Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 22 Issue 1 *www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info* October 2017

The Value of Science

We Need More Science.

Many years ago, a dear, departed friend told me the difference between a scientist and an engineer.

> When a scientist makes a discovery, the first thing he thinks is, "Where should I publish this?" When an engineer makes a discovery, the first thing he thinks is, "How can I make a buck with this?" [1]

There is a lot of truth in what he said—but that doesn't mean that pure science has no practical value.

Research is Valuable

Some people ask, "Why explore space? What do you expect to find out there?" The answer is that we won't know what we will find until we find it. If we already knew what we would find out in space, there would be no reason to explore it. At the risk of plagiarizing Forrest Gump, research is like a box of chocolates. You never know what you are going to get until you bite into it.

In 1947, when scientists at Bell Labs began exploring the properties of germanium, they didn't know that they would learn that germanium could be used to make transistors, which would lead to silicon transistors, and the invention of integrated circuits, which would eventually make smart phones possible.

Some scientific discoveries might not have immediately recognizable commercial value. Some discoveries might not ever have any commercial value. But most discoveries do eventually result in an improvement in daily life, to some degree. That makes scientific research worth doing, even if there is no immediate goal in mind. Scientific research is always valuable.

Scientific Debates

Debates are not scientific, by definition. Consider this example:

Some people say that you can conserve water by keeping your lawn mowed short because the shorter the grass is, the less water it needs. Other people say you can conserve water by letting your grass grow long because it shades the ground, keeping the ground cooler, so less water evaporates. I don't know who is right.

If the short-grass advocates debated the long-grass advocates, who would win the debate? Presumably, the more skillful debaters would win, regardless of which length actually conserves the most water.

On the other hand, the skill of the debaters might not determine who wins the debate. It might be impossible to convince people who run a lawn maintenance company that it is best not to cut the grass at all, regardless of whether that is true or not.

In any case, at the end of the debate, somebody wins because the majority of the audience believes them rather than their opponent, for whatever reason. The consensus might be different from what is really true. Decisions can be made by consensus—but truth cannot be determined by consensus.

Consensus has no place in science (despite what many people say). If a fact has been shown to be true scientifically, there is no need for consensus. As soon as someone says, "The consensus of scientists is …" you should know that what follows is an opinion, not a scientifically proven fact. There really cannot be a "scientific debate."

[1] James L. Rieger

Experimental Science

(Please forgive the redundancy in the heading above. Science is experimental, by definition.)

The TV show, Mythbusters, could have taken a truly scientific approach to answering the lawn mowing question. They could have planted the several kinds of grass in many different plots, kept each plot mowed to a different length, and compared the amount of water used by each kind of grass mowed different lengths. I actually posted a message on the Mythbusters website suggesting they do just that because it is important for us Californians (who are still suffering a long drought) to know if it is a myth that cutting grass short will conserve water; but they never took my suggestion. Presumably, watching grass grow doesn't make for exciting television, and there wasn't a way to involve massive amounts of explosives in the experiment (a Mythbusters trademark).

If they had done the experiment, they would have come to a conclusion about whether short grass or long grass takes more water. Some viewers might have been inspired to repeat the experiment and confirm it. That's how real science works. Science depends upon measurements, not speculation and consensus.

Computer Models

These days, one can use a computer to model how grass grows. The computer model could produce an answer in a few minutes, instead of the weeks it would take to actually grow and mow grass. Some people might think that the use of a computer takes the debate out of the realm of philosophy and into the realm of science—but it doesn't.

As a retired software engineer, I know I could make some plausible assumptions upon which I could base some equations. I could write a program that uses those equations, and the computer could tell me the optimal length of grass that conserves the most water. If I didn't like the answer, I could easily change my assumptions to get the answer that confirms my prejudice. It might take several iterations, but I could eventually get a computer model to tell me what I want to hear. That's not real science. That's using a computer to make a biased philosophical argument appear scientific.

That doesn't mean computer models are useless. During my career, I wrote and used computer models to determine how several different kinds of missiles would perform in many different situations. Trial and error analysis of a missile design using a computer is much faster and much less expensive than actually building and firing lots of missiles.

Yes, I could have written missile simulation models that would have shown the missile would work perfectly in every situation. That would have made my boss very happy—until the missile was built and missed the target by a mile.

The reason the missile simulations I wrote were valuable is because we verified the simulations with a few carefully chosen test flights. We usually adjusted some parameters after comparing the simulation with the experimental data; but we did it to make the simulated missile trajectory match an actual missile trajectory exactly. We did not adjust the parameters to tell us the missile would do what we wanted it to do. Computer models are valuable only if they can be verified.

