Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 15 Issue 1 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org October 2010

Undead

Our Halloween issue looks at what happens when cells die because death tells us something about the origin of life.

The theory of evolution is dead on arrival. The theory says inanimate chemicals came to life to form Frankencell, which evolved into all forms of life on earth today. But nobody really knows how dead matter could have turned into a living cell. We do know, however, how living things die. We see it all too often. Since we don't like death very much, we try not to think about it. Perhaps we should. We can learn about life from death.

Working Backwards

Sometimes the best way to solve a problem is to work backwards. For example, take a picture of a solved Rubic's Cube ™. Make one rotation and take another picture. This picture tells you the condition you have to produce before you can finally solve the puzzle. How do you get to this next-to-last step? Well, rotate the cube again and see what it looks like. Take a picture of the next-to-next-to-last step. If you make a movie of the process of mixing up the cube, then you can play the video backwards to see how to put it together again.

In the same way, we can examine what happens to a cell when it dies, step by step. If we can retrace those steps backwards, we can (theoretically) bring a dead cell back to life.

> IN THE FIRST STAGE, soft tissue begins to decompose in a chain of events that starts with autolysis, or self-digestion. When breathing and circulation cease, cells are left without a supply of oxygen. The cells survive for a few minutes to a few days, but they can no longer pass wastes into the bloodstream. Carbon dioxide, one of the by-products of metabolism, is acidic, and as it accumulates, the acidity inside a cell increases, causing cell membranes to rupture. Single membranes surrounding organelles called lysosomes tend to dissolve first. The sacs contain digestive enzymes normally used by cells to break down organic molecules such as proteins. As these enzymes spill out, they begin digesting the cell from the inside out, eventually creating small blisters in and on internal tissues and organs and on the skin. The blister fluid, consisting of digested cell innards, is rich in nutrients. [1]

So, all we have to do is to start out with a fluid rich in nutrients, just like evolutionists postulate existed in the "early Earth." The nutrients separate themselves into cell walls and enzymes that would naturally digest those cell walls. But, for some reason, lysosomes form to prevent that from happening. Then the cells start sucking carbon dioxide out of some surrounding fluid, and release oxygen. And there you have it! Life! Why didn't anybody think of that before? ☺

One Way

There are some processes (such as diving into a swimming pool) that naturally go only one way. You can take a video of someone diving into a swimming pool, and then play it backwards so the person comes out of the water feet first and lands on the diving board. It shows what would have to happen for someone to jump out of the water and land on a high diving board. It only happens with trick photography. It never happens in the real world.

You can play a video of a cell dying backwards to see how it would come to life, but it won't happen naturally. Death is a process that naturally goes one way, but not the other. Dead

[1] Vass, *Scientific American*, September 2010, "Dust to Dust", page 58

things don't naturally come to life (no matter what you may have read about Pinocchio and Frosty the Snowman). It violates natural law.

Natural Law

The natural law that forces things to go in one direction is the Second Law of Thermodynamics. It is what makes walls fall down, and keeps them from falling up spontaneously.

Of course, it is possible to build a wall up. The difference between building a wall up and a wall naturally falling up is purposeful, directed expenditure of energy. Energy has to be expended in just the right way to lift bricks up upon each other to form a wall. Undirected energy will knock them down.

The undirected energy of room temperature heat will cause cell membranes to break down, causing a cell to die. Undirected heat won't cause membranes to form and make a cell come to life.

Studying the processes that occur when something dies might give us the knowledge to apply energy in just the right way to reverse it; but the more we study life and death, the more obvious it becomes that it is impossible for random energy to cause inanimate material to come together in just the right way to come to life.

Email

A Reasonable Evolutionist

You don't need to argue with reasonable evolutionists.

Last month we shared an email from Phil, an unreasonable evolutionist who just wanted to argue. Now we would like to share this email from Matt, a Canadian university student.

We don't need to argue with Matt to convince him that the theory of evolution is false—he is going to come to that conclusion all by himself in a few years because he clearly has a reasonable, rational mind. Here's what he wrote.

