Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 15 Issue 4 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org January 2011

The Gullibility Limit

Is there no limit to what people will believe if it is prefaced by the phrase, "Scientists say …" ?

Someone once asked, "Why is it that when an astronomer tells you there are 100 billion trillion stars, you believe him; but when a sign says, 'Wet Paint', you have to touch it?" ☺ We realize it is a rhetorical question meant merely as a joke; but there is a serious answer. It could be that the sign has been there so long that the paint has had time to dry. We don't know if the paint is still wet or not. Since we are naturally curious, we do an experiment to see if the paint is still wet. We can verify if the paint really is wet or not by touching it.

When an astronomer tells us how many stars there are, how far away they are, what they are made of, and how old they are, there is no way we can know if he is correct. We have to take his word, based on his reputation, the degrees he has earned, and the college where he earned his degrees. He can never prove what he tells us is true, and we can never prove he is wrong. Cosmology is based on a few astronomical observations, resulting in conclusions which have to be accepted by faith in the cosmologist. That makes it personal, which makes it emotional.

We received this email (indirectly) from Ken regarding our recent article on missing short-lived isotopes [1] illustrating our point.

> The reality is that we understand quite well how such isotopes are formed in stars, and these processes produce both long- and short-lived isotopes, as well as non-radioactive isotopes. Potassium, for example, comes in three common isotopic forms: Potassium-39, potassium-40, and potassium-41. Only potassium 40 is radioactive, but all three types are found in nature, since the half-life of K-40 is more than a billion years. Now, lead (Pb) also comes in several isotopic forms, which include Pb-204, Pb-206, Pb-207, and Pb-208. The "missing" isotope, which is easy to generate in reactors, is Pb-205 which has a half-life of about 30 million years. Since the material from which the earth is formed is much older than that, no Pb-205 remains on earth.
>
> What's the point? The only way to claim that the natural process of element-building in stars could produce all of the isotopes of lead - except for Pb-205 - would be to identify a process that would somehow produce long-lived isotopes like K-40 while not producing short-lived isotopes like Pb-205 (even though it could make all of the other forms of lead!). There is, in fact, no such process - and the creationists know this. Therefore they are reduced to the ridiculous explanation that the reason those isotopes are missing is because God made it that way. In more direct terms, God deliberately set out to fool us about the age of the earth.
>
> Sorry, but I'm not buying into the idea of a deceptive God.
>
> Sincerely,
> Ken

There are two keys to his logic. The first key is his first sentence. He thinks "we understand quite well how such isotopes are formed in stars." The fact is that some people THINK they know, but the process has never been observed. Nobody really knows anything at all about how all the elements in the universe were created. The cosmological stories about elements being produced by exploding stars are just stories. Yes, stars apparently explode today, producing novas or supernovas, but that doesn't mean that all the elements in the universe were created that way.

Scientists don't agree on how all the elements in the universe were formed. Every theory has significant problems. Scientists can't even agree on how many stars there are.

> Astronomers who examined eight relatively nearby galaxies have found evidence of a surprisingly high abundance of faint, low-mass stars — each has about 10 times as many as the Milky Way. Those elderly galaxies are so

[1] *Disclosure*, November 2010, "Missing Isotopes", http://scienceagainstevolution.org/v15i2f.htm

chock-full of faint stars that the researchers extrapolate that the heavens contain up to three times the total number of stars previously estimated.

The profusion of stars also suggests that the early history of the cosmos may need a rewrite, perhaps doubling previous estimates of the total mass of stars in many of the universe's first, massive galaxies. If so, those early galaxies would have forged stars at a much more prodigious rate, says Pieter van Dokkum of Yale University. He and Charlie Conroy of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Cambridge, Mass., describe their study in a paper appearing online in *Nature* on December 1.

