

# Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 19 Issue 9

[www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info](http://www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info)

June 2015

## DINO-CHICKENS

*What do dino-chickens tell us about evolution?*

Last month, it was reported (in both the popular press and real scientific journals) that,

With a little molecular tinkering, for the first time scientists have created chicken embryos with broad, Velociraptor-like muzzles in the place of their beaks.

The bizarrely developing chickens shed **new light on how the bird beak evolved**, scientists added.<sup>1</sup>

Although they won't admit it, **the "new light" is that the DNA must have been manipulated on purpose by an intelligent being to achieve the desired result!** ☺

Seriously, there is some resemblance between the bones in a reptile's nose and a bird's beak, especially in the embryonic stage. Evolutionists believe that random changes to reptile DNA are what caused the nose bones to become a beak. Some scientists tried to figure out what these changes must have been by meddling with the DNA of a chicken to make a chicken with a dinosaur-like snout instead of a beak.

First, we are going to tell you how these experiments were reported in the popular press. Second, we will review the actual published study. Finally, we will tell you what the journal *Science* had to say about the research.

### THE POPULAR PRESS

In addition to the quote above, LiveScience.com also said,

"The experimental animals did not have a beak, instead developing a broad, rounded

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles Q. Choi, LiveScience.com, May 12, 2015, "Chicken Embryos With Dinosaur Snouts Created in Lab", <https://www.yahoo.com/news/chicken-embryos-dinosaur-snouts-created-lab-131834500.html>

snout," Bhullar said. However, "they still **lacked teeth**, and possessed a horny covering on the snout."

**These embryos did not live to hatch, researchers stressed.** "They could have," Bhullar said. "They actually probably wouldn't have done that badly if they did hatch. Mostly, though, we were interested in the evolution of the beak, and not in hatching a 'dino-chicken' just for the sake of it."<sup>2</sup>

They didn't have teeth—but they were still "Velociraptor-like muzzles" (just not so dangerous). ☺

The genetically modified chickens could have hatched—but they didn't. The scientists didn't give them a chance to hatch. Why not? We don't know. It could have been that they were afraid of the social backlash from the Monster Rights Activists. It would be immoral to murder the mutant chickens after they hatched; but it is socially acceptable to abort them before they hatched because monsters don't have a "right to life" until they are actually born.

On the other hand, they might have been afraid of failure. Perhaps a dull, weak, toothless dinosaur snout would not have been able to break the shell the way a strong, sharp beak does. Failure to hatch would have proved them wrong.

Last summer, when I was in Colorado, I could have hiked up Pikes Peak—but I didn't (because I couldn't find anyone who wanted to hike with me, and I didn't want to do it alone). But I could have hiked to the summit of Pikes Peak, just like those dino-chickens could have hatched. By today's science standards, since I could have climbed Pikes Peak, I actually did it! Experimental proof is no longer necessary. If you say it could happen,

---

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*

then it did. ☺

The point is, they did not actually create viable dino-chickens—they just claim they could have; and that's good enough for lazy journalists.

The other point the lazy journalists missed is that things are not made by the same process that breaks them.

If you took a car with an 8-cylinder engine, and cut two of the spark plug wires, you would wind up with a car that has a poor 6-cylinder engine. It would not run smoothly because the spark plugs would not fire evenly—there would be gaps when the disconnected spark plugs should fire. But the engine would run on 6 cylinders. Learning how to turn a good 8-cylinder engine into a poor 6-cylinder engine tells nothing about how the 6-cylinder engine design evolved into the 8-cylinder design. You can't turn a 6-cylinder engine into an 8-cylinder engine by cutting spark plug wires. You have to add wires, and spark plugs, and cylinders, and valves. You can't add features using the same process that takes features away.

The question, "How can a dull, weak snout turn into a sharp, strong beak?" is not answered by learning how to prevent a beak from developing.

## THE ACTUAL STUDY

The actual research report can be found in the Wiley Online Library. It is very technical, so we won't blame you if you just skim over the next three quotes. We will translate them into plain English; but some people want to get the information straight from the horse's mouth, even if the horse has an accent which is hard to understand.

