

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 17 Issue 7

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

April 2013

COMIN' TO LIFE

For our annual celebration of National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1), we put new life into this old BeeGees song.

Well, you can tell by the way your teachers balk
That they don't really want to talk
About a little puddle warm
Where the first living cell was born.

They can't figure out a way,
No matter what your teachers say.
They still try to understand
How this process led up to man.

One way or another they are trying to discover
How a cell came to life, a cell came to life.
Assumptions they have taken and
Excuses they are makin'
Just can't stand the light. You know they aren't right.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, Comin' To Life
Just can't stand the light.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, It's just a lie.

No matter how your teachers try
They can't convince you of the lie.
It's tough walking in their shoes.
In debates they always lose.

They can't figure out a way
No matter what your teachers say
They still try to understand
How this process led up to man

One way or another they are trying to discover
How a cell came to life, a cell came to life.
Assumptions they have taken and
Excuses they are makin'
Just can't stand the light. You know they aren't right.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, Comin' To Life
Just can't stand the light.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, It's just a lie.

In a warm puddle, or
Under the sea floor,
They really haven't got a clue.
They have to teach it,
What are they going to have to do?
They have to lie!

Well, they don't know how apes stood up to walk,
Made some tools, and learned to talk.
Don't know how birds learned to fly
And winged their way across the sky.

Even though they don't know
They still insist it's really so
They really do believe it's true
That pond scum has evolved to you.

One way or another they are trying to discover
How a cell came to life, a cell came to life.
Assumptions they have taken and
Excuses they are makin'
Just can't stand the light. You know they aren't right.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, Comin' To Life
Just can't stand the light.
Ah, ha, ha, ha, It's just a lie.

The proof is nowhere, so they can't tell me
They just can't tell me, yeah.
The proof is nowhere, so they can't tell me,
They have to lie!

(repeat and fade)

Hear me perform this parody for free at
<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/music/Life.mp3>

This diagram was based on an analysis of the portion of DNA that has to do with smell.

The olfactory [smell] receptor genes of the five avian species and of green anole, human, cow and dog were annotated using GenBank, Ensembl and published data (Supplementary Note). Intact avian olfactory receptor genes were aligned using SATé-II (ref. 35), from which a neighbor-joining tree was constructed using MEGA5.03 (ref. 36), with the Poisson model chosen as the substitution model as previously analyzed. The reliability of the phylogenetic tree was evaluated with 1,000 bootstrap replicates.

In plain English, in addition to the olfactory genes of five bird species they compared, they compared the olfactory genes of four non-birds as a control. They expected the bird olfactory genes to be similar, and the non-birds to be different.

Sure enough, the lizard was different from the birds because they proceeded down a different evolutionary path (they believe) about 130 million years ago.

But, we wondered, what about the human, cow, and dog? Why weren't they included as additional "proof" that the evolutionary tree is correct? Did it turn out that a cow was more closely related to a bird than a human?

Searching through the 81 pages of supplementary data, I found Table 16, which contained the total number of olfactory genes in all the species tested. Here they are. I sorted them by increasing number.

Species	Genes
Saker falcon	63
Peregrine falcon	67
Turkey	97
Lizard	157
Chicken	456
Zebra finch	501
Human	599
Dog	883
Cow	1260

What should we conclude from this? That humans are more closely related to finches than dogs? Or, should we use cows instead of bloodhounds to track criminals because cows have 50% more smell genes than dogs?

We should not conclude anything at all. It simply goes to show that you can get any result you want by choosing the comparison that best confirms your bias. If they had simply compared the total number of olfactory genes, the data would have "proved" that chickens are more closely related to lizards than they are to turkeys.

The only way they knew they made the "right" comparison is because it confirmed their evolutionary beliefs.

DEFENDING THE PAPER

Let us remind you of the quote that caught Mick's attention.

"We have been able to determine that specific genes, regulating beak development, have had to evolve to withstand the pressure of impacting their prey at a speed of up to 300 kilometres an hour," explained Professor Mike Bruford, who authored the paper published in the journal *Nature Genetics*.²

There is absolutely nothing in the *Nature Genetics* paper that says anything at all about beaks having to withstand impact with their prey. They were comparing genes related to the sense of smell, not the strength of the beak.

Even if they had been comparing the relative strengths of beaks, the fact that one beak is stronger than another does not prove that evolution made it stronger—it could just as easily been designed to be stronger.

RAPID EVOLUTION

The researchers claim to have found evidence for rapid evolution.

Analysis of 8,424 orthologs in both falcons, chicken, zebra finch and turkey identified consistent evidence for genome-wide rapid evolution in these raptors.³

What they actually found were many differences. That should not be surprising because falcons are very different from turkeys and finches.

Because they are laboring under the false assumption that the differences are the result of evolution, they are surprised that there are so many more differences than their assumption of mutation rates would suggest.

They confused "differences" with "evolutionary changes." The evidence against evolution is right before their eyes; but they can't see it.

² Ella Davies, *BBC Nature*, 25 March 2013, "Falcons 'rapidly evolved' hunting skill", <http://www.bbc.co.uk/nature/21885659>

³ Xiangjiang Zhan *et al.*, *Nature Genetics*, 24 March 2013, "Peregrine and saker falcon genome sequences provide insights into evolution of a predatory lifestyle", <http://www.nature.com/ng/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/ng.2588.html>

EVOLUTION AND THE ILLUSION OF RANDOMNESS

<http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/evolution-and-the-illusion-of-randomness>

Essay from The New Atlantis – A Journal of Technology & Society

This month's web site review looks at an essay recommended by a reader of our newsletter. This essay is the "fourth in a set of essays by Stephen L. Talbott dealing with the new understanding of living organisms being urged upon us by the intense ongoing work in molecular biology. The previous installments were 'Getting Over the Code Delusion' (Summer 2010), 'The Unbearable Wholeness of Beings' (Fall 2010), and 'What Do Organisms Mean?' (Winter 2011)." This fourth essay appears in the Fall 2011 issue of *The New Atlantis*.

At the beginning of the essay, Mr. Talbott points out that biologists say that an organism "as it develops from embryo to adult – as it socializes, eats, plays, fights, heals its wounds, communicates, and reproduces – is the most concertedly purposeful entity we could possibly imagine. It does not merely exist in accord with the laws of physics and chemistry; rather, it is telling the meaningful story of its own life."

He then addresses the fact that although biologists accept the routine language of biological description, they effectively disown them. It is believed that "meaning and purpose play no role in evolutionary 'mechanisms'".

Mr. Talbott then describes the views of Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett. He sums up their views as trying to explain the "appearance of design" or the "illusion of design and planning".

Under a section of the essay entitled "Chance to the Rescue?" you will find a discussion about random mutations and whether they really occur blindly.

The next topic covered is "Can We Track Fitness?" We often hear evolutionists talk about the survival of the fittest, so I'm sure you will find this discussion interesting.

The whole essay presents arguments that seek to counter the "Illusion of Randomness" as contained in its title. At the end of the essay, you will find an extensive list of Notes which you can explore to learn more about all the topics covered. Also on the web page you will find a link to "More on Stephen L. Talbott".



**You are permitted (even encouraged)
to copy and distribute this newsletter.**

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at **ScienceAgainstEvolution.org**.