

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 21 Issue 3

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

December 2016

FLYING REINDEER

The existence of flying reindeer proves the theory of evolution is true!

If you stop to think about it, the fact that flying reindeer help Santa deliver all those toys is perhaps the best proof that the theory of evolution is true. There are many general explanations for why the theory of evolution is true; but the specific explanation of how Santa's reindeer evolved proves all the general statements about evolution are correct. Evolution is proved to be true every December 25th. Nobody can deny it.

EVERYBODY KNOWS IT IS TRUE

The simple fact that so many children know that flying reindeer evolved to pull Santa's sleigh should be proof enough. Children in our public schools all over America draw pictures of Santa's reindeer because they know his reindeer really exist and know what they look like! One even has a red nose that glows! You can't make this stuff up! Nobody would believe it. It must be true.

This widespread belief is not evidence of some evolutionary conspiracy. It is ridiculous to think that some sinister, shadowy group has conspired to lie to our children and corrupted the public education system. Who is the leader of this conspiracy? You can't name him because he doesn't exist! There's no conspiracy among school teachers to fool our children into believing something that isn't true. Besides, it isn't just our schools that teach that reindeer can fly. Anybody who watches TV in December has seen lots of programs showing flying reindeer pulling Santa's sleigh. The evidence is everywhere, and is so widespread, it can't be an evil conspiracy. It must be true.

So, we really don't need any more proof. Millions of children know it is true, and they can't all be wrong. They know it is true because it is true—not because of any conspiracy. But, if you want more proof, here's more proof:

GOD DIDN'T DO IT

God would not create flying reindeer. He isn't that kind of god. Therefore, flying reindeer must have evolved. Any idiot can understand that! (And, as a side note, the fact that flying reindeer evolved proves that God doesn't exist, and the Bible is fiction. But let's not get distracted by religious arguments. Let's stick to scientific arguments.)

NATURAL SELECTION

Reindeer living at the North Pole evolved the ability to fly because they had to. The ground is covered with snow and ice. You know how hard it is to walk in deep snow, and how dangerous it is to walk on slippery ice. Flying over the snow and ice is much easier and safer than walking on it. Not only that, there isn't much for reindeer to eat at the North Pole. They have to fly to warmer places (where edible plants grow) to find food. And, since the warmer places are far away, they had to evolve the ability to fly very far very fast. The reindeer that could fly the farthest, and could fly the fastest, had a significant survival advantage over other reindeer. Natural selection drove the evolution of flight in reindeer. It was inevitable. The story makes sense!

MISSING EVIDENCE IS OUT THERE

Evolution-deniers are quick to point out that nobody has ever seen a flying reindeer, despite the fact that many children have stayed up late on Christmas Eve to try to catch a glimpse of one. But that just proves Santa's reindeer are very stealthy. They see you before you see them, so they can hide before you spot them. They evolved the ability to avoid detection, which is further proof of how highly evolved they are.

It is true, nobody has ever found a fossil of a

reindeer with wings—but that doesn't mean there aren't any fossils. The fossil record is very incomplete. Not only that, hardly anybody digs for fossils at the North Pole. There are probably thousands—no, more likely millions—of undiscovered flying reindeer fossils yet to be discovered. We just need more money for research to find them!

DETAILS DON'T MATTER

You may wonder exactly how reindeer evolved the ability to fly. That's a fair question. Unfortunately, we don't know the answer. But, in fairness, you must admit that we don't know how birds evolved the ability to fly, either. But birds certainly do fly, and they could not have been created with that ability by any kind of god, so it must be possible for flight to evolve somehow. Most evolutionists agree that it seems unlikely that reindeer evolved the ability to fly by jumping out of trees and gliding to the ground. Reindeer can run faster than birds can run, so the ground-up theory of reindeer flight is currently preferred by most evolutionists; but we can't be too dogmatic about that. The jury is still out. Someday, however, we will discover the true origin of reindeer flight. More research is needed.