Anatomically, the internal skeleton of the upper beak is composed of fused, elongated premaxillary bones; these are paired, small and form the tip of the snout in ancestral reptiles (Fig. 1a, 3l). The remainder of the snout and much of the face in birds are truncated, a paedomorphic (Hanken and Wake 1993) condition with respect to ancestral archosaurs (Bhullar *et al.* 2012; Balanoff *et al.* 2013; Lee *et al.* 2014) (Fig. 1a).<sup>3</sup>

Here we have shown that a relatively minor – though novel – additional region of gene

---

<sup>3</sup> Bhullar, *et al.*, Wiley Online Library, 12 May 2015, "A molecular mechanism for the origin of a key evolutionary innovation, the bird beak and palate, revealed by an integrative approach to major transitions in vertebrate history", <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/evo.12684/pdf>

expression at a sufficiently early stage can precipitate changes that result in a dramatic morphological transition of two distinct skeletal structures.<sup>4</sup>

Two frontonasal signaling systems active at different times during embryonic development have been broadly hypothesized to be responsible for facial differences between the two distantly related and highly derived biomedical model amniotes, chickens and mice. The first is the frontonasal ectodermal zone (FEZ), which is present in 3-day-old chicken embryos (Hamburger-Hamilton stages 18-20) and is composed of dorsoventrally apposed expression domains of Fibroblast growth factor 8 (Fgf8) and Sonic hedgehog (Shh)(Hu *et al.* 2003). ... The second signaling system implicated in bird-specific facial morphology is based on the WNT pathway, which is active in the frontonasal prominence for a period of time following the FEZ but preceding skeletogenesis (Brugmann *et al.* 2007).<sup>5</sup>

Basically, they are saying that the relationship between DNA and bones is like the relationship between a blueprint and a building. Just as a blueprint tells the contractor how to make the building, DNA tells the embryo how to grow into the final form. Just as there is a sequence that has to be followed as the building is constructed, there is a developmental sequence that has to be followed as an embryo develops. DNA not only contains instruction for what proteins have to be manufactured, it also contains timing information so that things will be put together in the proper sequence.

The growth sequences are called "pathways." Genetic engineers have learned a lot about these pathways by making small changes in the DNA which inhibit the proper operation of these pathways. They know that if they break a particular gene, then some physical feature does not develop properly. This tells them what that gene does.

They have discovered two pathways that are associated with the development of a beak or nose. By making small changes to the DNA, they can affect the timing or result of these pathways. In other words, they have discovered how to mess with the DNA to affect the shape of whatever grows on the front of the face to make it more like a snout or a beak.

This is important research because it has medical applications. The more we know about how DNA affects physical functionality, the better

---

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*

we will be able to develop ways to cure diseases through genetic repair. Our complaint is that, instead of devoting all of their efforts to making practical use of this knowledge, many scientists are wasting their time trying to figure out how all these genetic pathways developed by accident. If these pathways didn't develop by accident, their search is doomed to failure. If they did develop by accident, what does it matter? Either way, it is a waste of valuable scientific resources.

The scientists who did this study were trying to replicate the steps by which a dinosaur's snout turned into a bird's beak. This is hard to do because,

A large gap between the birdlike and non-birdlike clusters presumably represents missing transitional forms among early avialans. The experimental embryos bridged this gap and overlapped the non-bird snouted archosaur cluster (Fig. 5b). Thus, we propose that the experimental embryonic phenotypes actually predict the morphology of yet-undiscovered early avialan palatines and that new fossils will eventually be found that will show a gradual morphological transition toward modern birds.<sup>6</sup>

They can't be sure they have replicated the steps found in the fossil record because the steps can't be found in the fossil record! But they know that new fossils will eventually be found, so the actual discovery of those fossils is scientifically unnecessary. ☺

We acknowledge, however, that the transition to the avian rostrum was undoubtedly complex – as shown by multiple transitions to a premaxilla with some bird-beak-like features in the fossil record. The results reported here represent one part of a manifold transition. Additionally, the characterization of the beak as a key evolutionary innovation is made more complex because its components were assembled over a longer period of time than that represented by the proximal stem of Aves – a caveat that applies to many such transformations or putative innovations (Donoghue 2005). However, the abrupt geometric gap between non-beaked archosaurs and birds and stem-birds with beaks may suggest a rapid, comparatively saltational transformation. The difference in ontogenetic trajectories of shape change between non-beaked forms, in which the premaxilla becomes shorter and broader with time, and beaked forms, in which it becomes longer and narrower, also suggests a discontinuous

distinctiveness to the beak.<sup>7</sup>

There are two important admissions in this paragraph. First, the genetic changes they discovered don't fully explain the differences. They claim to have found just one piece of the puzzle. Of course, without the rest of the puzzle pieces, one can't be sure the piece really fits.

