Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 24 Issue 6 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info March 2020

Food for Thought

Do apples have supernatural powers?

Legend says that a falling apple inspired Sir Isaac Newton to think about gravity. I don't know if that is true, but an article by Marley Brown about the origin and domestication of apples inspired these thoughts about evolution. According to Brown,

> **Researchers are now** one step closer to understanding how apples made the journey from wild populations to grocery stores and farmers[']markets around the world, and how that process differed from the domestication of grasses such as wheat and rice. The first people to make use of these grasses encountered fields of densely packed wild cereals. The seeds of these self-pollinating annuals drop to the ground when ripe, allowing a fresh crop to grow each year. … Apple trees, on the other hand, reproduce poorly when fallen apples are left to rot, or when second-generation trees grow too close to their parents. They rely on animals—including humans—to disperse their seeds and carry out pollination. [1]

It is certainly true that "the apple doesn't fall far from the tree." Could animals have been responsible for spreading the seeds? How would that symbiotic relationship evolve?

Dogs Do

Nearly every day for more than 17 years, I walked my dog in the Mojave Desert. After he squatted down to do his business, he would stay in the same place, using his front paws to dig a hole, pushing the sand between his hind legs to cover what he had done. When I got him as a puppy I rather easily taught him to go outside when nature called. I never tried to teach him to cover his feces; but he did it instinctively. Was burying his poop a random behavior that gave him a survival advantage? I can't imagine what the advantage would be. Did he know that if his excrement contained a seed, in a few years it would grow into a tree which would provide him with more fruit? My dog was smart—but he wasn't that smart.

I can't believe that my dog was the only animal that instinctively dispersed seeds in a cloak of fertilizer, and buried them. Could that behavior have evolved independently in many different species? I doubt it.

More Detail

I had never thought much about apples before, so I decided to see what Wikipedia said about how apples reproduce. (Yes, we know Wikipedia isn't a reliable source because it is heavily biased toward evolutionary thought. We use Wikipedia so we can't be accused of using a "crackpot creationist source.")

> Apples are self-incompatible; they must cross-pollinate to develop fruit. During the flowering each season, apple growers often utilize pollinators to carry pollen. Honey bees are most commonly used. [2]

Let's think about that. Apple trees can't pollinate their flowers using their own pollen. It takes two to tango, and it takes at least two apple trees to produce apples. What did the very first apple tree do? If it was the very first apple tree, there was not another apple tree around to pollinate its flowers. If the flowers of the first apple tree didn't get pollinated, no apples (with

[1] Marley Brown, *Archaeology*, January/February 2020, "On the Origin of Apples", https://www.archaeology.org/issues/364-2001/features/8239-kazakhstan-apple-domestication

[2] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple#Pollination

seeds inside) would have developed. When that first apple tree died, that would be the end of it.

Evolutionists probably would say that the first wild apples could fertilize themselves, and that the need for a partner evolved later, and drove self-pollinating apple trees to extinction. There is no evidence for that, and it doesn't make any sense from a survival advantage. Why would a tree that could pollinate itself evolve into one that needed another tree near enough that wind or bees could bring pollen to it?

But there is more.

> Many apples grow readily from seeds. However, more than with most perennial fruits, apples must be propagated asexually by grafting to obtain the sweetness and other desirable characteristics of the parent. This is because seedling apples are an example of "extreme heterozygotes", in that rather than inheriting genes from their parents to create a new apple with parental characteristics, they are instead significantly different from their parents, perhaps to compete with the many pests. …
>
> Because apples do not breed true when planted as seeds, grafting is generally used to produce new apple trees. The rootstock used for the bottom of the graft can be selected to produce trees of a large variety of sizes, as well as changing the winter hardiness, insect and disease resistance, and soil preference of the resulting tree. Dwarf rootstocks can be used to produce very small trees (less than 3.0 m (10 ft) high at maturity), which bear fruit earlier in their life cycle than full size trees. Dwarf rootstocks for apple trees can be traced as far back as 300 BC, to the area of Persia and Asia Minor. Alexander the Great sent samples of dwarf apple trees to Aristotle's Lyceum. Dwarf rootstocks became common by the 15th century and later went through several cycles of popularity and decline throughout the world. The majority of the rootstocks used today to control size in apples were developed in England in the early 1900s. [3]