> In all honesty, the only point that you and I agree on is that there is no direct proof that re[p]tile reproduction evolved into mammalian reproduction, or on the development of lactation. Unfortunately, all of the related tissues are soft, not bony, and therefore lack any tendency to fossilize. On the other hand, there is no solid evidence refuting it either. Singular pieces of refuting evidence could easily be flukes or accidents of convergent evolution. All we have for the evolution of non-bony structures is precedent and theory.
>
> The theory on the evolution of reptiles is that they came from amphibians, which came from fish. Fish and amphibians have soft-shelled eggs, and it is believed that their ancestors did too. The theory is that reptiles lived near water early on, as they still had heavily permeable egg shells that needed to be laid in water, though adults could live solely on land. The harder shell developed later to keep water in, and hard, bird-like shells developed later still.
>
> Also, fossil evidence showed that mammal like-reptiles and mammals developed BEFORE birds and dinosaurs, and a relatively clear progression from one to the other, with no evidence of eggs from any of the ones that could be classified as mammals.
>
> And as for how live-birth developed in early mammals, the main theory is that soft-shelled eggs began to "hatch" in the uterus, while still relying on the yolk (still seen in some modern sharks). Later, the yolk was bypassed, and the blood vessels that fed nutrients into the yolk for its creation simply remained to nourish the developing offspring. At some point before this, Monotremes took another turn, and continued laying eggs.
>
> As for mammary glands and other aspects of mammal evolution, the fossil evidence was best described and characterized by my Comparative Chordate Zoology professor, Nancy Loadman of the University of Winnipeg. Her PowerPoint is attached It has been reduced to be able to fit into this e-mail, but all relevant information is attached.
>
> Anyhow, Lactation developed as just a patch of secreting skin (still seen in Monotremes rather than a nipple). It is believed that it began to moisten the egg, and later developed as a method to feed nutrients into the egg. It later might have continued to feed the young after they hatched. Later still, it would have fed them without needing any egg at all, just a juvenile animal. As for the suckling instinct, it likely evolved as a scent-based aspect, attracting the helpless young so that they don't stray too far off. This didn't happen all at once. One or two aspects evolved at a time, and all very gradually, with overlap.
>
> As for evolution itself, the progression in the fossil evidence is significant enough to support the theory. Genetic evidence connects different species, and defines elements of relation. Even non-coding DNA (introns) holds some secrets of evolutionary progress. By implanting the protein products that chicken introns would produce in their introns were planted in chicken embryos. This simulated activation of genes caused teeth, long tails and bodily scales to develop in those embryos before they were terminated. This suggests dinosaur origins for modern birds. There are innumerable other pieces of evidence supporting evolution. The only thing stopping actual proof is the impossibility of time travel with modern technology.
>
> So, in short, a lack of evidence is not a conclusion. Evidence of evolution itself, and the evolution from retiles [*sic*] to mammal-like-reptiles to mammals exists in the fossil record, and the only reason evidence of live birth and lactation don't exist is that they are not based on bony structures, so wouldn't fossilize. Please research before you start putting out wrong theories, especially if the website where you post it is good-looking enough to get some other ill-informed person to believe it. It also disputes currently accepted theories without putting forth new scientific ones to replace it (at least as far as I can see). Beliefs, once planted, are difficult to remove. You should understand this better than anyone, and I am unlikely to

> break that habit. I only hope that this can at least open you up to the possibility of other theories, and consider the consequences of your postings. If you want to kill a modern and accepted theory, don't kill it without replacing it.

No Explanation

Let's deal with the last paragraph first. Evolutionists want students to believe that a wrong explanation is better than no explanation at all.

Suppose a doctor said to you, "I know you don't have pneumonia, but since I can't figure out what you do have, I am going to treat you for pneumonia." Would you go to that doctor? Is an incorrect diagnosis better than no diagnosis?

Matt says, "lack of evidence is not a conclusion." We agree. There is a lack of evidence for evolution, as Matt admits. Yet, he accepts the conclusion of evolution despite the lack of evidence because there is no other explanation.