Second, the Punctuated Equilibrium problem has reared its head again. Darwin predicted slow, gradual change. Since this isn't found in the fossil record, Stephen Jay Gould (and others) suggested Punctuated Equilibrium as an explanation. He believed that long periods of time went by with no evolution. These periods of time were separated by brief intervals during which evolution happened so rapidly that there wasn't time for the transitional forms to be captured in the fossil record. In other words, he believed evolution proceeded by "saltations" (jumps), contrary to the widely accepted scientific axiom, *Natura non facit saltus*. (Nature doesn't make jumps.)<sup>8</sup>

The precise selective pressures that operated on the beak after its initial appearance are unknowable with certainty, but a series of careful, broadly comparative behavioral and functional morphological studies on the use of the avian feeding apparatus in paleognaths and conservative neognaths would make inroads toward inferring the set of functions associated with the ancestral beak and therefore, indirectly, perhaps what environmental pressures led to the selection which resulted in its persistence and continued elaboration.<sup>9</sup>

In other words, "We don't know for sure how natural selection caused the beak to evolve; but we are sure something in the environment did it."

## THE JOURNAL SCIENCE

Although other scientists admire this study's approach (that is, attempting to relate DNA to fossils), they don't necessarily agree with the conclusions.

Their conclusions are at odds with an earlier study. But even those who disagree with the result say Abzhanov and his student Bhart-Anjan Bhullar, now a postdoctoral fellow at the

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natura\\_non\\_facit\\_saltus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natura_non_facit_saltus)

<sup>9</sup> Bhullar, *et al.*, Wiley Online Library, 12 May 2015, "A molecular mechanism for the origin of a key evolutionary innovation, the bird beak and palate, revealed by an integrative approach to major transitions in vertebrate history", <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/evo.12684/pdf>

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*

University of Chicago in Illinois, have demonstrated a powerful new approach: pinning down how anatomy changes using fossils, then trying to recapitulate the changes in the lab by tinkering with genetic signals. “The value of this paper is their ability to blend paleontology with evolutionary developmental biology,” says **Richard Schneider** of the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), who has **linked beak evolution to different genes.**<sup>10</sup>

At least one developmental biologist might share our concern about the viability of the modified chickens.

Marcucio, a developmental biologist, also worries that the changes in facial structure observed by the Harvard team may stem from unintended cell death caused by the inhibitors they used.<sup>11</sup>

We aren’t sure, but Marcucio might be saying that messing with the DNA might cause fatal unintended consequences.

Email

## ALTERNATIVES

### *If not evolution, what?*

The criticism we most often receive is that we just debunk evolution and don’t provide any evidence for creation. Yes, we don’t address creation because our website is about science in general, and evolution in particular—not religion in general, or creation in particular.

### RULES OF LOGIC

People who write this criticism erroneously believe that disproving one thing proves another. Disproving evolution does not prove that Greek Mythology is true, and disproving Greek Mythology does not prove that evolution is true. The same logic applies to Christianity or any other religion. **Proving that something is false does not necessarily prove something else is true.**

In our last few newsletters we have shared emails from **Sam and Chris** who, when asked to defend the theory of evolution, **argued that evolution must be true because the Bible is false.** Famous evolutionists, Richard Dawkins and Jerry Coyne in particular, have written books based on that same premise.

<sup>10</sup> Elizabeth Pennisi, *Science*, 15 May 2015, “How birds got their beaks”,

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/348/6236/744.full>

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*

On the other side, creationist organizations (Answers in Genesis and the Institute for Creation Research) tend to argue that evolution must be false because the Bible is true. Logically, this is different because proving one mutually exclusive situation is true does actually prove the contradictory one false.

Proving that Jim is taller Bill proves that Bill is not the tallest boy in class. But proving that Bill isn’t the tallest boy in class does not prove that Jim is the tallest (perhaps Fred is taller than both).

In a murder trial, the defense attorney might win the case by proving someone else did it—but that is extremely rare. The law does not require the defense to identify the real killer to win the case. Generally, the verdict is based on evidence for and against the defendant alone.

**For nearly 20 years we have argued against the theory of evolution from a purely scientific viewpoint because the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly against the theory of evolution. Because the facts are on our side, there is no need to use debate tricks (personal attacks, straw man arguments, or changing the subject) to make our case. We don’t need to prove any alternative theory to prove the theory of evolution is false.**

### INSURMOUNTABLE BIAS

We have received many emails from people arguing that evolution must be true because the Bible is false; but in the course of writing the last newsletter, it finally occurred to us that **it might not be possible for an atheist to reject the theory of evolution and retain his atheistic beliefs.** **If that is true, no amount of scientific evidence disproving the theory of evolution can ever overcome his atheistic bias.**

Since we didn’t know for sure, we sent an email to 191 people we know who have an interest in evolution because they have written to us recently. Our email said,

We know:

- There are Christians who believe in evolution.
- There are Christians who don’t believe in evolution.
- There are atheists who believe in evolution.

