Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 20 Issue 8 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info May 2016

Sharpening the Point

Last month's satire can easily be misunderstood.

We received more than the usual amount of email praising last month's April Fools feature article; but perhaps for the wrong reason. Several of the emails contained even stronger arguments against the multiverse theory, which indicates that we may have failed to make the point we really wanted to make.

Our spoof of the multiverse theory was really about science, and how it has become confused with philosophy. If a scientist believes something that has no experimental proof, it isn't scientific. Some scientists do believe in other universes in other dimensions which cannot be observed. Since they cannot be observed, their existence cannot be proved or disproved. It is a philosophical notion which may or may not be true. It's not science.

Furthermore, it is inconsistent to say that belief in an invisible heaven in another, spiritual dimension is not scientific, but belief in another invisible physical universe is scientific. There really is no difference between believing in invisible universes and believing in unknown common ancestors, either. Belief in other invisible universes, invisible heavenly realms, and imagined ancestors, are all equally philosophical—not scientific. Science is based on observation of natural phenomena and observation of experimental results. Other universes, heavenly realms, and imaginary common ancestors have never been scientifically observed.

Computer Models

Many people in our society blindly accept anything a scientist says, or a computer model predicts. Some of my professional career was spent developing computer models of weapons. But when tested, some of those weapons did not perform as our models predicted. We often had to revise our models to make them give results that matched what really happened in the tested scenarios. Computer models can only be trusted after they have been experimentally verified.

Computer models of what happens inside a black hole, or how stars form, or how the global climate will change in hundreds of years, or how macroevolution works, have not been verified. Models are no better than the assumptions they are based upon, and the skill of the programmer converting those unverifiable assumptions into executable code.

The *Jurassic Park* series of movies used realistic computer generated animation showing how dinosaurs moved—but just because a computer makes it look realistic doesn't mean it really happened that way. Computer models tell us how dinosaurs would have moved IF their muscles were as strong as assumed, and their body mass index was correctly estimated, *et cetera*. The simulation of the fictional *Indominus rex* looked realistic, even though it never existed. Convincing simulations don't prove anything really happened that way.

Scientists use computer models to estimate how DNA and physical features might have evolved; but that doesn't mean it really happened. Computers can calculate what a common ancestor of two creatures might have looked like; but that doesn't mean the common ancestor actually existed.

Email

Sam the Parrot

Sam just repeats what other people say.

Regular readers seem to enjoy reading Sam's emails, and we print them because they are so typical of what evolutionists say. He wrote this in response to our March newsletter:

> Never any "Science for Creation." Isn't that odd? Is that an admission that your flaky bible-nonsense beliefs have no basis in reality?

It isn't odd, or any such admission. We never write about "Science for Art", either. Art isn't based on science; but art certainly is real. Our website is devoted to evolution, so we don't write much about art or religion.

We responded, "I'm glad to know you are still reading the newsletter, and still unable to find any errors!" to provoke another response from him.

He replied,

> And I am amused that you still possess the arrogant certainty of one suffering from the Dunning-Kruger effect. That I do not waste my time debunking your non-expert assertions does not mean that I do not find errors. There are many that have been documented:
>
> http://all-too-common-dissent.blogspot.com/2006/01/more-software-engineer-genetics-from-r.html
>
> http://all-too-common-dissent.blogspot.com/2006/01/pogge-on-chimp-human-differences.html
>
> Plus, so few people read your garbage that my time is better spent debunking the lies of creationists that have a wider readership. Those that read your crap are also too stupid to understand how little they understand.

Yes, there certainly are other websites with more readers. Why does he waste his time insulting us (and you) almost every month?

In all his many emails to us, he has never written an original thought. In this case, he simply says that 10 years ago a blogger, who calls himself "Doppelganger," said we are wrong, so we must be wrong. Even his Dunning-Kruger comment came from Doppelganger's blog.

Since Sam thinks Doppelganger's arguments are so compelling, let's look at them.

Chimp and Human Differences.

Please take a moment to go back and read "Chimps are Like Us" [1] before reading Doppelganger's response. [2]

Doppelganger correctly recognized that it is rude, demeaning, insulting, and offensive to say there is only 4% difference between Eugenie C. Scott (a prominent evolutionist) and a chimpanzee. We agree! What he failed to recognize is that we don't say that—evolutionists say that! Evolutionists claim there is only 4% difference between her and a chimp, and that a precisely calculated, small difference is proof of evolution.

We don't want to get into an endless cycle of 'Tis-so-'Tis-not-'Tis-so-'Tis-not arguments typical of Internet blogs, so we won't rehash what has already been written. Let's just summarize our two main points.