…

The number of stars in the universe is highly uncertain, but astronomers have previously put the total at about 100 billion trillion, or 10^{23}. [2]

Watch Where You Sit

From a practical point of view, it matters if the paint is still wet if you sit on the recently painted bench. Does it really matter if there are 100 billion trillion or 300 billion trillion stars? Does the number of stars affect what you eat, how long you will live, who you will marry, or how rich you will be? No, it only affects your life if you let it affect what you believe. The actual number of stars (and their locations at the moment of your birth) don't affect your life—unless you let them.

Let us be uncharacteristically repetitious because this is really important. Whether or not you get paint on your pants when you sit on the recently painted bench depends upon whether the paint is actually wet or not. It doesn't matter what you believe. If you believe the paint is dry, but it is actually wet, you will get paint on your pants no matter how strongly you believe the paint is dry. But when it comes to astrology or cosmology, the truth doesn't matter. Your belief is all that matters. If the astrologer tells you not to go outside today because of your astrological sign, your decision to stay inside is based on your belief, not the actual power of the position of the stars.

Cosmology is nothing more than a modern form of astrology. Some people make life-altering decisions based on what they believe about the formation of the universe. Ken is one of these people.

Remember, the first key to Ken's logic was his belief that he knows how all the elements in the universe were formed. He believes a cosmological story about how all isotopes were formed. He has no way of knowing if that story is correct or not. Practically speaking, it is irrelevant whether or not isotopes were formed by that process, or some other process. All that matters is that he believes it.

The second key to understanding Ken's argument is that he has certain beliefs about the character of God. He thinks he knows what God would or would not do. He thinks he knows why God did not create Pb-205. He thinks God did it to make the Earth look old.

Ken's email is based just as much on what he believes about God as it is on what he believes about nuclear reactions. He is trying to convince us to agree with him based on what he "knows" about God. Is Ken an expert theologian? Does Ken know God well enough that we should trust what he tells us about God?

Laughing From Beyond the Grave

It would not surprise me if, when Stephen Hawkings dies, someone discovers a recording that is labeled, "Do not play until after my death." When the recording is played a mechanical voice could very well say,

> *For decades I have been conducting a secret experiment. I wanted to discover how gullible people are. So, I kept telling taller and taller tales. Some of these ridiculous stories are on-line at http://hawking.org.uk/index.php/lectures /publiclectures. I expected that sooner or later everyone would recognize them to be nonsense. But no matter how fantastic the stories were, highly educated people believed them. In fact, the more highly educated they were, the easier it was to fool them. The experiment failed. I never could reach the "Gullibility Limit."*

There is something to be learned from every experiment, whether it succeeds or not, whether the experiment is done on purpose or not. Sometimes more is learned from failure than success. Decades of experiments failing to create life from scratch through natural processes has taught us why life could not have originated that way.

Similarly, all these different cosmological explanations requiring fudge factors like dark matter and dark energy fail to explain astronomical observations, and simply prove that the Big Bang Theory is just a big bust, and that there is no limit to gullibility!

---

[2] Cowen, *Science News*, January 1, 2011, "Billions, billions, and more billions", Page 10, http://sciencenews.org/view/generic/id/66894/title/Its_really_full_of_stars

Email

Their Rules

Evolutionists object when we don't play by their rules.

Joe wrote to us from an email address at a well-known Catholic university.

> Mr. Jones,
> Good evening! Today I came upon your site for the first time and decided to go through several of the "Disclosure" newsletters. While I see many arguments against the theory of evolution, or at least several aspects of it, I have been thus far unable to find a counter-solution. While I understand that the main point of the site is a rebuttal to evolution theory, it would be nice to see your theories as to the alternatives. Am I just missing this somewhere?
> Thank you,
> Joe

We wrote back to him, referring him to two recent articles [3] which explained why we don't present any alternatives, or feel the need to. One of these articles presented a legal analogy (an innocent person need not prove someone else guilty in order to be acquitted), and the other used a medical analogy (a doctor need not make a final diagnosis before ruling out one or more possible diseases).

Joe's response was instructive.