Do you know of any atheists who don’t believe in evolution? If so, what do they believe instead of evolution?

We received too many responses to print; but we want to thank all those people who did respond, even those whose emails we didn’t print. **Our goal this month (and this month only) is to present several alternatives to Darwinian evolution succinctly and accurately, without championing any one more than the others.**

## BOTH SIDES

K.C. gave us this response containing four links making the argument for both sides.

Alexander Mebane [is an atheist who rejects evolution]. I don't know if he is living. See <http://thecreationclub.com/book-review-of-darwins-creation-myth-by-alexander-mebane/> The reviewer qualifies also. Another review of his book ([http://newbeing.org/NB\\_Myth.html](http://newbeing.org/NB_Myth.html)) lists some others (such as Crick) at the bottom. Also, see comments at <http://www.quora.com/Are-there-atheists-who-dont-accept-formerly-believe-in-evolution> and <http://www.thethinkingatheist.com/forum/Thread-Can-one-be-an-atheist-and-not-believe-in-evolution?page=2> - K.C.

K.C.'s first link goes to The Creation Club website, maintained by Tom Shipley. Tom says he was raised an atheist, but became a Christian after he realized that the theory of evolution is scientifically bankrupt. He could not continue to be an atheist after he realized Darwin's theory is unscientific.

On his website Shipley quotes Mebane's quote of Huxley.

“Even if Darwinism is false above the microevolutionary level, it is nevertheless the only *scientific* [emphasis in the original] theory of cladogenesis now available; and that is more important than the question of truth or falsity.”  
-Thomas Henry Huxley, quote from pg. 73, “*Darwin's Creation Myth*” by Alexander Mebane<sup>12</sup>

Let that thought sink in. A false scientific theory is better than a true one, if the true explanation is religious. That certainly does support the proposition that an atheist must believe in evolution, even if he knows the theory is wrong.

The second link goes to the New Being Project. The home page contains the transcript of an interview with David Pursglove, who claims to be a “Post-Darwinist,” not a creationist. I found the website to be rather confusing, perhaps because I don't know what “non-linear intelligence” is. (It just seemed a little bit twisted to me. ☺)

The third link, to Quora is a blog asking if there are atheists who don't “believe” in evolution. But the argument got so tangled up in the word “believe” that they changed it to ask if there are atheists who don't “accept” evolution. That discussion got bogged down, too, without any compelling answer to the question.

<sup>12</sup> <http://thecreationclub.com/book-review-of-darwins-creation-myth-by-alexander-mebane/>

The last link goes to a blog at The Thinking Atheist. The bloggers there didn't take the question too seriously. One said,

Can one be an atheist and not believe in evolution?

I don't understand the question. Atheism and evolution have nothing to do with each other. Your question is like asking “Can one disbelieve in Santa Clause but still believe in gravity?” Your question, like mine, is simply nonsense.

Another person wrote,

You can be an atheist and believe or not believe anything you want. So long as deities are not included.

Then, like most blogs, the discussion got off-track and degenerated into personal attacks. We were hoping for a good, logical explanation of what an atheist who doesn't believe in evolution thinks. We certainly didn't find it here.

It is significant to note that the contributors to The Thinking Atheist didn't really think about the question. They just dismissed the question as foolish without even considering it. They do the same with any question about evolution. They take the attitude that everybody knows that evolution is true, so any question about it isn't worth thinking about.

On the other hand, our readers all gave careful consideration to the question, and gave examples of an alternative that atheists could accept.

I know agnostics that speculate on an inventive mechanism in organisms, a level of internal intelligent preplanning on the part of the organism itself. - Richard

The only example that comes to mind is John Lennon, who believed life just goes on and what we see now is how it always was. He professed no God and no evolution. Though I admit he really didn't know the issues seriously enough. - Patrick

There were atheists, people who did not believe in a god or the gods, long before Darwinian-style evolution. If they gave any thought to how the cosmos and living organisms came to be, there are only two choices: 1) the cosmos originated from nothing, or 2) the cosmos is eternal. - Kelly

The only atheists that I've found that don't believe in evolution believe it was some sort of space alien doing the creating/design. (These are the same sort that sleep with tin foil over their heads in order to block government control.) - Tom

Sir Anthony Flew is an atheist that rejected evolution. He took to believing that life started on another planet. He's hated for rejecting the theory. - Mick

To answer your question, my friend George who is an atheist, doesn't believe in evolution. Instead, he believes that aliens started life on planet earth. He keeps reminding me of the South American Indians and their symbols. - Nick

Apparently, an atheist can reject evolution if he believes that life came from outer space, which invites questions such as, "How did life evolve from non-life in outer space?" and "If you don't believe that life evolved on Earth, why would you believe it evolved in outer space?" But let's not get distracted by those questions. Let's examine the extraterrestrial alternative.