1) It isn't possible to exactly quantify the amount of similarity between apes and humans.

2) Similarity (no matter how great it is, no matter how accurately it can be quantified) could just as possibly be the result of common ancestry as common design, and there is no way to tell which.

Doppelganger's response suggests three possibilities:

1) We failed to express our position clearly.

2) We expressed our position clearly, but Doppelganger was too stupid to get it.

3) We expressed our position clearly, Doppelganger realized it was correct, and he tried to distort it to make it appear incorrect.

There is nothing we can do about the last two possibilities, but we should address the first one.

Rather than just assert without proof, "It isn't possible to exactly quantify the amount of similarity between apes and humans," we gave examples (from the professional, peer-reviewed literature) of the different ways in which the similarity between apes and humans has been measured, and the different values those methods produced. We didn't mean to imply that any of those methods were wrong. We just pointed out that they all gave different results depending upon what was measured and how it was measured.

---

[1] *Disclosure*, October 2006, "Chimps are Like Us", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v10i1f.htm

[2] Doppelganger, January 11, 2006, "Pogge on Chimp-Human Differences", http://all-too-common-dissent.blogspot.com/2006/01/pogge-on-chimp-human-differences.html

You have probably heard the story about the five blind men who had never seen an elephant, and went to the zoo to touch one and find out what it is like. The first man touched its trunk and said that an elephant is like a really fat, strong snake. The second man grabbed it by the tail and said it was more like a flimsy rope. The third blind man reached around one of its legs and said an elephant was more like a tree. The fourth man felt the elephant's side and declared it to be like a wall. The fifth blind man felt the elephant's ear and argued that an elephant is like a pancake. None of those blind men were wrong. They were simply assessing different parts of the elephant and came to different correct (but contradictory) conclusions.

Different genetic analysis methods produce different results. That's all there is to it. You can't just pick one and say that's the correct difference.

Doppelganger's rebuttal was irrelevant because it didn't address the point we were trying to make. He simply distracted from the main point by falsely claiming that we said the different ways of measuring similarity were invalid. We agree that all those different, contradictory methods are valid ways to measure similarity. We didn't mean to imply that they weren't valid or properly done.

His rebuttal was a clever debating trick. He tried to make it appear that we were claiming none of the methods were valid, and argued that those methods are valid, in an attempt to distract readers from the main point, which we will state again for emphasis: Similarity can be the result of common design or common ancestry, and being able to quantify exactly how much (or how little) difference there is does not prove one or the other. If the evolutionary argument is that exactly X% difference proves common ancestry, what does it mean if another method proves there is exactly Y% difference?

To prove us wrong, Doppelganger would have to prove that the acknowledged similarity could not possibly have been the result of common design—it had to be the result of common ancestry. He did not do that.

Artistic Similarities

If you go to an art museum and look at several Monet paintings, you can't help noticing a distinctive similarity in style. His paintings are similar because they are the "children" of a common "ancestor", Claude Monet. But just because two paintings exhibit characteristics of the French Impressionist style, it isn't proof that both were painted by Monet. Some other painters intentionally copy Monet's style because they appreciate it and want to emulate it. Some unscrupulous painters copy his style because they want to sell forgeries. It is also possible that there might be an artist who has never seen a painting by Monet who just happened to develop a style very similar to his. Paintings that look like they were painted by Monet weren't necessarily painted by Monet.

Occasionally there are copyright infringement suits when a song is very much like a previous song by another artist. Did the second songwriter intentionally copy the first songwriter's song? Did he copy it subconsciously? Did it just turn out to be similar by accident? You can't tell by similarity alone. You have to prove that the second songwriter had heard the first song and copied it in order to get a conviction.

The point that we are trying to make, and perhaps have been too redundant in making, is that similarity doesn't prove common ancestry or common design. The creationists' claim that all living things must have a common designer because they are so similar is no more (and no less) valid than the evolutionists' claim that all living things must have had a common ancestor because they are so similar. You need some additional evidence to prove the reason for the similarity, and we don't know of any.

The Origin of Information

The second blog Sam cited was Doppelganger's response [3] to one of our articles on the origin of information. [4]

We have repeatedly said that arguments should be evaluated on their own merit—not the reputation of the person making the argument. Doppelganger says he should be believed because he is a biologist and I am not. Therefore, what he says has more credibility simply because he is the one saying it. So, let's examine his argument, specifically the claim that the background and experience of the presenter is more important than the data presented.

It's true, I'm not a biologist. My first non-musical, non-academic, real job was designing telemetry systems for the Sidewinder missile in 1971. This involved gathering information from a missile in flight, encoding that information, transmitting the information back to a ground station where the information was decoded and printed.