Every model must be verified. I'm retired now, and haven't written a missile simulation in more than a decade; but suppose someone paid me to write a new missile model. The fact that I have written several accurate models in the past does not assure that the next model I write will be accurate. As they say on Wall Street, "Past performance is not a guarantee future results." Unfortunately, reputation is often considered to be unquestionable proof of accuracy. How can one disagree with anything Stephen Hawking says?

Two months ago we wrote about a computer model of how the stars affected the weather millions of years ago. [2] That model can't be verified. It was accepted simply because it produced the desired answers. Unverified models are useless.

Science is a reliable method for determining the truth. Some philosophical ideas attempt to gain credibility by masquerading as scientific. Don't be fooled.

Evolution is Not Scientific

The notion that life arose spontaneously from non-living matter and diversified into many different forms of life by random chance filtered by natural selection, is a philosophical notion, not a scientific fact. Ridiculous stories about how cells that happened to act as a lens accidentally formed over light-sensitive cells, which just happened to become connected to nerve cells which sent electrical signals to a brain that stumbled upon image-processing algorithms, are not scientific. Science is valuable, but the theory of evolution is not valuable because it is not scientific.

[2] *Disclosure*, Aug. 2017, "Astronomical Time Scale", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v21i11n.htm

Email

Paleomagnetism Revisited

Matt reviewed our paleomagnetism experiment.

Matt watched our "Paleomagnetism Busted!" video,[3] which we described in the December, 2013, issue of our newsletter.[4] In it, we used little magnets to show that they naturally line up in anti-parallel orientation because that is the lowest energy state. Therefore, one should not conclude that alternating bands of weakly magnetized minerals are evidence that the Earth's magnetic field has changed polarity many times over the past several million years. This was his response:

> Hi,
>
> I just wanted to provide some feedback on your paleomagnetism experiment.
>
> (1) As I understand it, the entities that align themselves with the earth's magnetic field, when new crust is forming at mid-ocean spreading ridges, are not themselves magnets. They are little tiny iron-bearing minerals that respond to magnetic fields but do not themselves produce magnetic fields—that is, not until they have all been lined up in a certain direction by the earth's magnetic field. That is one inaccuracy of your model. I think a better experiment would use something similarly susceptible to magnetism (like little bits of iron) but not, at the outset, magnetic.
>
> (2) I know you said it wasn't the basis of your argument, but you still misrepresented how these analyses are made. You mentioned having to preserve the orientation of a rock as it is brought into the lab for analysis. Surely paleomagnetic rocks are analyzed in the lab, but some of the most compelling observations when it comes to paleomagnetism are ship-towed magnetometer readings. Traveling perpendicular to a ridge they register *slight* stengthenings and weakenings of the earth's magnetic field, which are interpreted as paleomagnetism aligned with and against (respectively) the Earth's present magnetic field.
>
> (3) Because the entities in the rocks that produce the magnetic anomalies are so tiny, then if your model were correct, wouldn't it be impossible to detect magnetic anomalies on the scale that we have observed them? Let me break that down, in case it's not obvious. Your experiment is supposed to be evidence that when something is aligning itself with a magnetic field, the dominant factor is the orientation of the adjacent magnetic body. New crust forms at spreading centers just a little at a time, so if your model were correct the alternation would occur at a very small scale—doubtfully at a scale that could be detected by ship-towed magnetometers. Your theory might gain credibility if the magnetic stripes were roughly the same width—then you could argue that the paleomagnetic orientation is determined by the earth until the slightly-magnetized rock has built up enough to compete with the Earth's magnetic field—but they are not.
>
> (4) The Earth's molten outer core is thought to produce the magnetic field, and is thus (probably, but not assuredly) responsible for the switches in polarity. It is extremely difficult to study the Earth's core, for obvious reasons. Philosophically speaking, I think it is fitting that the mechanism of this phenomenon is as mysterious as the thing itself!
>
> That's all, I sincerely hope that you take the time to respond to one or more of these points.
>
> Cheers,
> Matt

Regarding Matt's first point, in their molten state, the minerals bearing iron, nickel, or certain other elements are not themselves magnetic, but they align at a molecular level with the surrounding magnetic field. Then, when they solidify, they do retain some residual magnetism. It is their residual magnetism that is measured. So, they really do become very weak magnets.

Matt is correct to point out that little chunks of magnetized rock do not ooze out from inside the Earth and line themselves up. The rocks are in a liquid state containing molecules which are free to align with an external magnetic field. When they cool, they retain that alignment and produce a weak magnetic field. We fail to see why it matters if the minerals were magnetized deep under ground or became magnetized at the surface of the Earth. All that matters is that they had a magnetic field when they solidified.

If we had used iron filings instead of magnets, we would have had to have dropped them on something smoother than the blue shop cloth we used so that they could overcome friction to align with the Earth's magnet field. But if we had added a second row of iron filings, how could we have known if they were pointing north or south?