Flew believes in panspermia; George believes in something that is very close to panspermia, but not exactly the same.

Panspermia is the belief that life began somewhere out in space, came to Earth accidentally, and then evolved.<sup>13</sup> It is believed by Sir Fred Hoyle, and others, because the notion that chemicals on Earth could accidentally form the right amino acids, proteins, *et cetera*, and form a living cell, is just too ridiculous to take seriously. Moving the origin of life to someplace else, where conditions are completely unknown, allows the very remote possibility that the conditions there could form life spontaneously.

With that in mind, let's consider the opinions of Anthony Flew and George, and see how they differ.

Anthony Flew was an atheist most of his life; but famously became a deist (not a Christian) a few years before his death. A deist is someone who believes that there must be some sort of higher power, some sort of god, but that god is not Allah, Jesus Christ or the God of Abraham. Here's why Flew became a deist.

Flew also said: "My one and only piece of relevant evidence [for an Aristotelian God] is the apparent impossibility of providing a naturalistic theory of the origin from DNA of the first reproducing species... [In fact] the only reason which I have for beginning to think of believing in a First Cause god is the impossibility of providing a naturalistic account of the origin of the first reproducing organisms."<sup>14</sup>

Biology textbooks tend to divide the theory of evolution into two parts: the origin of life and the diversity of life. The origin of life is called "*abiogenesis*" from the Greek phrase "beginning (*genesis*) without (*a*) life (*bio*)." The diversity of life is explained by "descent with modification,"

which depends upon random mutations filtered by natural selection. Evolutionists include abiogenesis as part of the definition of "evolution" when it suits their purposes, but exclude it when it doesn't. We always include abiogenesis as a necessary part of the theory because, without it, Darwinian evolution is literally dead on arrival. The evolutionary tale begins with a dead planet.

Our initial question was whether or not one could be an atheist and reject the theory of evolution. In the case of Anthony Flew, when he rejected abiogenesis, a key aspect of evolution, he could no longer remain an atheist, and became a deist. So, Nick's email supports the idea that one cannot be an atheist without believing in evolution.

Nick's email (not to be confused with Mick's email) says his friend George is an atheist who believes in aliens instead of evolution. I don't know George, so I don't know exactly what he believes; but I do have a close atheist friend named Dave who holds a very similar view.

Dave is a mathematical genius, one of the smartest people I know. He has written some data encryption algorithms that are as cryptic as the cipher text they produce. After he joined our work group (coming from a group which designed nuclear weapons) it was part of my job to document, and try to explain how some of his computer programs work. His social skills are as bad as his mathematical skills are good. Before he retired he used to get in trouble for harassing a devout Catholic co-worker about his religion. He loves to push the buttons of anyone who believes in God.

Because he is so smart, and knows so much about science, he recognizes that the theory of evolution is utter foolishness. Instead, Dave believes that there is (or was) an advanced civilization somewhere outside our solar system. This civilization decided to do an experiment by putting an ecosystem (complete with human beings) on Earth, and has been secretly observing it ever since to see what happens. Occasionally the aliens manipulate things to see how life reacts; but they may have become bored with the experiment and no longer monitor us, and may just let us drive ourselves to extinction.

I asked him once what the name of this advanced civilization is, but he could not tell me. I asked Dave, "Why not call this civilization, 'God'?" He would not answer me; but it is clear to me that his notion of superior aliens creating life on Earth, and watching over it, does not differ significantly from the Christian notion of God creating life on Earth and watching over it. The main difference is that Dave's aliens did not give us ten commandments to live by.

<sup>13</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panspermia>

<sup>14</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antony\\_Flew](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antony_Flew)

Although Dave considers himself to be an atheist, his belief in an advanced celestial civilization controlling our world isn't much different from deism. He insists he doesn't believe in beings with supernatural powers—just alien beings with much more highly advanced technology. Those aliens put life on Earth pretty much the way it is now. (Some life forms have gone extinct since then, and some have undergone microevolution.) How those aliens came to life, and developed such advanced technology, is a question he can't answer.