I later worked on the Sidewinder seeker itself.

---

[3] Doppelganger, January 31, 2006, "More software engineer genetics from R. David Pogge",http://all-too-common-dissent.blogspot.com/2006/01/more-software-engineer-genetics-from-r.html

[4] *Disclosure*, October 2005, "Gene Duplicatioioion", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v10i1e.htm

That involved using an optical sensor to view a scene and determine which photons came from the target, and which photons came from clouds or other background clutter. After extracting the target position information from the extraneous background information, the target information was transmitted to the guidance section, which used it to steer the missile.

I also modified some foreign weapons systems to extract information from them while they were being tested to determine how those foreign weapons processed information, and devised ways to inject false information into them to render them harmless.

I wrote the software for the Phoenix missile Target Detecting Device, which processed the information from a sensor which measured the relative positions of the missile and the target and sent information to the warhead to detonate it.

I was granted a patent for a radar signal processing algorithm that separates information about a Viet Cong soldier's movements from the movement of jungle leaves blown by the wind.

I was on the committee that made minor improvements to the Ada programming language to make it easier for computer programmers to communicate to a computer what that computer should do.

The preceding facts have been presented simply to establish the fact that I spent decades extracting information from the surroundings, encoding information, transmitting information, and decoding information. I didn't just think about how that might be done. I actually built things which worked, proving that I understand the fundamental principles about information.

Doppelganger's argument is that because he is a biologist, he knows more than I possibly could about how information arose spontaneously, was encoded in the DNA molecule to be transmitted to offspring, and later decoded by cells to produce the creature specified by the information in the DNA. He's thought so much about it, he has never had to actually do experiments to prove he is right.

We disagree with Doppelganger for two reasons:

1) We don't believe that the background of the person presenting the evidence is more important than the evidence itself.

2) Our background in information processing is better than Doppelganger's, anyway.

Our approach is to present what we believe and why we believe it. Then we encourage you to evaluate the evidence and come to your own conclusion.

Doppelganger's approach is to try to convince you to believe something because he says it is true. He makes personal attacks in an attempt to destroy the credibility of his opponent. Because his argument is based on his credibility, you should read the other articles posted on his blog (http://all-too-common-dissent.blogspot.com/) and decide if you think he is credible or not.

It's Your Decision

Read what we have written about the similarity between apes and humans, and then read what he says we wrote about that similarity. Did he seem to understand what we wrote and honestly address the factual points we made? Did he seem to twist what we wrote into something we didn't say just to try to refute it?

Did Doppelganger present a compelling argument that information can arise spontaneously through duplication of existing information and random changes?

On the other hand, are we mischaracterizing Doppelganger's rebuttals? Are we falsely accusing him of basing his arguments on distortions and personal attacks? Please read what we have both written and come to your own conclusion.

It doesn't matter WHO is right. It matters WHAT is right, regardless of who says it. You may conclude we are right about some things, and he is right about other things. That's fair enough. We just want you to become informed about the evidence for and against the theory of evolution and judge the evidence honestly for you yourself.

Don't Be a Parrot

We didn't call Sam a parrot to insult him. We wanted to come up with a memorable way to make this point: Sam is just repeating what he heard without knowing what it means, just like a parrot. If Sam had understood our articles, and understood Doppelganger's rebuttal, he would have been able to explain, in his own words, why he thinks we are wrong and Doppelganger is right.

There are lots of creationist parrots, too. We have heard far too many creationists repeating things they have heard from Answers in Genesis or the Institute for Creation Research who don't have a clue what they are talking about.

We don't want you to be a parrot. We want you to be a rational human being. Study the facts for yourself. Then you can explain why you believe in creation or evolution in your own words.

Email

The Definition of Evolution

Just what is, "Evolution?"

One of the common criticisms we get is that our definition of "evolution" is wrong. What is the correct definition? That brings us to this month's email from William Herath.