Mammal-like Reptiles

He has been told that there is fossil evidence of reptiles to mammal-like reptiles, and mammal-like reptiles to mammals. Presumably he is referring to the fact that the jaw bones in some reptiles look a lot like the bones in a mammalian ear. In years past, evolutionists claimed this was evidence for reptile to mammal evolution. The bones supposedly migrated from the jaw to the ear in order to improve hearing. We haven't devoted an article to this because we haven't seen this argument presented in the REAL scientific literature for decades, so it isn't really news-worthy. But the argument does still show up on some evolutionists' websites, and (apparently) in Canadian biology classes. So, we will briefly discuss it in the sidebar elsewhere in this newsletter.

Flukes

Going back to the beginning of Matt's email, he admits there is no proof that reptiles evolved into mammals. Sadly, he is ready to discount refuting evidence as a fluke, or convergent evolution. Last month we warned you that evolutionists try to explain away similarity that can't reasonably be attributed to a common ancestor as "convergent evolution." Matt has heard that argument, and accepts it (for now). The more times he hears it, however, the less convincing it will be. We are confident that Matt will eventually see through this deception.

Matt's second paragraph is the standard evolutionary fairy tale. He is simply repeating the story his teacher told him (as if we had never heard it before). Just because a story is told over and over doesn't make it true.

The third paragraph is based on the evolutionary assumption that the geologic column represents time periods rather than ecological zones. Matt hasn't questioned this assumption (yet).

The fourth paragraph begins a speculative story about how early mammals evolved from egg laying to live-birth reproduction. There is no evidence that "the yolk was bypassed." It is all based on the assumption of evolution.

Let's look at the sixth paragraph in detail.

> Lactation developed as just a patch of secreting skin (still seen in Monotremes rather than a nipple).

Notice that he states this as an absolute fact. How does Matt know that lactation developed as just a patch of secreting skin? We asked him, and he gave us this reply in a subsequent email:

> I don't, and neither do the scientists, since soft tissues don't fossilize. The best we can do is look at modern animals with primitive traits, and then try and trace back ancestry in the fossil record. Given fossil evidence, this is just the theory that fits best within it.

This answer satisfies him for now; but we don't think it will satisfy him for long—especially as he learns more about what the fossil record really shows. The sixth paragraph continues,

> It is believed that it began to moisten the egg, and later developed as a method to feed nutrients into the egg.

We asked him, "Why is that believed?" In his subsequent email he replied,

> It is simply one of the theories, and the one that was focussed [*sic*] on in my class. Since it is a theory with enough acceptance to make it into the class, at least a good number of people do beliee [*sic*] it. And it does make sense, given the permeable nature of some primitive egg designs.

Clearly, Matt realizes that it is (to use a term that evolutionists hate) "just a theory" without evidence to back it up. At this point in his life he is ready to accept it because, "a good number of people" believe it. As he matures, he will discover that the majority can be wrong. (This has been proved frequently by political elections. ☺)

In the conclusion to his second email to us, he said,

> I admit, I should have used the terms "theorized," or some synonym more often, and said "might have" rather than "would have." I wasn't so much trying to say that my beliefs are undeniably right, so much as I was saying don't shoot down a line of evidence and the extrapolated theories that result without a comprable [*sic*] argument available to replace it. I am open to other possibilities, but I

won't accept them without greater proof than a few holes in modern theories. A hole in a theory doesn't disprove anything if surrounding evidence is still valid unless there is another theory that lacks that hole is found. As far as I've seen, there are no better theories with anywhere near as much fossil evidence. Beyond that, all scientists can do for the moment is theorize and extrapolate, but it's better than just leaving these gaps in our knowledge empty.

No! It isn't better to fill gaps with nonsense because the nonsense hides the fact that there are gaps that need to be filled. Unsolved mysteries need to be clearly identified as unsolved mysteries so people can solve them.

Don't Argue

Matt is a smart guy. He already sees the weaknesses of the theory of evolution. He quite properly, for the moment, defers to the judgment of his more experienced teacher. It is good that he listens to, and understands, what his teacher is telling him.

After he graduates, however, we are confident that he will continue to learn. The more he learns, (especially when it comes to fossils and DNA), the less comfortable it will be for him to accept a theory that he knows isn't supported by the facts. Sooner or later, he won't be content to believe a lie just because the truth hasn't yet been found.