### SOME SAY IT CAN'T BE DONE

Most of the people who answered our email said it isn't possible to be an atheist and not believe in evolution.

No, I don't know any atheists that don't believe in evolution. The two go hand in hand. I think that evolution is, to them, the "evidence" that supports their unbelief. In the end, it is all vanity. - Kirk

I have not met any Atheist who doesn't believe in evolution (whether Darwinian or Lamarckian etc.), although I met many and work with many, and that's most likely to be due to the fact that there isn't yet any other credible "scenario" that explains life and the immense variety of life on this planet. They are clinging on the evolutionary storey because it's their only "way out" to disbelieve in the Creator. - Selim

Wow, you must have gotten some interesting feedback ;o) Indeed, I have Atheists tell me all the time that Atheism is just \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in the blank with the favorite pop definition de jour) and that is all. However, yes; they all seem to agree on just about everything else including and especially evolution.  
Shalom,  
Ken

Mick sent us a follow-up email in which he said,

Like you, I know evolution-believing Christians but not creation-believing atheists. So much for atheists being the most (only?) open-minded ones.

A radio DJ told us this week about breaking news that our fingers and toes wrinkle in the bath for 'evolutionary' reasons. It happens because it let our ancestors grip trees better in the wet, according to scientists. Their thinking is that as it's involuntary, it must have an evolutionary background. What would be their evolutionary reason for the knee-jerk?

As with so many other evolutionary matters, they make it sound like an intention. I don't believe that DNA has enough of a mind to have intentions. Furthermore, I've never seen a primate grip boughs with only its fingertips, and we were taught in school that sweaty palms let our ancestors grip trees better—more contradictory teaching.

Besides that, googling shows that the

wrinkling-fingertip hypothesis was being talked about as fact at least two years ago. - Mick

### SOME SAY IT CAN

Some atheists say they don't believe in evolution. One of these people is Aaron (despite his Biblical name).

I'd say I fit in that category. But not too extreme, I think it's possible there's some kind of intelligence greater than ourselves, but it hasn't been discovered yet, and may not fit the traditional definition of "God." What do I believe instead of evolution? Your pages lead me to believe there's very little chance it all started by accidental random events. But I don't have an answer. I think some sort of design, but by who, or why, is a mystery. -Aaron

Although Aaron self-identifies as an atheist, he sounds more like an agnostic to us.

### CHRIS, AGAIN

Chris and Sam started this whole discussion by arguing that evolution must be true because the Bible is false. Chris wrote to us again—this time much more respectfully and coherently. Not all of it is on point; but here is his whole email, unedited.

Hello again.

Okay, so here's the deal. That is a very good question. I will tell you that I have a few friends who consider themselves atheists, which I feel you shouldn't worry too much about. After all, this is a nation where you decide what religion you want to follow. Anyway, I never engaged in a conversation with them on evolution, but I would say that they most likely do or don't believe in evolution, depending on who you ask. It's bad enough I have to hear this gobbledygook about a 6,000 year old and 10,000 year old universe with a side of a special designer who made everything in six days. Some of my atheist buddies think that aliens created us and all life that existed is just a mad science experiment from extraterrestrial life forms. And to be honest, that sounds even more stupid than the Genesis narrative (which is just as false, by the way).

So, in short, I have atheists who accept evolution, and then I have the wingnut friends who are atheist that believe something as stupid as a kitten riding a unicycle made life. But you shouldn't dwell on ignorance. You don't have to be atheist to approve of evolution. Even the most devoted followers of Jesus would frown upon a week's worth of creation. You either look at the Bible literally or figuratively. Some information in it is false, though. For example, we all celebrate Christmas because Jesus was supposedly born on that day. It turns out in reality, he was born somewhere between late September and early October, but that's for another day.

Hope this answers your question. Have a good day, and please keep my name disclosed. - Chris

## SPECIFIC EXAMPLES

Harley reminded us that some famous atheists (like Jerry Fodor) believe evolution is true, even if it is wrong.

I haven't taken the time to read it yet, but <http://www.examiner.com/article/atheists-attack-darwinian-evolution-new-book>. A little more on that article is at [http://www.salon.com/2010/02/23/what\\_darwin\\_got\\_wrong\\_jerry\\_fodor/](http://www.salon.com/2010/02/23/what_darwin_got_wrong_jerry_fodor/) - Harley

We reviewed Jerry Fodor's book five years ago, when it came out.<sup>15</sup> His book says, essentially, that the theory of evolution is generally true, but many specific details are wrong. The Publishers Weekly review on Amazon said,

The authors of this scattershot treatise believe in evolution, but think that the Darwinian model of adaptationism—that random genetic mutations, filtered by natural selection, produce traits that enhance fitness for a particular biological niche—is fatally flawed.<sup>16</sup>

There are some well-known stories about atheists who have rejected the theory of evolution, and consequently became Christians.