> I find the logic behind both of these reasoning [*sic*] to be a bit strange. By comparing theories for (or by extension against) evolution to a crime or disease, you seem to be implying that there are immediate negative consequences related to belief in evolution; your examples of a false conviction or mistreatment. Putting the rhetoric aside, the only consequence of accepting one of the theories of evolution as a possibility (emphasis on theory and possibility) should be to encourage exploration of said theory with the hope of uncovering more or stronger evidence either denying or (hopefully) confirming it.
> As it stands, contemporary theories of evolution are those that we have the most evidence supporting. While I agree with you that they are neither perfect nor solid (far from it in some cases), to close our minds to even this possibility would be to start from scratch with no theory at all, which could not only slow down our attempts at finding a true solution, but provides no real scientific benefit.
> I strongly support the concept of your site; to provide a reasonable academic rebuttal to theories of evolution. I do not agree with your practices of not accepting it as even a possibility, given that the evidence for both sides of the argument have their relative strengths and weaknesses.
> My point: The future of science should encourage open-mindedness and cooperation from all involved parties to find the one true solution. By taking a polarizing stance either for or against this, both your followers and the staunch evolutionists are discouraging this future.
> Please do not regard this message as a personal attack, I would simply like to engage in a more serious academic discussion.
> Thank you very much for your time,
> Joe

Joe doesn't dispute any of the facts in our newsletters. He objects to our approach and tone. He wants us to play by his rules. We aren't conforming to his academic prejudice of how a discussion should be conducted.

Red Herrings

In his first letter, he wanted us to present an alternative to the theory of evolution. This would have allowed him to use a debate tactic termed, "the red herring." The term conjures up the image of an escaping prisoner dragging a smelly fish across his trail to prevent a bloodhound from following him. It is a way of diverting the discussion away from a weak position.

There are dozens of alternatives to the theory of evolution including (but not limited to) Greek Mythology, traditional Cherokee legends, and the Multiverse Theory rooted in quantum physics. Suppose we present the Cherokee creation story as the alternative. We can't prove it is true, and Joe can't prove it is false; but it allows Joe to avoid talking about the many weaknesses of the theory of evolution.

The theory of evolution should be evaluated on its own merits. The merits (or lack of merit) of any other explanations are irrelevant.

Since we didn't follow the first red herring, Joe came up with a second red herring. He wanted to draw us into a discussion about the proper tone and method to take when discussing evolution. He wanted to talk about anything other than the scientific arguments against evolution.

Where to Start

Joes said that "to start from scratch with no theory at all … could not only slow down our attempts at finding a true solution, but provides no real scientific benefit." That's nonsense. It is better to start over from scratch than to continue down the wrong path. A correct theory will never be found as long as one holds on to an incorrect theory.

As long as Joe continues to believe that the theory of evolution is generally correct, but wrong in a few specific details, he will never find a solution. That's why "there are immediate negative consequences related to belief in evolution." There is no positive benefit to

[3] http://scienceagainstevolution.org/v15i1e.htm and http://www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v13i12f.htm

believing something that isn't true—especially if it is an obstacle to finding the truth.

Explorers Wanted

Despite what Joe says, we do encourage exploration of the theory of evolution. The more you explore it, the more you will find wrong with it, and the sooner you will reject it. That's why we subscribe to the expensive professional scientific journals and tell you what they say about evolution. We give you a glimpse into the serious academic discussions going on in the professional literature about the weaknesses of the theory of evolution.

If Joe really wanted to promote a serious academic discussion about evolution, he would write to us about recent articles in the peer-reviewed professional literature. Instead, he asks us to defend alternatives and our tone. But, coming from academia as he does, he probably doesn't even realize what he is doing.

Evolution in the News

Arsenic-Loving Bacteria

The need for funding poisons science.

Last month, our "six-page newsletter" was 12 pages long, so we could not address the announcement of what some people thought was an alien life-form discovered on Earth. This misunderstanding was later corrected in the scientific literature; but it didn't get as much press as the original sensational announcement. In case you missed it, here's what happened. It all started with a NASA press release on December 2 which contained some exciting claims.

