academic Freedom Day](#).² We will have to wait and see and react when it happens.

Yes, it has been a slow news year, from an evolutionary point of view. And yes, we do have a backlog of material from previous months and years that we can use. And yes, after 12 years of 12 newsletters each, there remains very little to refute. So, the challenge for us next year will be to remain current and topical in the absence of new claims from evolutionists. We will do our best to rise to the challenge.

¹ <http://www.darwinday.org/>

² <http://www.academicfreedomday.com/>

HELPFUL EVOLUTIONISTS

We are now getting less hate mail from evolutionists. Now, they want to help us!

In the past, a lot of our hate mail has been unprintable. In recent months, however, evolutionists have taken a kinder, gentler, tone. Here is a typical example.

Subject: Responding to "Take A Joke!"
From: Nicholas
Date: Sat, 22 Nov 2008

Most of what is said on the site scienceagainstevolution.org is truthful and I value that. But when I read "Ironically, in his last paragraph, he admits he can't explain how a love for cats could have evolved, which was our only point." in the article "Take A Joke!" and reread the last paragraph of the email within it, I was troubled. He claimed that he was not attempting to explain nor to make a claim. He said nothing about not being able to explain. If I am not mistaken, the statement I quoted in my second sentence was a lie. I suggest you correct it before more repercussions occur.

Technically, Nicholas is correct. Cyrus did say that he wasn't attempting to explain how love could have evolved. But, we have to ask, "Why did Cyrus not attempt to explain how love could have evolved?" The answer seems clear to us. He didn't attempt to do it because he could not, and he knew he could not. It is an unsolved problem for evolutionists. If Cyrus could explain it, then the problem would be solved.

Nicholas doesn't really want to help us. He is trying to get us to back away from the position that love cannot be explained by any evolutionary process.

Love certainly exists. Even some animals show behavior that implies at least devotion or affection. But unselfish love is incompatible with the idea of selfish genes trying to win the struggle for existence at all cost. It is a constant thorn in the side of evolutionists.

Remember, Cyrus started his email to us last month with "good advice."

Your arguments would be much more compelling if your writers would stick to fact.

He didn't want to help us refute evolution. He just wanted us to stop using humor because it is an effective weapon.

In fairness, however, we must admit that we have sometimes offered "good advice" to evolutionists. But we are honest enough to admit that we offered this good advice out of purely

selfish motives. ☺

We have told evolutionists how to end the controversy once and for all. Simply put forth a scientifically sound argument in favor of evolution. Let there be honest debate between those who believe in intelligent design and those who believe in evolution. If there is such good evidence for evolution, then the evolutionary argument will surely carry the day.

But evolutionists have fallen into that trap before. That's why they won't debate any more. That's why they go to court to censor the science curriculum. That's why they don't take our "good advice."

THE CONSPIRACY

Aaron wonders how such an evolutionary conspiracy could exist.

Ben Stein's movie and Jerry Bergman's book both imply a massive global conspiracy to keep the public in the dark about the fallacies of the theory of evolution. Aaron is skeptical.

Subject: Evolution and peer review
From: Aaron
Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2008
Hello Mr. Pogge,

I am constantly thinking about the evolution debate, and although it may not be solved in my lifetime, I just can't stop thinking about it. Granted I am no biologist, but my current belief (based on an evaluation of all the facts) is that everything you say is correct. Lately, I have been bothered by the apparent lack of peer-reviewed articles in favor of intelligent design, or ones that cast doubt on the idea of life forming unguided, or cast doubt on macroevolution.

From reading your pages it would seem like a huge conspiracy exists that prevents any peer-reviewed literature against evolution to be published. But, I wonder how this can be so difficult, unless either (a) a worldwide conspiracy actually does exist, or (b) science is actually in favor of evolution. Maybe I don't understand the peer-review process. What if somebody kept them short, and included some of the facts that you list on your pages, ones that nobody could possibly refute. Start small, with brief snippets of facts. Then, peer-reviewed articles will exist, and then maybe more scientists will be free to "come out of the closet" against evolution.

How hard could it be to make a couple peer reviewed articles that say stuff like:

"Life has never been witnessed to appear spontaneously, therefore it is a perfectly within the reasonable realm of science to doubt that life arose by natural causes." And leave it at that; send it out for peer review. Again, I am sure I am showing my ignorance in the peer review process.

