Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 17 Issue 2 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org November 2012

More Junk

Junk is evidence of sophisticated adaptability, not chance.

Last month, we didn't give the articles about junk DNA all the attention they really deserve. We simply noted that evolutionary thinking had hindered scientific research in that area. [1] We didn't want to go into detail about everything the ENCODE project had discovered, and we still don't. We don't want to get so technical that the majority of our readers get overwhelmed. We do, however, want to say more about the topic.

Our only point last month was that evolutionists were surprised to discover that junk DNA isn't junk—it has a purpose. On the other hand, creationists have always thought that junk DNA does have a purpose—scientists just hadn't figured out what the purpose was. Because evolutionists thought there wasn't any information in junk DNA, they didn't bother looking for it. Their evolutionary bias stood in the way of the advancement of science. Now that evolutionary scientists know what creation scientists have always known, much more research will be done on junk DNA (we really need a new term for "junk DNA" now) and more will be learned.

Background Bias

Everybody has a bias. That's not necessarily a bad thing. Our past experience biases how we look at new situations. The bias is bad only if it prevents us from seeing the truth. If our bias helps us look at a problem from a different angle, and that angle makes the truth more apparent, then bias is a good thing.

I have an engineering background which gives me an engineering bias. I began my career working in telemetry. That job involved taking information from many sensors on a Sidewinder missile, combining information from all those data sources into a single data stream, and transmitting that data stream to a ground station so the missile designers could analyze how the missile performed during a test flight. In other words, my first job had to do with collecting, encoding, transmitting, and decoding information.

Later, I designed seekers for several guided missiles. That job involved creating an image from an infrared sensor, detecting the location of the target in that image, and transmitting that location to the guidance section of the missile. Again, the job was to collect, encode, transmit, and decode information.

When microprocessors were invented, I wrote programs that used them to process information in various weapons systems. One of those systems was a radar that could tell the difference between radar returns from a soldier sneaking through the jungle and radar returns from leaves being blown by the wind. I was awarded a patent for that algorithm.

Later, I moved into "foreign material exploitation," where I reverse engineered weapons designed in other countries. Working from whatever I had, however it was obtained, I had to figure out the purpose of every part, and how they all worked together. I quickly learned that every part of a foreign weapon system had an important function, even if it wasn't immediately apparent to me.

Here's the point of all this personal background: For decades, my life was dedicated to every aspect of information transmission and processing. So, naturally, I look at the DNA molecule as an information system of foreign design—not some random combination of chemicals that just happened to do something by accident. When I look at the DNA molecule, I see a very sophisticated information encoding system, not meaningless junk.

[1] *Disclosure*, October 2012, "Another Man's Junk", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v17i1n.htm

Evolutionists have been biased to think that everything happened by chance. So, when evolutionists saw portions of the DNA molecule that aren't immediately apparent, they saw junk. They weren't looking for meaning, so they didn't find meaning.

The "junk" in DNA isn't really junk—it is pseudo-junk. That is, it looks like junk, but it isn't.

An HTML Analogy

Perhaps the most interesting way to see how to recognize pseudo-junk from real junk is to stroll down memory lane and compare DNA to HTML.

HTML is the HyperText Markup Language. [2] It is used to transmit web pages over the Internet. To the untrained eye, it looks like it contains a lot of junk—but it doesn't. So, let's explore HTML and see what it tells us about how to tell junk from obscure information.

When I first started working with computers, text files contained nothing but text. That is, a text file contained letters, numbers, punctuation marks, and three formatting characters (Carriage Return, Line Feed, and Tab). There was no unnecessary junk in a text file. Every character had meaning.

When printed, a text file looked like it came out of a typewriter. All the characters were the same color, in the same font, and the same size.

As printers became capable of printing different colors, fonts, and pictures, it became desirable to mark up text in such a way as to tell the printer how to display the text. Tags were invented to do this. Tags were enclosed in angle brackets, telling the printer that the text between the tags should be shown as bold, or italic, or a different size, *et cetera*. The first HTML specification was published on November 24, 1995.