SCIENCE IS SELF-CORRECTING

The fact that there is disagreement among scientists about how reindeer flight evolved is proof of the superiority of science over faith. What scientists believe about reindeer evolution today might not be the same as what they will believe tomorrow because science is self-correcting. Granted, it may take some time for that to happen, and in the case of evolution it has taken more than 160 years (so far) to get the story right, but given more time, the mystery of evolution will eventually be solved. Given enough time, anything is possible.

BILLIONS OF YEARS

It is a statistical fact that infinite time makes improbable events inevitable. The idea that reindeer can fly may seem fantastic, but is it really that much more fantastic than bird migration? How do birds and reindeer find their way around without a GPS? We don't know, but we know they do it, so they must have evolved that ability, as improbable as it seems, because they had billions of years to do it.

DNA

It has been reported that a tiny fragment of a reindeer antler was discovered, and its DNA was analyzed. It was not exactly like the DNA of any known reindeer, so it must have come from one of Santa's reindeer. We have no observational or

fossil evidence that flying reindeer exist—but this discovery gives us the same amount of DNA evidence for flying reindeer as we have for the existence of Denisovans.¹ Just like in the case of the Denisovans (for whom we have just fragmentary fossil evidence) we can tell from the DNA alone where Santa's reindeer live, what they look like, what they eat, and what the DNA of their ancestors must have been like. And, not surprisingly, our DNA analysis confirms everything we previously believed about Santa's reindeer. (Well, yes, there is a lot of DNA analysis that contradicts our findings, but that must be the result of contamination, or convergent evolution, or improper analysis, or something. So, let's just ignore those disquieting results.)

MORE STUDIES ARE NEEDED

Everyone agrees further DNA studies are needed. To that end, the Federal Government has given a \$487 million grant to scientists in Iceland to extract DNA from fresh reindeer feces. They are looking for the same genes associated with bioluminescence found in fireflies, glow worms, and jellyfish which would cause a nose to glow bright red. This would not only confirm the existence of *Rangifer rudolphensis*, it would also prove that bioluminescence reindeer and fireflies have a close common ancestor; or maybe it would prove that convergent evolution happens even more frequently than generally assumed. (The correct conclusion depends upon what the scientists who made the discovery already believe.)

No feces from *Rangifer rudolphensis* have been found yet, but we know they will. If they aren't found, then the scientists' faces will be redder than Rudolph's nose. That can't be allowed to happen.

SCIENCE RULES!

Despite the facts that nobody has ever seen flying reindeer, no fossil evidence has ever been found, and DNA analysis is inconsistent with expectations, we know they must exist. There is no other plausible explanation for all those gifts under the tree on Christmas morning.

Anybody who doesn't believe reindeer can fly is just anti-science. Flying-reindeer-evolution-deniers are just ignorant, irredeemable, deplorable, bitter clingers who cling to the scientific method and reject the wisdom of the elite scientists who know so much more than they do.

¹ *Disclosure*, July 2013, "Denisovans", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v17i10n.htm>

SUMMARY

In summary, here is the proof that the theory of evolution is true in general, and that, in particular, flying reindeer have evolved:

- There is no god.
- Millions of children believe in evolution.
- Evolution could not be a conspiracy.
- Evolution is a necessary consequence of natural selection.
- There really are transitional fossils, but none have been found yet.
- The contradictory DNA analysis can be explained away.
- We all like a good, comforting story.
- The story keeps changing, which is proof that the theory is more correct than it used to be.
- It is scientific (because we said so).
- People who don't believe in evolution are stupid, and deserve to be insulted.
- More money for research will provide the answers.

What more proof do you need?

EPILOG

We usually reserve our parodies for the annual April Fool issue. We didn't in this case because of the obvious seasonal nature of this parody.