Or what about another one liner:

"Some mathematicians calculated the odds of the human brain forming by natural causes over time to be 100 trillion to 1." I don't have

the exact numbers or anything, just an example, can't a mathematician/biologist out there come up with something like this?

Can't something be done to get a few "peer-reviewed" articles out there so that people who doubt evolution can at least cite some "peer reviewed" articles during debates?

Thanks again, love your site!

Aaron

HERD MENTALITY

It isn't really a conspiracy. It is simply herd mentality. The longer an individual remains in an academic environment, the less capable that individual is of independent thought. The only way to succeed in academia is to be part of the Good Old Boy Network.

Engineers who work in the real world have a different view of truth than professors who live in the ivory tower of academia.

Suppose ten engineers say that a bridge design is sound, but one engineer disagrees. They build the bridge, and it falls down. The one engineer who recognized the design flaw was right. If the bridge stands, then the lone engineer who said it wouldn't work was wrong. Truth is based on experimental reality.

In the academic world, truth is determined by consensus. If ten professors say one thing, and one professor disagrees, the one who disagrees is wrong by definition. That's why nobody wants to hold the minority opinion.

PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS

There is also a difference between peer-reviewed journals and independently published magazines. Anybody with enough money can publish a magazine devoted to any topic. If you are Oprah Winfrey, you can even put your own picture on the cover of every issue. But peer-reviewed journals have to be published by some sort of recognized academic group, so there aren't many of them. The big three peer-reviewed journals are *Science*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science (PNAS)*, and *Nature*. There are also some very narrowly focused journals, too. For example, the same people who publish *Nature* also publish *Nature Biotechnology*, *Nature Cell Biology*, *Nature Chemical Biology*, *Nature Chemistry*, and other similar specific journals.

There are also some lesser journals. One of those is the one published by the Smithsonian Institute, which nobody heard of until Richard Sternberg published an article on Intelligent Design in it, and got fired for doing so. We documented his troubles in previous newsletters,³

³ *Disclosure*, October 2004, "Driving a Stake into the Heart of Evolution",

Disclosure, February 2005, "Retaliation",

and Ben Stein featured him in his movie, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) publishes the journal, *Science*. As a member of the AAAS, every year I get to vote to determine which one of the three nominated evolutionists will be president of the AAAS. Every time I vote I hum, "Back in the U.S.S.R.". The Good Old Boy Network decides who will be on the ballot. I really have no choice.

The point is, there aren't that many peer-reviewed journals, and their editorial boards are controlled by an elite inner circle of people. We aren't talking about a great number of people. It isn't a vast conspiracy. It is just a few people who have spent so much time in an academic environment isolated from reality that they have all acquired the same ideas.

THE EVIL INTERNET

Prior to the invention of the Internet, these people had a monopoly on information distribution. What has driven these people into a panic the last few years is the fact that people they can't control now have access to an information distribution system. They can't censor opposing opinions. If the opposing opinion becomes the majority opinion, then it becomes consensus. That makes it true by definition, making them wrong.

The rejection of evolution eventually (after a long fight) is going to become the majority opinion because it is more consistent with scientific fact. To stall off the inevitable, they have to keep denying the facts. That's why any criticism of evolution has to be kept out of biology textbooks. That's why court decisions have to be obtained to prevent any discussion of evolution in the biology classrooms. That's why teachers who permit open discussion of the theory of evolution have to be punished. Evolutionists are afraid of the truth.

OTHER SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

There are other excellent scientific journals that evolutionists pretend don't exist. The *Creation Research Society Quarterly Journal*⁴ has been published continuously since 1964. *Answers in Genesis* publishes the on-line *Answers Research Journal (ARJ)*.⁵ Both are professional, peer-reviewed technical journals for the publication of interdisciplinary scientific and other relevant research from the perspective of the recent creation and the global flood within a

Disclosure, November 2005, "Conspiracy Proof"

⁴ <http://www.creationresearch.org/crsq.html>

⁵ <http://www.answersingenesis.org/arj>

Biblical framework.

From an evolutionist's perspective, however, these aren't "real" peer-reviewed journals published by "real" scientists. "Real" scientists don't doubt evolution, and since these people reject evolution, they cannot (by definition) be "real" scientists.