There isn't any need to argue with people like Matt. They will figure it out all by themselves. Just answer their questions, and give them things to think about.

Sidebar

Mammal-like Reptiles

What would make a reptile like a mammal? It would be mammal-like if it had mammary glands; but mammary glands don't fossilize. It would be mammal-like if it had a womb; but wombs don't fossilize. It would be mammal-like if it had hair instead of scales; but none of the mammal-like reptile fossils had skin impressions. It would be mammal-like if it were warm-blooded; but body temperature doesn't fossilize.

The only things mammal-like about mammal-like reptile fossils are three bones in the jaw which look like the three bones in the mammalian inner ear. According to some evolutionists, these bones accidentally grew in the ear instead of the mouth, and provided an improvement in hearing which increased their chances of survival.

Any engineer who has ever designed an antenna, microphone, loudspeaker, or any other component that depends upon impedance matching, knows how silly this is. The three bones in the middle ear use leverage to match the impedance of the fluid in the ear with the impedance of air outside the air to allow the transmission of sound waves.

You may not know about impedance, but you have probably been to a public swimming pool with a crowd of people at some time in your life. As you stood there on the diving board, you could hear all the laughing and conversation going on. As soon as you dove in, you could not hear those sounds from the surface, but heard underwater sounds (gurgling and splashing) that you didn't hear when you were on the diving board. The reason has to do with impedance matching.

The density of water is much higher than the density of air. Sound waves traveling through low-density air are reflected off high-density water. Sound waves traveling through high-density water are reflected off low-density air. The density of the medium (air or water) impedes the wave motion to a particular degree. It is a fundamental property of waves that they don't pass from one medium to another unless their impedances match.

Your radio needs an antenna because the antenna is designed to match the impedance of the air with the impedance of the electronic circuitry of the radio, allowing waves to pass in and out of the radio. In the same way, the bones in your ear use mechanical leverage to match the impedance of the fluid in your ear to the impedance of the air surrounding your ear. Without those bones, the sound waves would just bounce off your eardrum like sound waves bounce off the surface of a swimming pool.

Designing antennas (and microphones and speakers) is tricky business. They don't just spontaneously occur in nature. It is unreasonable to think that jaw bones that happened to grow in the wrong place would just happen to function as efficient impedance matchers.

Book Review

Game Gene Theory

We don't always like Hamilton's answers—but we love his questions!

While we don't endorse G. R. Hamilton's Game Gene Theory, we recommend that you read it. That is to say, we don't concur with many of Hamilton's conclusions, but we encourage you to think about his reasoning. It doesn't matter if you are an atheist, believer, evolutionist, creationist, capitalist, communist, Democrat, or Republican—you will find something offensive about this book. It is a radically different way of

looking at everything.

Hamilton sent us a copy of the second edition to review, presumably because he considers it to be an anti-evolution book. In many ways, we suppose it is. He certainly pokes some significant holes in the evolutionary teachings of Darwin and Dawkins. But that isn't really what this book is about.

Instead, we would characterize Game Gene Theory as a wide-ranging philosophy book, in which the theory of evolution plays a part. This is a direct result of the fact that the theory of evolution is more accurately described as a widely held philosophical belief than an actual scientific theory.

The aspect of Hamilton's book that deals with evolution goes something like this: The theory of evolution depends upon the notion of survival of the fittest. The most-fit organisms survive when less-fit organism go extinct. But being better equipped for survival (in other words, having better survival skills) is of no value to an organism if that organism doesn't use those survival skills. Having survival skills is of no value if the organism doesn't know how to use them, or doesn't want to use them. Therefore, the theory of evolution depends upon the notion of a survival instinct that causes the organism to use whatever survival skills it has. The organism has to have what evolutionist Richard Dawkins calls, "the selfish gene."

If you are unfamiliar with Dawkins' selfish gene, let us just simply say that Dawkins doesn't view an egg as the way a chicken produces another chicken. He sees a chicken as the way an egg produces lots more eggs just like itself. There is a selfish gene in the egg that (for some unexplained reason) wants to produce more and more copies of itself.