In general, what makes parodies funny is the fact that they illustrate absurdity by being absurd. This particular parody is based on the fact that the theory of evolution is an absurd fairy tale which is no more scientific than belief in flying reindeer. All of the silly arguments we used to prove the existence of flying reindeer are basically the same arguments used to prove the theory of evolution; and you know it. (If you don't know it, you haven't really listened to what evolutionists say.)

People don't believe in evolution because of scientific evidence—they believe in evolution in spite of all the science against evolution. They believe the theory of evolution for the same reasons children believe in Santa Claus—it is a story they want to believe told to them by adults.

It is always disappointing, and sometimes traumatic, when children learn the truth about Santa. They usually try to hold onto that belief in the face of overwhelming logic as long as they can. Sooner or later, they have to accept the truth.

The same thing is true about the theory of evolution. We can read the desperation written between the lines in some of the emails evolutionists write to us. When asked the simple question, "Why do you believe the theory of evolution is true?" they never can give a rational answer. This is abundantly clear on the evolutionists' blogs you find all over the Internet. Evolutionists just lash out with insults whenever a creationist makes a valid, scientific point. It is pointless to debate them, so we don't. We just take comfort in the fact that they would not write us such nasty hate mail if we had not struck a nerve. They would not bother to write if they didn't feel like they had to try to disprove our compelling arguments.

It is heartwarming, on the other hand, to get thoughtful emails from people like Greg, which we are sharing with you in this month's newsletter. When you read it you can tell he is really searching for the truth. He isn't going to accept anything just because it is said by a scientist, or a priest. He has questions, and he wants answers. So, let's turn from parody to a serious discussion of the issue.

Email

CATEGORIZING "EVOLUTION"

Greg thinks that it isn't helpful to categorize certain changes as "microevolution" or "macroevolution."

Greg has written us several emails over the past two months that are worth sharing with you. Here is how the discussion began.

Hello Mr. Pogge,
I continue to enjoy reading the articles on your website.

I thought I would share something with you and see if I could get your thoughts on it if you have the time. My apologies if this or anything like it has already been discussed in a back article, as I have not read everything you've written. I have been thinking a lot about how the word "evolution" is ambiguously defined in the current scientific culture as sort of an all-encompassing umbrella of microevolution, macroevolution, and the Theory itself.

First, I've become convinced (and I'm sure many others would agree) that this is a deliberate attempt to make those that doubt the Theory look unintelligent. If a person says, "I don't believe in evolution," they almost certainly mean they just don't believe in the theory that life evolved from a single-celled organism all the way to humans and the other organisms we see today. But an evolutionist will hear that and call them stupid as if they meant they don't believe in

observable variations, too. (although they probably think they're stupid for not believing the Theory anyway, but I digress).

Secondly (and this is what I was hoping to get your opinion on), it seems to me that we are quick to try and clarify this by pointing out the difference between microevolution and macroevolution and just leaving it at that, but this really isn't enough. If you define microevolution as "any single mutation or variation in an organism" and macroevolution as "a series of mutations or variations that lead to a new type of organism distinct from the original organism from which it evolved" we are really arguing about the wrong thing. Isn't the real argument (in my opinion, the crux of the entire argument) that micro-mutations that create new genetic information have never been observed and are, in fact, impossible? I know that these types of mutations are often called macro-mutations, but to me that is a miscategorization, since macroevolution is, as I defined above, really a series of micro-mutations. (Separate side question here, but technically wouldn't macro-DEvolution be possible?)

My points are that a) it's necessary to not only point out the difference between microevolution and macroevolution but also go one step further and point out the different categories of microevolution: regressive evolution (or devolution), neutral evolution, and progressive evolution; and b) mutations that would create new genetic code really belong in the progressive evolution category instead of the macroevolution category.

Thanks!
Greg

Our response was

We are glad you enjoy the articles.

Yes, we have written several times about how evolutionists like to change the definition of evolution to suit themselves. They point to different breeds of dogs as proof of evolution, and extrapolate that to evolution of reptiles to mammals. And yes, we have tried to point out the difference between microevolution and macroevolution, and the slippery definition of evolution.