If you are reading the HTML version of this article, please use your web browser to look at the page source. (If you are using Internet Explorer, pull down the View menu and click on Source.) You will be able to read this article with minor difficulty because the text is cluttered with "junk." The junk contains no information about the subject matter; but it does contain information about how a printer or web browser should display the subject matter.

In the same way, DNA molecules contain information about which proteins the cell should build. That's all the information that geneticists have typically cared about. But the DNA molecules also contained "junk" telling the cells when and how to build the proteins. The DNA molecule contains more formatting information than subject information. Until recently, geneticists did not understand the formatting information, and, thinking that the DNA molecule developed by chance, thought that most of the DNA molecule was meaningless junk. They were wrong.

But there is another, more important observation we would like to make using the HTML analogy.

The HTML standard was only a year old when we started publishing this newsletter. There were no software tools for creating HTML back then. When the first HTML tools appeared shortly thereafter, they were very hard to use, and didn't work very well. So, I used a simple text editor to insert all the HTML tags manually when publishing the first Science Against Evolution articles—and I still do that today.

Now there are slick web development tools which create HTML automatically. Please take a moment to go to KRSF.NET and use your browser to look at the page source. (I'll wait for you to do that.) The page source is almost impossible to read, isn't it? It is almost all "junk." That "junk" is actually Java scripts, Cascading Style Sheets, and who-knows-what-else, which adapt the formatting to many different kinds of browsers. All that junk in the KRSF page source makes the KRSF web page much more visually appealing than our simple Science Against Evolution web pages; but all that junk makes it almost impossible to find the information in the page source. (It also makes the web page slower to load using a dial-up Internet connection, which is why I still create the HTML by hand.)

Here's the point we have gone to so much trouble to make: All the extra junk in the KRSF web page isn't evidence that the web page is the result of bumbling, inefficient, random chance—it is evidence of adaptable design sophistication. All the extra junk in the DNA molecule isn't evidence of bumbling, inefficient, random chance—it is evidence of adaptable design sophistication.

Stop the Clock!

The recognition that junk DNA isn't really junk has devastating implications for the so-called "molecular clock" that evolutionists use to determine how long it has taken for particular species to evolve. The molecular clock depends on the assumption that junk DNA has no purpose. Since junk DNA does have a purpose, it invalidates the clock. Here's why:

[2] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hypertext_markup_language

Evolutionists assume, for example, that there was an unknown common ancestor of both apes and man which lived some time in the past. When the human/ape lineage supposedly split, it was because of differences in the functional DNA; but both lines inherited the same junk DNA. As time went on, random changes to non-junk DNA made the critter more or less able to survive. Harmful changes to functional DNA would be quickly eliminated by natural selection, so it is impossible to tell how many mutations there actually were. The coding portions of the DNA could not be used to determine number of generations because nearly all mutations were eliminated by natural selection.

But since junk DNA supposedly has no purpose, random mutations to the junk sections of the DNA don't affect survival. Therefore, "harmful" mutations weren't harmful (because they had no effect) and weren't removed by natural selection. Therefore, all mutations continue to accumulate in the junk regions of the DNA molecule, giving a supposedly accurate count of the number of mutations since the split. Knowing the mutation rate, and the unfiltered number of mutations, one can supposedly tell the time since the species diverged.

The fallacy is that junk DNA certainly does have a purpose, and harmful mutations to the junk DNA regions will be eliminated by natural selection. Therefore, one can't really determine the number of mutations that have occurred over the years.

(Of course, the other fallacy is the false assumption that there actually was a common ancestor—but evolutionists won't even consider that.)

So, evolutionists now try to accommodate the fact that natural selection does affect the mutation rate by trying to take that into account. But, tinkering with the clock doesn't solve their problems, as we shall see in this month's *Evolution in the News* column, "Tinkering With the Clock."