Somebody had the bright idea to graft the branch of one apple tree onto a different apple tree. It didn't happen by accident. Grafting branches of one kind of apple tree to the trunk of a different kind of tree was done intentionally by an intelligent designer. Who thinks of cutting off a branch from one tree and sticking it in a slot in the trunk of another tree? Apparently somebody did! He was either very intelligent, or crazy enough to wonder what would happen if he did it. Of course, after the first person did it successfully, lots of other people got into the act.

Selective breeding, and grafting, to produce apples with particular characteristics is common.

> There are more than 7,500 known cultivars [varieties] of apples. … . Most of these cultivars are bred for eating fresh (dessert apples), though some are cultivated specifically for cooking (cooking apples) or producing cider. Cider apples are typically too tart and astringent to eat fresh, but they give the beverage a rich flavor that dessert apples cannot. [4]

Selective breeding mixes up genes to obtain the desired characteristics, and apples have lots of genes to work with.

> In 2010, an Italian-led consortium announced they had sequenced the complete genome of the apple in collaboration with horticultural genomicists at Washington State University, using 'Golden Delicious'. It had about 57,000 genes, the highest number of any plant genome studied to date and more genes than the human genome (about 30,000). [5]

Each of those 57,000 genes has several different alleles (variations), the combination of which produces particular characteristics. If you combine the right alleles, you will get the desired result, within limits. Despite all that breeding and grafting, apples are still apples. But where did the 57,000 genes necessary to create all those varieties of apples come from?

The Chicken or the Seed

It isn't just chickens that have a chicken-or-the-egg problem. Wheat and rice have the same trouble, too. Where did the first kernel of wheat come from? If it came from a stalk of wheat, what caused that stalk of wheat to grow if it didn't come from a kernel of wheat? The same question could be asked of rice, apples, and every other living thing, too.

But, as Brown points out, apples have the problem in spades. The first wheat seed could have been produced from a single stalk of wheat (assuming the wheat came first). The first apple seed would have come from two apple trees (which must have magically appeared close to each other). Unlike wheat, which just falls to the ground and sprouts where it lands, the first apple seed would have had to have been moved away from the mother tree. So, the question is, "Which came first, two apple trees or the seed?" The idea that sexual reproduction evolved by unguided natural processes is fantastically illogical.

[3] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple#Breeding

[4] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple#Cultivars

[5] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple#Pollination

Two Classes

It has been truly said that there are only two classes of people in the world. One class of people divides things into two classes. The other class doesn't. ☺

The first class of people would divide every process into two classes—natural and supernatural. The other class would not because they don't think there are any supernatural processes. How would those two classes of people look at apples?

First, you would have to differentiate a supernatural process from a natural process. That's harder to do than you might expect. Our perhaps overly simplistic definition is that a supernatural process involves a miracle, where a miracle is defined to be an unusual exception to natural laws.

An apple falls from a branch onto the ground. That's certainly a natural process. There is nothing miraculous about it. Gravity pulls the apple down until the apple's stem can't take it any more, and it falls from the branch. Force equals mass times acceleration, and down it comes.

The apple lays on the ground and rots. That's also a natural process. It's the Second Law of Thermodynamics in action. The chemical energy organized inside the apple disorganizes into the environment to equalize the distribution of energy.

But then, something possibly unnatural happens. Somehow those 57,000 genes inside the apple seed respond to moisture and temperature cycles causing the seed to sprout. A stem with primary leaves go up, and roots go down. The leaves extract energy from sunlight, and the roots extract water and nutrients from the soil, which the plant uses to grow into a tree with branches. Eventually, the tree matures to the point where it produces flowers at the proper season, which attract bees which have pollen from another apple tree stuck to them. Some of that pollen rubs off of the bee and fertilizes the ovule. The fertilized ovule grows into an apple.