Macroevolution is NOT a series of micro-mutations. Macroevolution is not a whole lot of instances of microevolution. Microevolution is a small change in an existing characteristic through novel combinations of existing genes, or expression of recessive genes when dominant genes are eliminated from the gene pool. That really does happen. Macroevolution is the hypothetical creation of new, functional genetic material by random chance. That has never been observed, and has nothing to do with microevolution.

Yes, devolution is possible. (For example, a mutation could cause a fish not to develop functional eyes.) It is a loss of functionality. In practice, nearly any loss of functionality would result in less capability in the struggle for survival, and would be eliminated from the gene pool by natural selection. (But in very deep water, or in an underwater cave, where there isn't any light to begin with, loss of vision does not appreciably hinder survival.) So devolution, although possible, is rare.

Thanks for writing.

That satisfied him for a while, but several weeks later he wrote to us again.

Hello Mr. Pogge,

Thank you for your kind reply. I didn't respond back initially because at the time I didn't think I had much to add, but I believe I do now.

To clarify, I understand that Evolution (the theory) requires creative mutations. But evolutionists themselves define macroevolution as "microevolution happening over and over", so they are able to create a straw man argument and avoid the topic of whether or not any of those micro-mutations they believe happened "over and over" actually created anything new.

For instance, I was once arguing with an evolutionist who, in response to me saying that microevolution was possible but not macroevolution, said something to the effect of, "So you believe 1+1=2, but that 1+1 a million times wouldn't get you to a million". My response was that it wasn't that I didn't believe one plus one a million times would get me to a million, it was that I didn't believe that one MINUS one (or minus zero) a million times could get me to a million! His statement illustrated that he believed mutations were/could be creative, even though there's no evidence of that.

But it occurred to me: While one minus one a million times won't get me to a million, it will get me to negative one million. This is why I asked about whether you thought "macro-devolution" was possible. You responded with describing that devolution is possible, and I understand that, but notice: I didn't say devolution, I said macro-devolution. I know that you object to using the prefix macro- the way that evolutionists use it, but I think you understand what I mean when I say macro-DEvolution (and I don't have a better word for it). If it could be shown that two separate populations of formerly the same kind of animal DEvolved and varied so much (in different ways) that they could no longer produce viable offspring with each other, I would call that macro-devolution, but it would in no way give credence to neo-darwinism, because it doesn't matter if two or more populations can evolve in such a way. It matters if the evolution they underwent was due to creation of new, functional genetic code or loss/change of existing genetic code.

My whole point is that I wouldn't really argue with evolutionists about their definition of macroevolution, because they'll take something like horses and donkeys or different breeds of dogs (as you pointed out), which might actually be the result of a series of micro-mutations (and hence, their definition of macroevolution), tout them as evidence for Evolution, and think that they've won the whole argument when, in fact, they've won a straw man argument. This is why I proposed "recategorizing" everything as I did. I feel like it helps make sure we are all arguing about the same thing, and more importantly, arguing about the right thing. I'm all about knocking down straw men.

I do recognize, however, that you've been doing this since I was in grade school (heck, you've probably been a student of this issue longer than I've been alive!). I guess I shouldn't really expect to change your mind about how you classify and define different terms. I just wanted to run this by you and get your opinion about whether or not I'm completely off base because I don't think I clearly defined my point or what I was asking last time. It may be that we just have a difference of semantics.

Thanks again for your time, and thanks for

adding me to your mailing list!

Greg

(For an explanation of Greg's comment about the mailing list, please see the sidebar about our mailing list elsewhere in this newsletter.)

THE BEST WAY

If you ask a number of people, "What is the best way to present the evidence against the theory of evolution?" the number of answers you get will equal (or maybe exceed) the number of people you ask. A lot of those answers will be excellent. We feel that Greg's answer is better than most, which is why we shared it with you.