In a YouTube video, Richard Lumsden claims to have been a famous, ardent evolutionist who found God after rejecting evolution.

Dr. Richard Lumsden was professor of parasitology and cell biology at Tulane University. He served as dean of the graduate school, and published hundreds of scientific papers.<sup>17</sup>

We decided check out his “hundreds of scientific papers” to see how strongly he believed in evolution. We searched all the papers published by *Nature* and *Science*, and did not find a single paper authored by him. Nor did we find a single paper that referenced his work in other periodicals. Therefore we reject Richard Lumsden's story as a hoax.

On the other hand, Dean Kenyon's story is unquestionably true. He really was an atheist who co-wrote a critically acclaimed book about

the spontaneous origin of life when he was 30 years old. He became a Christian seven years later after trying to disprove the writings of A.E. Wilder Smith. I had the honor of talking privately with Dr. Kenyon for about an hour in 1998. I heard his story first hand.

Dean H. Kenyon (born c. 1939) is Professor Emeritus of Biology at San Francisco State University, a young Earth creationist, and one of the instigators of the intelligent design movement. He is the author of *Biochemical Predestination*. He became a creationist around 1976.

In 1969, Kenyon co-authored *Biochemical Predestination* with Gary Steinman.

...  
Kenyon received a BSc in physics from the University of Chicago in 1961 and a Ph.D. in biophysics from Stanford University in 1965. In 1965-1966 he was a National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellow in Chemical Biodynamics at the University of California, Berkeley, a Research Associate at Ames Research Center. In 1966, he started as an Assistant Professor of Biology at San Francisco State University and became Emeritus in 2001.<sup>18</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Perhaps some of the evolutionists who ask us for an alternative aren't (as we previously thought) simply trying to change the subject. Apparently they believe in evolution despite all the overwhelming scientific evidence against it simply because they don't have any better alternative, and really want to find one.

## Evolution in the News

# DARK MATTER OF FAITH

*You have to believe in dark matter.*

Normally, we would let this news item slide; but since it ties this month's feature article and email together, we had to include it in this newsletter, even though it is only peripherally related to evolution. Our feature article makes the point that, unlike old science (in which something had to be observed to happen spontaneously in nature, or forced to occur in the laboratory), new science says if enough scientists think something could have happened, it must have happened. The email column explored the premise that atheism might force otherwise rational people to

<sup>15</sup> *Disclosure*, April 2010, “What Darwin Got Wrong”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v14i7b.htm>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0374288798?ie=UTF8&tag=saloncom08-20&linkCode=as2&camp=1789&creative=9325&creativeASIN=0374288798>

<sup>17</sup> <http://crev.info/?scientists=richard-lumsden>

<sup>18</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dean\\_H.\\_Kenyon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dean_H._Kenyon)

believe irrational things. Because we were writing about these two subjects, the following news item in *Scientific American* immediately caught our attention:

For decades the story of dark matter has been one revelation after another about what this mysterious material is *not* [emphasis in the original], a gradual winnowing of possibilities that has made physicists increasingly nervous. What happens when the last candidate gets crossed off the list? Will we be doomed never to glimpse the nature of the stuff that contributes about 25 percent of all mass in the universe?<sup>19</sup>

The Big Bang theory is a mathematical model of what could have happened right after time and space began spontaneously about 15 billion years ago, assuming certain unverifiable initial conditions. Since the mathematical equations say it could have happened, it must have happened. The unverifiable model can't be wrong. ☺

The Big Bang theory calculated a certain amount of total mass in the universe. But, when astronomers estimated the number of stars, and estimated how much they must weigh (including the planets that must orbit them, and dust and gas), they realized that the measured (actually, estimated) mass of everything in the universe added up to only about 5% of what the theory predicted. Therefore, there must be a lot of "dark matter" which can't be seen by telescopes.

Eight years ago, we reported that astronomers believed that 90 to 98 percent of all the mass in the universe is "dark matter."<sup>20</sup> The recent *Scientific American* article said that only 25% of the mass is dark matter. That's because the more calculations the astronomers made, the harder it was to reconcile the measured rate of expansion of the universe, and the motion of celestial bodies, with the gravitational effect of that much mass. So, they postulated that most of that mass had to exist in the form of energy. (The famous equation  $E = mc^2$  relates mass to energy.) They call this mysterious energy, "dark energy," which seems to act like anti-gravity, making the universe expand faster than it would if all that dark matter existed as matter.