THE PURPOSE OF JOURNALS

There are two main reasons why people write education articles. One is that there is a satisfaction that comes from helping other people. Writing an article about a technical subject that helps other people make a technical advancement for the good of humanity is very satisfying. That's a very powerful motivation, especially for teachers, because people certainly don't become teachers for the money!

The second reason is for the money. Despite what we just said about teachers not being motivated by money, teachers do need money to survive.

The magazines that you buy on the newsstands pay by the page, but not very much. The prestigious journals don't pay anything at all. Despite that, professors must, as the saying goes, "Publish or perish!" Professors have to publish articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals in order to prove their intelligence and the value of their research in order to get funding for further research. So, despite the fact that publishing an article may not result in any immediate financial reward, publishing indirectly results in income. You can be a great teacher, loved by all your students, but if you don't publish any papers that result in research grants to your university, you will probably get fired.

An article that directly attacks the theory of evolution isn't going to get published in one of the accepted peer-reviewed journals, regardless of its technical merits. Such an article would directly contradict the credibility of the elite group of editors who believe in the theory of evolution. If the editors lose their credibility, they lose their research grants.

HOW TO PUBLISH THE TRUTH

You may wonder why we are able to find so much information in the approved scientific journals that refutes the theory of evolution. The answer is that the authors always present the information very tactfully. The articles are always presented as possible solutions to a well-known problems with the theory of evolution.

For example, unselfish, altruistic behavior is totally incompatible with the theory of evolution. But people do, from time to time, perform

unselfish acts. This needs to be explained. So, authors write papers attempting to suggest that one can really be selfish by being unselfish. Usually the article admits that their answer doesn't really work; but they claim they are on the right track, and with just a little bit more funding, they will solve the problem! ☺

This has been a long, drawn-out explanation to Aaron's question why peer-reviewed journals never publish anything like, "Life has never been witnessed to appear spontaneously, therefore it is perfectly within the reasonable realm of science to doubt that life arose by natural causes." Articles like that don't lead to research grants, so they will never be published.

You Can help

RADIO SPOTS

*"In exchange for obtaining a valuable license to operate a broadcast station using the public airwaves, each radio and television licensee is required by law to operate its station in the 'public interest, convenience and necessity.' "*⁶

You can help Science Against Evolution by asking your local radio station to broadcast our 30-second public service announcements. Your local radio station might not only be willing to do this, or they might actually be eager to do it. Here's why.

Applications for License Renewal.

Licenses expire and renewal applications are due on a staggered basis, based upon the state in which the station is licensed. Before we can renew a station's license, we must first determine whether, during the preceding license term, the licensee has served the public interest; has not committed any serious violations of the Communications Act or the FCC's rules; and has not committed other violations which, taken together, would constitute a pattern of abuse.⁷

Each radio station must maintain a "public inspection file" documenting how the station served the public interest. One of the ways a station can prove that it served the public interest is by broadcasting Public Service Announcements free of charge.

Many modern radio stations are largely automated. They receive program material via satellite. This program material could be music or a syndicated talk show. The program material has

⁶ http://www.fcc.gov/mb/audio/decdoc/public_and_broadcasting.html

⁷ *ibid.*

certain designated times when the local radio station can insert commercials. If the local radio station doesn't sell enough commercials, they have to broadcast something to fill the time. Radio stations do this in one of two ways.

First, they can broadcast paid commercials additional times for free. This makes the advertisers happy because they get more advertising than they paid for; but it also tells advertisers that they really don't need to buy so many commercials. They can buy fewer commercials, but the radio station will broadcast them just as often as they used to because they have to fill the time. This reduces the radio station's revenue, so the radio station would rather not do this too often.

The second way to fill the time is to broadcast Public Service Announcements. This forces advertisers to pay for their commercials, and scores the radio station points with the FCC when it comes time to renew their license. Your local radio station might be looking for 30-second Public Service Announcements that they can broadcast to fill time. You can give them some. We have converted six of our Seventy-five Theses⁸ to audio format.

Let us emphasize that radio stations are not required to broadcast Public Service Announcements. You cannot demand that they do. But it doesn't hurt to ask. Some radio stations, especially those targeting Christian or conservative listeners, might be eager to broadcast our spots. Other radio stations might not.