Hamilton argues that there really isn't an instinct to survive. Instead, he says, there is an instinct to play games. One of those games is the survival game. We won't attempt to present Hamilton's argument here, partly because we don't have the space to do it justice, and partly because we want you to read it for yourself.

We may be missing something crucial in Hamilton's argument, but it seems to us that for every argument Hamilton makes against Dawkins' selfish gene, a similar argument could be made against Hamilton's game gene. That's why we don't find his conclusions entirely satisfactory. But, as always, we encourage you to study for yourself and come to your own conclusion.

Hamilton does bring up an interesting point when it comes to the survival instinct of plants and lower forms of animal life. A desire to survive implies consciousness. Consciousness implies a brain. Plants don't have a brain, so they presumably don't have any self-awareness or desire to live (or play games, for that matter). So why do they bother to live?

Consider a sunflower seed buried in the ground. It has no intelligence or thought processes, but it "knows" (for lack of a better word) when to sprout. It knows to send the root down and the stem up. Once the stem breaks the surface, it knows to leaf out. The flower on the mature plant knows how to turn to face the sun. The sunflower does all these things (that is, plays these games) without having any cognitive ability. How can this be?

Evolutionists try to explain this all in terms of physical laws. The moisture in the ground, and the seasonal temperature cycles, trigger a natural reaction in the seed to sprout at the proper time. All the seeds that triggered at the wrong time sprouted too soon (or too late) went extinct, leaving only the seeds that sprouted at the proper time. But why sprout at all? Furthermore, if gravity naturally makes roots grow down, why would gravity make stems grow up? The more you think about sunflowers, the more unanswered questions you will think of.

Sunflower seeds "know" how to sprout, grow, and reproduce, without the ability to think. Were they preprogrammed to respond to physical conditions and forces? If so, was that preprogramming intentional or accidental? Or are sunflowers simply dumb peripherals that are somehow networked to some impersonal cosmic central processor that tells them what to do and when to do it? We don't claim to know. We simply recognize that these are questions that need to be answered.

Hamilton thinks everything can be explained as a natural result of an instinct to play games. We aren't convinced he has found the answer; but we encourage you to consider his proposal.

Hamilton's Game Gene Theory will give you plenty to think about. It will certainly raise some important questions. Maybe it will help you find some answers, too.

by Lothar Janetzko

The Battle of Beginnings: Why Neither Side is Winning the Creation-Evolution Debate

http://www.amazon.com/Battle-Beginnings-Neither-Winning-Creation-Evolution/dp/0830815295#_

The history of the creation-versus-evolution debate

This month's web site review looks at a book by Del Ratzsch found on Amazon.com. It examines the history of the creation-versus-evolution debate and critiques the entrenched positions that he argues merely impede progress toward truth. The book contains a preface, thirteen chapters, notes and a bibliography. Most of the book can be previewed by clicking on the *Look Inside!* link found on the Amazon.com website.

The preface provides some interesting details about the upbringing of the author. He points out that the aim of the book is not to convince readers to accept any particular resolution to the creation-versus-evolution debate, but rather to point out those things that should not convince one.

The first chapter of the book, Introduction, starts with "Some public disagreements transcend the category of mere debate and become social institutions." This is the case regarding the creation-versus-evolution debate. Because of the strong opinions on both sides of such disputes, little actual communication takes place. In the introduction you will find two quotes. One by Henry Morris, and another by Richard Dawkins, show how strongly they feel about their respective positions. The introduction then presents an outline for the rest of the book.

The chapter titles for the rest of the book are as follows: 2) Darwin: The Historical Context, 3) Darwin's Theory: A Brief Introduction, 4) Darwin's Theory: Popular Creationist Misunderstandings, 5) Twentieth-Century Creationism: The Historical Context, 6) Creationist Theory: A Brief Introduction, 7) Creationist Theory: Popular Evolutionist Misunderstandings, 8) Philosophy of Science: The Twentieth-Century Background, 9) The Nature of Science: A Contemporary Perspective, 10) The Nature of Science: Popular Creationist Mistakes, 11) The Nature of Science: Popular Anticreationist Mistakes, 12) Theistic Evolution: Catching It from Both Sides and 13) Conclusion.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of

Twenty-first Century Science Against EVOLUTION

P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org