Is the transformation of a seed into a tree bearing fruit really a natural process? Does it violate natural laws?

A five-ounce Gala apple hanging on a branch seven feet off the ground has 2.2 foot-pounds of potential energy. If properly harnessed, it could do 2.2 foot-pounds of work when it falls. I don't know how many calories are in an apple because I don't care. I am going to eat it no matter how much sugar is in it! ☺ All that matters is that it has more than zero calories of chemical energy stored in it.

But wait! Hasn't the apple tree violated a natural law by increasing the organization of energy? It must have, because when the apple falls from the tree (equalizing potential energy) and rots (equalizing chemical energy), those two processes obey the laws of thermodynamics.

If a rotten apple on the ground suddenly became fresh, and jumped up off the ground and attached itself to the branch of an apple tree, that would certainly be miraculous. Un-rotting, and falling up, are two processes which violate natural laws.

If a rotten apple on the ground suddenly became a fresh apple on a branch, it would be a miracle. Why would a rotten apple on the ground gradually becoming a tree full of apples be any less miraculous?

Since potential energy is independent of path, it doesn't matter how, or how long, the apple was raised off the ground. Potential energy is determined entirely by height, regardless of how that height was attained and how long it took to attain it.

On the other hand, miracles are miraculous because they don't happen every day. Miracles are surprising and out of the ordinary. It isn't surprising or out of the ordinary for an apple tree to produce apples. There's nothing miraculous about an apple tree producing apples, is there? Producing apples is what an apple tree naturally does.

Let's clarify that. Producing apples is what a living apple tree naturally does. It would be miraculous if a dead apple tree produced apples. So, there must be a connection between life and whether or not a process is natural or supernatural.

An Apple's Life

Life is hard to define.

> There is currently no consensus regarding the definition of life. One popular definition is that organisms are open systems that maintain homeostasis, are composed of cells, have a life cycle, undergo metabolism, can grow, adapt to their environment, respond to stimuli, reproduce and evolve. [6]

(The last two words in Wikipedia's definition are unnecessary and prejudicial. If there is no evolution, there aren't any living things by that definition! Living things exist, therefore the theory of evolution must be true! ☺ That is just one example of Wikipedia's bias toward evolution.)

I would prefer to say that anything that isn't dead is alive. (It's that dividing into two classes

[6] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life

thing, again.) Of course, that doesn't really solve the problem, unless you can define what "dead" means. Since death is also difficult to define, there are lawsuits about what to do with people on life support.

A rather crass way of saying that someone has died is to say, "He has assumed room temperature." That's because heat (that is, energy) distributes itself evenly through natural processes. Dead things do not create organized pockets of energy. Dead things obey all the natural laws of thermodynamics, chemistry and physics.

Living things don't obey all those laws. Living things sometimes lift heavy objects up to a higher potential energy state. Internally or externally they sometimes combine chemicals to form chemical compounds (like sugars or gasoline) which store energy which they can release later when needed. That's not natural—but do we dare call it "supernatural?"

Are plant life, animal life, and human life, natural or supernatural?

The Evolutionists' Problem

The theory of evolution is based on the notion that there are no supernatural processes, so all forms of life must be the result of natural processes. That means that the life cycle of an apple tree has to be a natural process. If so, it is a natural process that runs afoul of the laws of thermodynamics because the tree causes heat (disguised in various forms of energy) to flow from a cold place to a hot place. Furthermore, it must be a circular natural process which has no discernable beginning (the chicken-or-egg problem). Natural processes don't violate the laws of thermodynamics, and aren't eternal. If the life cycle of an apple tree violates natural laws, then it must involve some supernatural processes. The theory of evolution is based on the notion that there are no supernatural processes, so it is partly based on a false premise.