Our radio spots are easy to obtain. Just go to <http://scienceagainstevolution.org/radio.htm>. At the bottom of the page right-click on these links: Thesis 12; Thesis 39; Thesis 47; Thesis 56; Thesis 70; and Thesis 74. "Save link target as" files on your disk drive. Burn them on an audio CD that you can take to the radio station. Or, simply ask the radio station to use their computer to download these six 30-second spots.

If your local radio station does agree to broadcast our Public Service Announcements, please send an email to radio@ScienceAgainstEvolution.org telling us what station is broadcasting our spots. Thanks!

About Us

14TH COMMUNITY DINNER

Science Against Evolution participated in Ridgecrest's annual Community Dinner again this

year. It is one of our few opportunities to meet with the public to try to gauge public sentiment about the theory of evolution. Granted, it is a relatively small sample of the population in a small desert city that is more technically oriented than most, so the conclusions might not be valid. We have, however, seen a trend over the past several years. Fewer and fewer people want to defend the theory of evolution.

In fact, this year, the only defender of evolution that I talked to was a retired Presbyterian minister. (The retired Methodist minister who believes in evolution was at the dinner, too, but he won't answer me when I greet him.) Like the Methodist minister, the Presbyterian minister couldn't defend the theory of evolution on a scientific basis, but assumed it must be true because scientists say it is true. The Presbyterian minister said that since evolution is a scientific fact, the Biblical days must not be 24 hour days, but rather long ages, and "death" in the Bible must not mean death, but rather "second death." Kindly, the minister assured me it was OK for me to believe whatever I wanted to believe, even if it was wrong.

Several people took the opportunity at the Community Dinner to thank us for showing Ben Stein's movie, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, at a special meeting we had a few days after the movie came out on DVD in October. We advertised the special meeting extensively in print and on the radio. As a result we had a huge crowd (we estimate about 280 people), many of whom I had never met before.

I was pleasantly surprised to learn at the Community Dinner that at least one of the local public schools had shown *Expelled* to its students.

Certainly there wasn't much support in Ridgecrest for the theory of evolution when we began in 1996. Each year at the Community Dinner, we find fewer and fewer people who believe in evolution. It is hard for us to tell if that is representative of America as a whole. The primary employer of people in Ridgecrest is the premier Naval weapons laboratory, so people in Ridgecrest tend to be more scientifically literate than most other places. No doubt the theory of evolution is still going strong in pockets of ignorance where scientific censorship has been successful. But the amount of hate mail we receive has decreased dramatically the last few years, despite increasing visits to our web site. Hopefully, the theory of evolution might not be fit enough to survive many more years.

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

⁸ *Disclosure*, March 2008, Seventy-five Theses

by Lothar Janetzko

MOLECULAR HISTORY RESEARCH CENTER

<http://www.mhrc.net/why.htm>

Why Creation Research?

This month's web site review looks at a site where the author, Michael Brown, Ph.D., discusses why he is planning to do research within a Creation/short chronology framework. He believes the weight of evidence does not prove evolution. "We do not have an issue of weight of evidence. Rather, what we have is weight of interpretation!"

On the home page you will find links to 1) Home, 2) Why Creation Research?, 3) Research Assumptions, 4) Pseudogene Research, 5) Topics of Interest, 6) Michael Brown Ph.D. 7) Molecular Biology Links, 8) Creation links, 9) Donate and 10) Mike's Resources on Creation, Prophecy.

Following the Home page link you learn about the purpose of the Molecular History Research Center. It is a nonprofit organization that conducts research for the purpose of pursuing Molecular theories that have a Biblical Creation perspective.

Following the Topics of Interest link you will find a number of issues that show good promise of allowing the Creation paradigm to give more satisfying answers to problems faced by evolutionists. The topics discussed are 1) Ancient Amino Acids, 2) Ancient DNA, 3) Mitochondrial Clock and the Story of Mitochondrial Eve, 4) Cambrian Explosion of Life and Complexity, 5) Speciation and Origins an Alternate to the Biological Revolution, 6) Carbon 14 Dating and 7) Amino Acid Dating.

There is much to explore on this site. The author is very open about his research assumptions and his approach to science. He states that "The Evolution paradigm has been a successful tool for producing workable models and interesting theories, but I feel the Creation paradigm will prove to be even more successful in producing greater insights in the workings of reality."

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