Matt's second point is absolutely correct.

[3] http://scienceagainstevolution.info/video/Paleomagnetism.wmv

[4] *Disclosure*, December 2013, "Paleomagnetism Busted!", http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v18i3f.htm

When measuring the rocks under water, a towed magnetometer is used. There is no argument there.

In his second and third points, Matt correctly states that the magnetic fields are very, very, very weak. They can, however, be detected by very, very, very sensitive magnetometers. But their weakness says nothing about how they became magnetized, or why they aligned in a particular direction.

If you use a magnet to pick up a pin, the north pole of the magnet in your hand is nowhere nearly as strong as the north pole of the magnet that is the North Pole. But the pin jumps up off the table and sticks to the magnet in your hand rather than flying through the air to the Earth's North Pole because the pin is closer to the magnet in your hand than it is to the North Pole. The magnetic field produced by a little magnet nearby can be stronger than the magnetic field produced by a bigger magnet far away. (Note to hikers: Don't trust a magnetic compass if you are standing next to your pickup truck. Nearby steel can affect the orientation of a magnet, too.)

The width of the magnetized regions says nothing about the magnetic field that produced them.

Oscillations

In a subsequent email, Matt wrote,

> I also wanted to address this idea of the damped oscillation more directly. For one thing, I don't think the reversals of the Earth's magnetic field are true oscillations that can be modeled with a simple pendulum or a spring. Yet it is true that the Earth needs some form of energy to power it's [*sic*] magnetic field, because (the prevailing theory states) the magnetic field of the Earth is generated by convection in the Earth's outer core. Convection is a process by which heat escapes a system. Geologists puzzled long and hard how there could still be heat within the Earth, billions of years after it's [*sic*] genesis. They discovered that radioactive decay is the source of that heat.

I questioned the basis for his belief that the oscillations of the Earth's magnetic field cannot be modeled by an under-damped second-order differential equation. In his subsequent emails, Matt never explained the reason for his unbelief.

The equations that describe a swinging pendulum, a car bouncing up and down after hitting a pot hole, and the oscillating electric field in a radio transmitter, take an identical form. That's because every kind of oscillation involves energy transfer from one state to another, and the equations for energy transfer don't depend upon the kind of energy being transferred.

The pendulum is the easiest to explain. When the weight at the end of the string is at its highest position to one side, it has potential energy (due to its height) but no kinetic energy (because it isn't moving). As the weight starts moving down, it loses potential energy and gains kinetic energy. At the bottom of its path it has no potential energy (it doesn't have the potential to go any lower) because all its potential energy has been converted to kinetic energy. As the pendulum continues to swing, the kinetic energy it had at the bottom of its path starts to get converted back to potential energy as the weight slows down and gets higher. When it reaches its highest point on the other side, all the kinetic energy has been transferred to potential energy, and the weight starts moving down again.

Whether it is a pendulum swinging back and forth, a weight bouncing up and down on a spring, the electromagnetic field oscillating in the antenna of a radio transmitter, the form of the equation is always the same because oscillation always involves energy transfer back and forth between two energy storage states. (And, yes, it always also involves an energy source because some energy always gets lost in the transfer. A pendulum eventually stops swinging when the iron pine cone on a cuckoo clock gets to the bottom and can't give the pendulum a little kick on each swing.)

The radioactive decay deep inside the Earth produces the energy that would be necessary to support oscillation of the energy stored in the Earth's magnetic field IF there were a secondary energy storage state for energy to move into and back out of. That's why, in Matt's own words, "the mechanism of this phenomenon [the supposed periodic reversal of the Earth's magnetic field] is as mysterious as the thing itself!"

Thinking isn't Knowing

Matt doesn't know how the Earth's magnetic field could change polarity. There is no known explanation for it. It is mysterious. But, since he "knows" the Earth's magnetic field did change polarity, there must be an unknown explanation for it.

The flaw in his reasoning is that he doesn't KNOW the Earth's magnetic field changed polarity—he only THINKS it changed polarity because he thinks that is what caused the alternating bands of residual magnetism on the seafloor.

Years of debugging software have taught me to be very careful to make a distinction between

what I really know and what I think I know. To find errors in computer programs, I added monitoring points to tell me what branch the computer took, or what value was stored in a particular memory location. It wasn't until I realized that the path actually taken, or the value actually stored, wasn't really what I "knew" it had to be, that I could find and fix the problem.

Evolutionists know that the spontaneous origin of life is impossible; but since they "know" it did originate spontaneously, they believe there must be some mysterious natural process which violates known laws of chemistry and physics and caused life to originate.

Evolutionists know there is no known mechanism for how the Earth's magnetic field could reverse polarity; but since they "know" it did reverse, the consensus is that there must be some mysterious natural process, probably connected to convection, which caused the reversal.