So, as of right now, the official story (according to Wikipedia, which is subject to change) is,

---

<sup>19</sup> *Scientific American*, June 2015, "Dark Matter Drops a Clue, pp. 15-17, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/dark-matter-particles-interact-with-themselves/>

<sup>20</sup> *Disclosure*, June 2007, "The Dark (MATTER) Side of the Moon", <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v11i9f.htm>

Dark matter neither emits nor absorbs light or any other electromagnetic radiation at any significant level. According to the Planck mission team, and based on the standard model of cosmology, the total mass-energy of the known universe contains 4.9% ordinary matter, 26.8% dark matter and 68.3% dark energy. Thus, dark matter is estimated to constitute 84.5% of the total matter in the universe, while dark energy plus dark matter constitute 95.1% of the total mass-energy content of the universe.

Astrophysicists hypothesized dark matter because of discrepancies between the mass of large astronomical objects determined from their gravitational effects and the mass calculated from the observable matter (stars, gas, and dust) that they can be seen to contain. Dark matter was postulated by Jan Oort in 1932 ...<sup>21</sup>

In physical cosmology and astronomy, dark energy is an unknown form of energy which is hypothesized to permeate all of space, tending to accelerate the expansion of the universe. Dark energy is the most accepted hypothesis to explain the observations since the 1990s indicating that the universe is expanding at an accelerating rate.<sup>22</sup>

The 90 to 98 percent estimate of dark matter in 2007 has been refined to 95.1 %, of which 26.8% is actually (undetected) matter, and the rest is (unexplainable) energy. *Scientific American* rounded 26.8% down to 25%. Doesn't *Scientific American* know that the matter (which has never been observed) has been measured to an accuracy of one tenth of one percent? ☺

Astronomers have known since 1932 that the measured amount of mass in the universe is nowhere close to the amount of mass predicted by the "standard model of cosmology" (*i.e.*, the Big Bang). They have been looking for the missing mass ever since. Now, *Scientific American* is worried that we might "be doomed never to glimpse the nature of the stuff."

In old science, if scientists tried vigorously to verify a theory for 83 years without success, the theory would be rejected. But in new science, if there is even the slightest chance that the theory might be correct by some reason that nobody knows, and if that theory supports the creation myth of atheism, then the theory must be correct. Furthermore, anyone who doesn't believe the Big Bang must be anti-science! ☺

---

<sup>21</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark\\_matter](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark_matter)

<sup>22</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark\\_energy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark_energy)

# FOUR STEPS TO STAYING CHRISTIAN THROUGH COLLEGE

<http://legacyacademic.com/tag/creationism/>

*Legacy Academic Consulting*

This month's website review looks at a blog post that provides some interesting insights on how Christians can survive college with their faith intact. In the introduction, the post author states that students need to be prepared "for the challenges they will hear to Christianity and central Christian doctrines when they are in college."

Much of the blog post is based on an article the author read on the apologetic website "The Poached Egg". The article has the title "Talking Back to Goliath: Some Advice for Students in the Evolutionary Biology Classroom," written by Paul Nelson, Ph.D. of Biola University and the Discovery Institute. You will find a link to this article on the blog post under discussion.

Dr. Nelson's main advice is "First, no aggression. David slaying Goliath is a justly famous account of bravery, but that was a literal battlefield. Your task is to persuade, not harm. Your sling and stones should be the evidence – or its conspicuous absence."

The main comment the post author makes regarding Dr. Nelson's article is "We have to be honest that the environment at colleges and universities is increasingly antagonistic toward traditional Christian beliefs and doctrines...the battlefield on the classroom is generally one in which the profs have the power and the podium, while students have no power and only as much podium as the prof is willing to yield."

The general advice given in the blog post consists of four steps. Step 1: **Know your audience.** "This is not primarily your professor, but your fellow students." Step 2: **Learn and be able to articulate the evidence** "and the evidence gaps in evolutionary theory, not just evidence that supports creationism." Step 3: **Learn how to be winsome in the way you undermine others' faith** "in Neo-Darwinian evolution and then communicate the opposing view." Step 4: **Develop a support system.** "Find professors at your school or at other schools who will support your faith as well as who know the literature and theories."

Many other general suggestions are made in the blog post that should help students in coping with the increasingly intolerant views regarding creationism they will face in colleges and universities.



**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.info](http://ScienceAgainstEvolution.info).