Evolution in the News

Tinkering With the Clock

Mutation rates aren't what they used to be. (They never were.)

At the end of this month's feature article, we told you about how mutations in junk DNA were thought (by evolutionists) to tell how long ago closely related species split from a common ancestor, and why the method is fundamentally flawed. Because the method is based on a faulty premise, we weren't surprised to read this in last month's journal, *Science*.

> New work suggests that mutations arise more slowly in humans than previously thought, raising questions about the timetable of evolutionary events. [3]

This isn't really news. Scientists have known there has been a problem for nearly 10 years.

> The first sign that something was amiss came in 2003, when a study tracking genes that cause hemophilia, muscular dystrophy, and other diseases in parents and children found slower mutation rates than expected. [4]

Of course, YOU knew something was amiss more than four years before the evolutionary scientists did, because we told you in our newsletter! [5]

But, even though scientists have known there are problems with molecular dating for a decade, they used it anyway.

Circular Reasoning

By their own admission, evolutionists used circular reasoning to calibrate the molecular clock.

> For the past 15 years, researchers have estimated the speed of the molecular clock by counting the mutational differences between humans and primates in matching segments of DNA, then using different species' first appearances in the fossil record to estimate how long it took those mutations to accumulate. For example, the fossils of the oldest known orangutan ancestor are about 13 million years old, so DNA differences between humans and orangutans had about that long to accumulate. [6]
>
> When researchers plugged this rate into their equations, most got dates between 4 million and 6 million years ago for the split between the ancestors of humans and chimps. That dovetails pretty well with fossils identified

---

[3] Gibbons, *Science*, 12 October 2012, "Turning Back the Clock: Slowing the Pace of Prehistory", pp. 189-191, http://www.sciencemag.org/content/338/6104/189.full?sid=cb155686-4d36-4626-9c37-1eccec86ec78

[4] *ibid.*

[5] *Disclosure*, July 1999, "The DNA Dilemma", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v3i10f.htm

[6] Gibbons, *Science*, 12 October 2012, "Turning Back the Clock: Slowing the Pace of Prehistory", pp. 189-191

as the earliest known hominins … [7]

In other words, they used the presumed ages of fossils to determine the clock rate, and then used that clock rate to determine the age of the fossils. Naturally, they got consistent answers ("most" of the time). If they had initially assumed the split happened twice as long ago, then they would have gotten a mutation rate that is twice as slow, and then using that slower rate they would have concluded that the fossil split happened twice as long ago.

Circular reasoning uses an assumption to come to a conclusion, and then uses that conclusion to verify the assumption. That's why circular logic always gives consistent results, whether the assumption is true or not. Circular reasoning is not a valid method of reasoning.

Scientists should have known that using the date of fossils to calibrate the clock rate, and then using the calibrated clock to determine the date of the fossils is not valid. But the evolutionists who wrote last month's peer-reviewed article know there are other problems with the method, too.

> But this method of calculating the mutation rate has drawbacks. For starters, it assumes that the fossil dates accurately record the first appearance of a species, but that can change with a new find. Second, there are no fossils of our closest living relatives: chimps and gorillas. Third, the method assumes that species split at the same time as their genes diverged, but in fact, genetic separation can be millions of years earlier than species divergence. Finally, the method assumes that mutation rates are similar across apes, although factors such as generation time—the average number of years between generations—affect the rate. [8]

Medicine is the Cure

Using the presumed time since humans split from apes to determine the mutation rate has never been valid. Now, evolutionists have independently determined mutation rates as a byproduct of studies of genetic diseases.