> Reading journals, watching documentaries, and chatting with evolutionary professionals I realized that there is a mountain of scientific evidence and research when it comes to the subject at hand. There is a great deal of science that goes into evolutionary research! With that said, I discovered a seemingly small inconsistency across the sources I had found. No journal, publication, book, documentary, or professor of evolutionary biology offered a consistent definition of the term. In fact, some descriptions I found were in oblate contrast to other descriptions of evolution. Yes, even professors at prestigious universities (of which I will leave name-less) would send me their favorite or personal definition(s) of evolution and many would conflict and/or minimally coincide with another professor's idea of evolution. In all of my research I had NEVER found the same definition of evolution twice.
>
> Knowing that evolution is a compulsory subject in U.S. public schools, I decided to contact some educational agencies. The federally funded Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) has created an educational frame work from which many states have adopted. The NGSS does not offer a definition of biological evolution at all. So, I contacted the California Department of Education and received the same response. Next, I contacted the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), which is the second largest school district in the United States to the New York City Unified School District. Not surprising, LAUSD does not offer a definition of biological evolution. If a definition is taught in the classroom, it comes from one of the many various definitions provided by the current textbook of choice for that district. Many teachers have the freedom to create their own curriculum which allows them to teach their favorite definition of biological evolution, even if it is their own. Yikes! Although the percentage of science teachers is more than likely a different number, 34% of Americans do not subscribe to evolution. Imagine a science teacher that does not subscribe to evolution, yet has the freedom to create their own curriculum and define evolution as they please. Sure, evolution is part of the required educational framework, but without a standard definition; where does this reality leave the future of science education?
>
> Being completely baffled, I turned to high profile court cases surrounding the evolutionary contention. Reading court transcripts going all the way back to the 1925 Scopes trial, I thought that I would absolutely find a definition of evolution. Not a single case in the United States has ever offered a consistent definition of biological evolution that could be cross referenced with another case. In essence, the legal battle that has been raging over evolution has failed to produce or outline a consistent, scientific, and legally agreed upon definition.
>
> How could such a contentiously debated idea have become part of our nation's required science curriculum, yet been left ambiguous? The reality of failing to define biological evolution is far from being deemed just for those who oppose it, and frightening for the future of science education.
>
> Leaving evolution as an ambiguous term must come to an end and I have addressed this in my book, What Is Evolution?"
>
> My blog is located at: WhatIsEvolutionBook.BlogSpot.com and I use it to give insight as to what my book is about. There are zero references to alternative ideas, nor are there references to the validity of the supernatural realm. This book is solely about questioning the scientific validity of evolution, but asking what evolution is beforehand. I would be more than happy to go into more detail with you if you are interested.
>
> Thank you for your time!
> Sincerely,
> William Herath
> 310.721.1538

We have not read William's book, so we neither approve nor disapprove of it; but we have obviously read his email. The points he makes in his email are valid. We do need to define what we are talking about before debating the merits of any idea.

When we talk about "evolution," we don't mean, "any kind of change." Nor do we mean minor variations that result from natural selection. There is no disagreement about that. There are limits to those variations, as Nyquist proved in the Kentucky Derby again this year. [5] Breeding has been well-established scientifically—but breeding isn't the kind of evolution we are discussing.

We use the term "evolution" to mean,

"The doctrine that unguided natural forces caused chemicals to combine in such a way that life resulted; and that all living things have descended from that common ancestral form of life."

That kind of evolution is unscientific, and untrue.

---

[5] *Disclosure*, June 1999, "The Kentucky Derby Limit", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v3i9f.htm

by Lothar Janetzko

10 Things I Wish Everyone Knew about the Creation vs. Evolution Debate

http://www.faithstreet.com/onfaith/2014/11/04/10-things-i-wish-everyone-knew-about-the-creation-vs-evolution-debate/34879

Some quick insights about the ongoing conflict between two very big ideas.

This month's website review looks at an article by Mike Lehman who edits Jesus & Dawkins, a blog that looks at the intersection of Christianity, science and atheism. The article is the result of asking Mike to list what he wishes everyone understood about creation and evolution after he had an exchange with Answers in Genesis founder Ken Ham about the creation/evolution debate.

The 10 things are as follows:

1. Darwin's idea can help us read the Bible better.
2. Yes, evolution is just a theory – and so is gravity.
3. Evolution doesn't disprove creation. It can't.
4. If you believe Genesis 1 is science, you should also believe the sky is domed.
5. The structure and numbers in Genesis 1 are a big hint: It's not about science.
6. If they're read as straightforward history, the six-day creation story and the Adam and Eve story contradict each other.
7. There are other creation stories in the Old Testament.
8. How did Christians react to Charles Darwin's discovery? Some of their responses might surprise you.
9. Darwin wasn't an atheist, nor did he have a deathbed conversion to Christianity.
10. Accepting evolution does not require accepting atheism. Choosing between creation and evolution is a false dilemma.

After each one of the above listed items you will find a brief discussion about the statement and links to additional information.

You may not agree with Mike and the 10 things he mentions in the article, but I believe it is interesting to learn the views of people who are actively involved in the creation/evolution debate. As with most blog posts, especially ones discussing creation and evolution, you will find many comments (111 at the present time) which provide insights into the views held by readers of this particular article.