Evolution in the News

One Mass Extinction Goes Extinct

Now evolutionists claim there were only four mass extinctions, not five.

Not surprisingly, evolutionary "truth" has changed again.

> The best record yet of how biodiversity changed in the distant past has been created with the help of machine learning and a supercomputer. Among other things, it confirms that one of the five great mass extinctions didn't really happen.
>
> It was thought the oceans turned toxic around 375 million years ago, near the end of the Devonian period, wiping out many marine species including almost all trilobites. But the latest study shows no evidence of a sudden catastrophic change like the asteroid impact that wiped out the dinosaurs. Instead, there was a gradual decline over an immensely long time – around 50 million years.
>
> "The late Devonian mass extinction isn't there," says Doug Erwin at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC. [7]

There is no new evidence—there is just a new study. A different analysis of the same data came to a different conclusion. Which one is correct?

The new study used a supercomputer, so it must be correct! ☺ In fact, the only difference between a computer and a supercomputer is computational speed. A supercomputer can reach the wrong conclusion much faster than a normal computer can.

Computers know nothing. They just execute the instructions they are given. In this case, a supercomputer was used to compare fossils using criteria specified by a team of computer programmers who guessed the age and relationships of fossils. The computer just covers their guesses with a veneer of credibility.

The Fatal Fossil Flaw

Their analysis is based on this belief:

> Fossils are used to date rocks. Because most species are only around for a few million years, if fossils of one species are present in rocks from different places, those rocks must be roughly the same age. [8]

That's the unwarranted conjecture that was used as the basis of the study.

Creationists and evolutionists agree that fossils are formed by rapid burial, before the thing had time to decay or be eaten by scavengers. A rockslide could cause the burial, but a flood is the more common means of burial.

---

[7] Michael Le Page, *New Scientist*, 16 January 2020, "AI suggests Earth has had fewer mass extinctions than we thought." https://www.newscientist.com/article/2230345-ai-suggests-earth-has-had-fewer-mass-extinctions-than-we-thought/

[8] *ibid.*

It doesn't flood very often here in the Mojave Desert, but it does happen occasionally. The August 15, 1984, flood was the most recent.

A few years before that, a friend of mine was returning from Los Angeles. She was a member of the China Lake Mountain Rescue Group, and had been trained in water rescue. She was driving north on the short stretch of Highway 14 where Highway 178 joins Highway 14. There was a heavy rainstorm in the Sierra Nevada Mountains just west of that section of road. Granite does not absorb water very well, so all that water funneled into a canyon, and turned into an eastward flowing river across the northbound highway. Her car was swept off the road down into the valley. Enough of the car was exposed that they found her body the next day. Even here in the desert, miles from any significant body of water, [9] living things can get buried by a flood.

If my survival-trained friend could not survive a flood, I'll bet that during the last 50 years, a coyote or two has probably been buried by a flood. I'm also guessing that there must have been many more floods in the Amazon basin during that time, and some piranha fish must have been buried by muddy water during one of those floods.

Admittedly, those are just guesses—but they are plausible guesses. The only thing I know for sure is that 12 years from now climate change will have caused the complete extinction of all forms of life on Earth. ☺ So, millions of years after that complete extinction, aliens from outer space might come to Earth. They could find fossilized coyotes in the Mojave Desert, and fossilized piranha fish in the Amazon basin. If those intelligent life forms aren't that intelligent, and therefore believe in evolution, they would conclude that the Amazon flood occurred millions of years before the Mojave flood because fish evolved millions of years before mammals.

It is true, you never find rock layers containing piranhas and coyotes—but it isn't because they didn't live at the same time. It is because they don't live in the same place.

Back to the Story

Let's pick up where we left off.