> The Icelandic study found that on average, every newborn baby has 36 spontaneous new mutations, those not inherited from either parent. [9]

The New Dilemma

Now they have a legitimate mutation rate that is much lower than previously thought. That leads them to these conclusions:

> For the past 45 years, researchers have used the number of mutations in DNA like a molecular clock to date key chapters in the human evolutionary story, such as the dawn of humankind millions of years ago and the exodus of modern humans from Africa in the past 100,000 years.
>
> Now it seems that the molecular clock ticks more slowly than anyone had thought, and many dates may need to be adjusted. Over the past 3 years, researchers have used new methods to sequence whole human genomes, allowing them to measure directly, for the first time, the average rate at which new mutations arise in a newborn baby. Most of these studies conclude that the mutation rate in humans today is roughly half the rate that has been used in many evolutionary studies since 2000. "Together, these papers make a convincing case that the human sequence mutation rate is substantially less than the one previously used," says Harvard University population geneticist David Reich, co-author of one recent study. "As a result, genetic estimates of dates for ancient events are going to be older than previously reported."
>
> The question now is how much older? Three new studies have taken a stab at providing an answer, trying to apply the slower mutation rates to major events in human evolution. In the past month, they have published a range of dates that sometimes fit with evidence from the fossil record—and that are sometimes way off, particularly for events further back in time. [10]
>
> "The mutation rates are so up in air," said paleogeneticist Svante Pääbo of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig, Germany, in August, when his team published big margins of error—from 170,000 to 700,000 years ago—for the date when our ancestors split from Neandertals and their close cousins, the Denisovans. As a result, the timing of some events in human origins is now "very murky," says paleoanthropologist Chris Stringer of the Natural History Museum in London. [11]
>
> What's more, the new rate slows the pace of evolution in apes to a downright crawl …. It puts the split of humans and chimpanzees, for example, at between 8.3 million years ago and 10.1 million years ago—far too early, given current fossil dates. The split of the lineages leading to orangutans and the African apes, including humans, goes back to 34 million to 46 million years ago, Reich says. "A human-

[7] *ibid.*
[8] *ibid.*
[9] *ibid.*
[10] *ibid.*
[11] *ibid.*

> orangutan split at 40 million years is absolutely crazy," says paleoanthropologist David Begun of the University of Toronto, St. George, in Canada, who notes that fossils of likely orangutan ancestors date from 9 million to 13.9 million years ago. [12]

The Spin

Much of the article we have been quoting has been devoted to coming up with ways to explain away the discrepancy between fossil dates and molecular dates. The primary excuse is the unsubstantiated assertion that mutation rates must be highly variable and must have been much faster in the past. Sooner or later, someone will come up with a story that most evolutionists can live with, and that will become the new "truth."

The real reason why the fossil dates don't agree with the molecular dates is because both are based on the false premise that apes and humans had a common ancestor. The fact is that they didn't have a common ancestor, so the differences in DNA are not the result of random mutations over a long period of time.

Email

Paranoia

You aren't paranoid if they really are out to get you.

Ivey received this email invitation to join a conspiracy against Dr. Paul Broun for daring to speak out against the theory of evolution, and forwarded it to us.

```
Dear Ivey,
Rep. Paul Broun (R-GA) has publically [sic]
and vocally demonstrated his rejection of even
the most basic tenets of scientific progress
and critical thought.
Evolution, embryology and the Big Bang
theory are some of the major underpinnings of
modern science. Broun condemns them as "lies
straight from the pit of hell… to try to keep
me and all the folks who were taught that from
understanding that they need a savior."
This man has no right to sit on the House
Science, Space and Technology Committee, and
his very presence there discredits the
Committee and its purpose.
We're calling on Ralph Hall, the Committee
Chairman, to remove Rep. Broun from the
committee immediately. Join the call: sign our
petition now!
PETITION TO RALPH HALL: Rep. Paul Broun has
no place on a committee dedicated to
scientific progress and critical thought, as
his recent comments and past actions have
proved. Please, remove Rep. Broun from the
House Science, Space and Technology Committee
immediately.
```

[12] *ibid.*

Dr. Broun is a medical doctor. As such, he is well aware that embryology is based upon Ernst Haeckel's false Biogenetic Law ("Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny"), in which Haeckel used faked drawings purporting to show that human embryos repeat their evolutionary history as they develop. Evolutionists admitted this fraud 20 years ago. [13] It is certainly not one "of the major underpinnings of modern science."