> NASA-funded astrobiology research has changed the fundamental knowledge about what comprises all known life on Earth.
>
> Researchers conducting tests in the harsh environment of Mono Lake in California have discovered the first known microorganism on Earth able to thrive and reproduce using the toxic chemical arsenic. The microorganism substitutes arsenic for phosphorus in its cell components.
>
> "The definition of life has just expanded," said Ed Weiler, NASA's associate administrator for the Science Mission Directorate at the agency's Headquarters in Washington. "As we pursue our efforts to seek signs of life in the solar system, we have to think more broadly, more diversely and consider life as we do not know it." [4]
>
> The discovery of an organism that thrives on otherwise poisonous arsenic broadens our thinking about the possibility of life on other planets, and begs a rewrite of biology textbooks by changing our understanding of how life is formed from its most basic elemental building blocks. [5]

This was sensationally reported by popular news media in stories like these:

> In a bombshell that upends long-held assumptions about the basic building blocks of life, scientists have discovered a whole new type of creature: a microbe that lives on arsenic. It is unlike every other lifeform on the planet - from the simplest plant to the most complex mammal. [6]
>
> The discovery of such odd life in our own backyard is a big boost for those searching the skies for extraterrestrials.
>
> Such research findings prove that "shadow" creatures live in extreme environments previously thought uninhabitable. So here are the provocative questions posed by this finding: Are there other microbes than can do this? And could such creatures evolve into intelligent life, elsewhere? [7]
>
> This finding is important because it adds an extra criterion for the search of life on other planets. Historically, astronauts on space missions looked for evidence of life on other planets by seeing if their samples had the basic chemical elements of life. Arsenic was not one of those elements until this recent discovery. This means that there may have been samples they found that actually had signs of sustaining life. [8]

---

[4] NASA, 2 December 2010, "NASA-Funded Research Discovers Life Built With Toxic Chemical", http://www.nasa.gov/topics/universe/features/astrobiology_toxic_chemical.html

[5] NASA, 2 December 2010, "Get Your Biology Textbook...and an Eraser!", http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/articles/thriving-on-arsenic/

[6] The Huffington Post, December 2, 2010, "NASA Discovers New Life: Arsenic Bacteria With DNA Completely Alien To What We Know", http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/12/02/nasa-new-life-arsenic-bacteria_n_791094.html

[7] MercuryNews.com, 2 December 2010, "NASA: Arsenic-eating bacteria suggests extraterrestrial life possible", http://www.mercurynews.com/san-mateo-county/ci_16763468?nclick_check=1

[8] AllMediaNY.com, 5 December 2010, "Arsenic-Based Bacteria: Implications and Why It's Important", http://www.allmediany.com/details_news_article.php?news_artid=420

> So, theoretically speaking, life could exist on Venus which is extremely hot and acidic, or, it can exist on Mars where it's extremely cold and gaseous. [9]

It's easy to see how the general public could get the impression that evidence for extra-terrestrial life had been discovered. Other scientists acted quickly to correct this misconception, but with much less fanfare.

> A cryptic announcement from NASA in November said that the agency had important astrobiology news, leading many to speculate that it was set to unveil extraterrestrial life. Instead, during a media conference on 2 December, researchers announced the discovery of ordinary earthly bacteria from Mono Lake in California that seemed to do something extraordinary — use arsenic as a building block for DNA and proteins, in place of the phosphorus relied on by other organisms. But as soon as the unprecedented finding was made public, it drew sharp criticism from the scientific community. Biochemists took to the blogosphere, attacking the methodology and assumptions of the original research and provoking a flurry of articles in the media. Further work will be needed to settle whether the bacteria actually do use arsenic in their biochemistry as opposed to just cleverly thwarting its toxic effects. [10]
>
> In December, the bullets were flying furiously over a report about a microbe converted into an arsenic-loving, alien-like species proving that life on other worlds can be very different from Earth's.
>
> Oh wait. That was the hype. NASA's clever PR machine leaked just enough information about the announcement for this new study to compete for media attention with celebrity divorces and athlete arrests. … it turned out to be a simple case of an earthly species learning to substitute arsenic for phosphorus in its diet, as Rachel Ehrenberg describes in this issue (Page 5). [11]

NASA's clever PR machine isn't really competing for attention—it is competing for money! But, the way to get money is to get media attention.