Real science doesn't lead one to believe things that cannot be confirmed scientifically, and actually would have to contradict known scientific laws. The theory of evolution is not real science. Science is against evolution.

Evolution in the News

FUKANGICHTHYS

It's what the evolutionists said, not us!

Usually it is a new DNA analysis that contradicts what evolutionists used to believe. This time it is a fossil that is causing them trouble.

The title of the printed version of the article said,

> Rethink
>
> **Fossils shake up fish family tree** [5]

The on-line version of the article says,

> **3-D scans of fossils suggest new fish family tree**
>
> Analysis of specimens from China implies ray-finned fishes are younger than previously thought [6]

Regardless of the title, both versions of the article say,

> *Polypterus*, today found only in Africa, and its close kin have generally been considered some of the most primitive ray-finned fishes alive, thanks in part to skeletal features that resemble those on some ancient fish. Now a new analysis of fish fossils of an early polypterid relative called *Fukangichthys* unearthed in China suggests that those features aren't so old. The finding shakes up the evolutionary tree of ray-finned fishes, making the group as a whole about 20 million to 40 million years younger than thought, researchers propose online August 30 in *Nature*. [7]

Why did it shake up the evolutionary tree?

> One of the largest extinction events in Earth's history marks the boundary between the Devonian and Carboniferous. "We know that many groups of backboned animals were hard hit by the event," Friedman says. But after the massive die-off, ray-finned fishes popped up and, according to previous fossil evidence, their diversity exploded. The new finding "brings the origin of the modern ray-finned fish group in line with this conspicuous pattern that we see in the fossil record," Friedman says. It suggests these vertebrates didn't survive the event. They came after, then flourished. [8]

They don't KNOW many animals were "hard hit" by this large extinction event. In fact, they don't even know the extinction event happened. It is just the consensus of opinions.

Those opinions are based on speculation about why the fossil record looks like it does. There was no scientific observation of ray-finned fishes actually evolving. There is simply unjustified assumption of ancestry based upon similarity of appearance and the kind of rocks where the fossils were discovered.

The fossil record doesn't contain the graduation of fossils Darwin predicted would be found, so evolutionists change the "prediction" based on what they have found. Every time they find something different, opinions change because they are based on philosophy, not science.

Since academics never use a 4-letter word when a 13-letter word will do, when they realized what this fossil does to their previous belief about fish evolution, they said, "Fukangichthys!" ☺

[5] *Science News*, September 30, 2017, "Fossils shake up fish family tree", page 5

[6] Viviane Callier, 18 September, 2017, https://www.sciencenews.org/article/3-d-scans-fossils-suggest-new-fish-family-tree

[7] *ibid.*

[8] *ibid.*

by Lothar Janetzko

THE INSECTMAN (Karl Priest)

http://www.insectman.us/index.htm

INSECTS Incredible and Inspirational

This month's website review looks at the website of Karl Priest, THE INSECTMAN. When you first look at the main page of the site you will encounter numerous links which provide information about Karl Priest and his views about evolutionism. On the left side of the main page, you will find that the information Karl seeks to present is organized by vertical tabs to the following topics: 1) Home, 2) Get Bugged, 3) Contact, 4) Testimony, 5) Articles, 6) Links, 7) Get Saved, 8) Exodus Mandate and 9) The Lie: Evolution.

To gain insight into the message Karl is presenting on the website, I recommend that you start by reading the information on the Testimony tab. Here you will learn about the life experience of Karl, his fascination with insects and his personal involvement in the Textbook War of 1974 held in Kanawha County, West Virginia.

On the Get Bugged tab you learn about the PowerPoint presentation Karl has developed called **"Insects: Incredible and Inspirational".** He is available to come to your church or organization and present this hour-long program. He also does an "Instructional Lab, Hands on Program, Booth Display, and Pre-Presentation Special." You can get a lot of information about this and other presentations he has developed over the years.

On the Articles tab, you will find numerous articles by Karl about insects. "All articles are approximately on a 7th to 12th grade level unless indicated as **(children)** or **(advanced**)". Following the articles from Karl, you will find an extensive list of articles by other authors organized primarily by different insect types such as Ants, Beetles, Cicadas, Flies, Dragonflies and Damselflies, Mosquitoes, and others.

Space does not permit to describe all the different websites the reader can explore by following the links found on the Links tab. Just click on links that you may find of interest.

I found reading the Exodus Mandate tab to be most informative. From his experience of teaching in the public-school system for over 30 years, Karl now believes that parents should consider sending their children either to a Christian school or home-schooling them. He presents in detail why he believes this is so important.

The Home tab of the site leads the reader back to the main page of the site. This is important because there are so many different links to explore.