As a physician, Dr. Broun knows how complex biological systems are, and has good reason to doubt that they all evolved by accident. He knows the biogenetic law is bogus. Dr. Broun is much more qualified to sit on the House Science, Space and Technology Committee than someone who stubbornly believes in evolution despite all the scientific evidence against evolution. (And Dr. Broun probably knows how to spell "publicly," unlike the writer of the email petition. ☺)

Bill Nye

What prompted the illiterate petitioner to call for Dr. Broun's removal? We don't know; but the petition smacks of Bill Nye's criticism of Dr. Broun's September 27, 2012 speech at the Liberty Baptist Church Sportsman's Banquet. [14] We suspect his misplaced regard for Bill Nye might have had something to do with it.

Bill Nye is an outspoken liberal who uses pseudo-science to advance his political agenda. At the time the first draft of this column was written (November 2, 2012), Wikipedia had this banner at the top of their entry on Bill Nye:

> This page is currently protected from editing until November 10, 2012 or until disputes have been resolved. [15]

Wikipedia doesn't say what the disputes are, but we presume it regards his recent "Big Think" anti-creation video. [16] Is it not a coincidence that the Wikipedia page (which contains no criticism of his liberal political views) is protected from editing until after the election by the left-leaning Wikipedia? No! To think so would be paranoid! ☺

[P.S. When we were writing a later draft of this column (on November 12), after the election, we went back to the Wikipedia article on Bill Nye to see if the disputes had been resolved. The banner was gone, and there was no mention of "Big Think" or his criticism of Dr. Broun. Of course, there is no telling what Wikipedia will say about Bill Nye or Dr. Broun when you read this.]

[13] Milner, The Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1993, "Biogenetic Law", page 44

[14] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Broun

[15] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill_Nye

[16] http://www.enstarz.com/articles/5810/20120827/bill-nye-the-science-guy-sparks-controversy-with-anti-creation-theory-kids-should-be-scientifically-literate.htm

by Lothar Janetzko

Evolution; God's Greatest Creation

http://nwcreation.net/evolution_creation.html

Evolution – From the Creationist Perspective

This month's web site review looks at an article I found on the Northwest Creation Network. Many different articles can be found on this network by going to the home page located at http://nwcreation.net. Here you will also find videos of the Seattle Creation Conference from 2011 which cover many different topics of interest to creationists, and mp3 files you can download and listen to on your audio mp3 player.

The article under discussion, "Evolution; God's Greatest Creation," presents the author's view that it is important for creationists to study evolution. He believes that intelligently designed genetic recombination is the true source of variability driving the evolution of living organisms. In the introduction section, he states that "evolution occurs not through random reactions, but controlled cellular genetic rearrangements." He provides more details about genetic recombination in the introduction and ends the introduction by stating that "A study of evolution can give you two things: the ability to challenge evolutionary dogma such as abiogenesis and mutations, but also a better appreciation for God's creation. Truly the ability of organisms to change themselves into a variety of forms may be one of God's greatest creations."

He continues his article by addressing the following topics: 1) Created Kinds and Evolutionary Potential, 2) Speciation and the Created Kinds, 3) Classic Evolution, 4) Biblical "Kinds" Synonymous with Species? 5) Macroevolution and the Creation Perspective, 6) Is the Creation Evolving or De-Evolving? 7) The Importance of Speciation, 8) Macroevolution?

As you can tell, there is much to read about in this article that may give you some new insights into the role evolution plays when you look at the diversity of life found in the world today.

At the end of the article you will find the Northwest Creation Network Webstore. Here you will find a listing of links to books you can order from the store. Clicking on a book link will provide you with details about the cost, author and a brief product description of the book. Once in the online store you will also find links to other materials available for purchase.