It is no secret that money is tight these days, and budgets are getting cut. Politicians and the general public don't appreciate the importance of scientific research as much as we think they should. Space exploration, just to find out what's out there, is very important; but the people who hold the purse strings usually don't see it that way. They need to know that they are going to get something valuable for their investment.

NASA knows that there are people who desperately want to find evidence of life outside Earth because evolutionists believe that wherever the conditions permit life to exist, life will evolve. As long as people believe that NASA will someday vindicate their evolutionary beliefs, they will keep funding it. NASA is very much aware of this. That's why their announcement of this strange bacterium in Mono Lake included these admissions:

> NASA's Astrobiology Program in Washington contributed funding for the research through its Exobiology and Evolutionary Biology program and the NASA Astrobiology Institute. NASA's Astrobiology Program supports research into the origin, evolution, distribution, and future of life on Earth. [12]
>
> Among the goals of these programs is determining the evolution of genes, metabolic pathways, and microbial species on Earth in order to understand the potential for life on other worlds. Wolfe-Simon's discovery represents the first time in the history of biology that an organism has been found to use a different element to build one of its most basic structures. [13]

The need to tie these arsenic-loving bacteria to evolution in order to get money, poisoned the way this discovery was reported.

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

You are also permitted (even encouraged) to send a donation of $15/year to Science Against Evolution, P.O. Box 923, Ridgecrest, CA 93556-0923, to help us in our work. ☺

[9] *ibid.*

[10] *Nature*, 23/30 December 2010, "Arsenic-based life was discovered. Or not.", page 1016, http://www.nature.com/news/2010/101222/full/4681014a.html

[11] *Science News*, 1 January 2011, "Even with poisonous hype, some science can survive", page 2

[12] NASA, 2 December 2010, Discovery of "Arsenic-bug" Expands Definition of Life", http://science.nasa.gov/science-news/science-at-nasa/2010/02dec_monolake/

[13] NASA, 2 December 2010, "Get Your Biology Textbook...and an Eraser!", http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/articles/thriving-on-arsenic/

by Lothar Janetzko

Refuting Evolution

http://creation.com/refuting-evolution-index

A handbook for students, parents, and teachers countering the latest arguments for evolution

This month's web site review looks at a book that can be found on the Creation Ministries International web site. This web site shows the reach of the Internet because at the bottom of the home page you will find a copyright notice that states, "© Creation Ministries International in Australia/Canada/NZ/Singapore/South Africa/UK-Europe/USA."

The handbook, Refuting Evolution, contains a forward & introduction and ten chapters. Each of the first nine chapters is followed by a study guide. The chapter titles are as follows: 1) Facts & Bias; 2) Variation and Natural Selection versus Evolution; 3) The Links Are Missing; 4) Bird Evolution?; 5) Whale Evolution?; 6) Humans: Images of God or Advanced Apes?; 7) Astronomy; 8) How Old Is the Earth?; 9) Is the Design Explanation Legitimate?; and 10) Conclusion.

At the end of each chapter you will find links to references and notes that you can explore.

In the Introduction you learn that Refuting Evolution seeks to "redress the lopsided pro-evolutionary way in which origins are taught." The handbook responds to many of the arguments presented in the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) educator's guidebook entitled *Teaching about Evolution and the Nature of Science*.

Besides exploring the handbook, there is a lot of information that a reader can find on this web site. There are links to Featured Articles, Magazine Archive, Book Reviews, Study Guides, Creation for Kids and many other topics. Just explore topics that you find interesting.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of

Twenty-first Century Science Against Evolution

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