> Fossils are used to date rocks. Because most species are only around for a few million years, if fossils of one species are present in rocks from different places, those rocks must be roughly the same age.
>
> Roughly really does mean roughly, though. Previous studies of how biodiversity has changed over time have only been able to divide the past into huge chunks around ten million years long.
>
> Now Shuzhong Shen at the Nanjing Institute of Geology and Palaeontology in China and his colleagues including Erwin have produced a dramatically improved record in which each chunk is just 26,000 years long. They did this by taking a statistical approach developed around a decade ago and using it to analyse 100,000 records of 11,000 marine species whose fossils have been found in China and Europe.
>
> This approach is so computationally intense it would take dozens of years to do this on a normal computer. Instead, the team developed special machine-learning procedures and ran them on the Tianhe-2 supercomputer. [10]

They compared fossils found in China and Europe, and they must have found some differences. (If there weren't any differences at all, they could not have come to any conclusion.) They must have found some marine species whose fossils were in China, but not Europe (or vice versa). What a shock! ☺

The team used artificial intelligence techniques to develop special procedures so that the Tianhe-2 supercomputer could learn to figure out how long each species lived, and whether or not they all went extinct at the same time.

There is no way to verify the supercomputer's results. But, since a supercomputer came up with an answer, it must be correct! ☺

I spent 30 years (1975-2005) writing countless computer programs. Those programs had to be independently verified using experimental data. For example, we measured the flight parameters of a guided missile when we fired it at a target, and measured the trajectory it took. Then we used those flight parameters as inputs to the missile simulation program and compared the simulated flight path to the actual flight path. If they didn't match (and they seldom did the first time) we changed the computer program so that they did. But we didn't stop there. We fired another missile with different parameters at a different target, and compared the computed flight path to the actual flight path. We kept testing and modifying the program until the computer simulation gave the right results every time.

Computer simulations of fictional extinctions in the past are not (and cannot be) verified. They are meaningless. They don't prove (or disprove) mass extinctions in the past.

[9] China Lake is little more than a puddle with delusions of grandeur. It probably never gets more than 3 feet deep after a heavy rain.

[10] See footnote 7.

by Lothar Janetzko

Meridian Creation Science

https://www.creation.xtn.co/

Meridian Creation Science – from the meridian to the nations

The website review this month discusses a site which contains a great deal of information regarding the controversy concerning the subject of Darwinian evolution and the Special Creation of God.

The home page of the site presents tabs which allow the reader to explore the wealth of information the site has cataloged about the various creation and evolution websites found on the internet. The tabs have the following titles: HOME, BASICS, I, O, QU'S, SITES A-D, SITES E-Y, SUBJECTS A-L and SUBJECTS M-Z. The home page also provides a search box to allow the reader to search for topics of interest.

The HOME tab makes interesting observations about the ongoing controversy between creation and evolution. "The theory of evolution (molecules, to microbes, to mammals to man) is widely taught as proven fact, it pervades the media and dissenters suffer scorn or worse. Creation science however refuses to be silenced and as can be found from this website has a great explanatory power."

The BASICS tab presents 11 papers covering the fundamental differences between the worldviews of creationists and evolutionists and a section that defines terms.

The I tab serves as providing Site Information. Here you will find a description of how to navigate this website to find information about various creation and evolution websites. You can search for site names alphabetically or search for creation-related subjects alphabetically. To help you find websites of interest, the cataloged sites have a Site Rating and a Site Description. Subjects covered, and data format types of the various websites, are also given a code to make it easier to provide a short description of the contents of the various websites.

The SITES tabs provide a list of all websites listed in Meridian Creation Science along with a rating for each entry. Here you will also find a detailed listing of the above-mentioned Site Descriptions. By hovering on the SITES A-D tab you will find a pull down menu that will lead you to a listing of all Creation or Creation Science websites beginning with the letters A through D.

The O tab provides Other creation-related sites, positive, neutral and anti-.

Whether you search for websites alphabetically or by subject, there is much to explore on this website, which makes searching for information about creation and evolution on the internet interesting and even fun. Just select a letter on one of the SITES tabs or SUBJECTS tabs and be surprised by what you will find.