We use lots of different approaches (including parody, as is evident from this month's feature article). So, we aren't going to argue with Greg. We simply want to share some thoughts which were inspired by Greg's email.

DEFINITIONS AND CATEGORIES

Definitions and categories are double-edged swords. They both are useful because they clearly set forth the topic under discussion. On the other hand, they can be distractions used to avoid talking about the topic of interest. For example, a clever lawyer could obscure the importance of categorization by arguing about whether there is a difference between a definition and a category, thus avoiding the real issue.

We need to understand what we mean by microevolution, macroevolution, and devolution. So, it is important to spend some time defining those terms, and categorizing observations according to those definitions, without wasting time arguing about whether or not the definitions and categories are perfect.

What it really comes down to is whether or not a lot of small changes can eventually create a new order of living things, and whether or not every order of living things sprang from a common ancestor. Evolutionists tend to argue about definitions in a lawyerly way in order to come to an apparently logical conclusion that is totally irrelevant to the real issue.

MICRO VS. MACRO

The microevolution/macroevolution argument can get so bogged down in semantics that we lose sight of the real issue. Yes, minor differences can result from mutations (or particular combinations of undamaged genes) that get established in a population. Those differences can be large enough that biologists assign them to different species. The important point is that the new species is always a new division of an existing family.

For example, it might be possible that a genetic mutation might cause a tiger to have a checkerboard coat, instead of stripes. Furthermore, checkerboard tigers might be so averse to mating with striped tigers that they won't produce offspring with each other, which is the common definition of a separate species. Let's resist the temptation to argue about whether or not fertility is an infallible criterion for determining species, and notice the important point that is often overlooked. The new species is a refinement in the existing cat family.

Let's restate that point for emphasis. Our fictitious checkerboard tiger will still be in the cat family, and not in the dog family, or an entirely new family. Microevolution might produce a new species in an existing family, but no amount of microevolution will create a new family, order, division, or phylum, no matter how long it takes. Microevolution can't produce anything so radically different that it differs enough from its ancestors that scientists would arbitrarily create a whole new classification to contain the new species.

DEVOLUTION

Evolution and devolution are two entirely different kinds of change. Evolution needs an increase in genetic information. It requires something from nothing. Devolution, on the other hand, is the result of loss of genetic information.

There is an old joke about a stupid businessman who lost a dollar on every sale, but was hoping to make up for his losses by increasing the volume of his sales. Gain is fundamentally different from loss. Organization is fundamentally different from disorganization.

The random vibrations of an earthquake might knock a wall down, but random vibrations won't build a wall up. The fact that walls fall down spontaneously is not proof that walls fall up spontaneously. The fact that genetic information can be lost accidentally does not mean genetic information can be created accidentally.

IMPROVEMENT

Suppose you go up into the mountains and you find a beautiful piece of property near a lake. You love it so much you buy the land and go camping on it frequently. After a while, you decide that you want to build a log cabin on the property and spend even more time on it.

One day the tax assessor is out for a hike and happens to see your log cabin. He recognizes that it consists of tree trunks that have been organized into walls. Not only that, there is some foreign material. Specifically, there are metal hinges and a lock on the door, and glass

windows. He concludes that this material is evidence of design, and that the tree trunks serve the purpose of providing shelter. So, on your next tax bill, you are taxed not only on the land, but on the “improvements” you have made.

Years go by, and you get tired of going up to the cabin. Natural forces cause the cabin to fall into disrepair. The wood starts to rot. Then a forest fire burns it to the ground. Subsequent rains cause flooding that wash away the charred remains. Eventually, new things grow on the land and there is no evidence you were ever there.

But you are still paying taxes on the improvements, so you get the tax assessor to reassess the property and lower your tax bill because the improvements are no longer there.

The point of the analogy is that it takes conscious decision and directed energy to organize material into a higher energy state to serve the desired purpose. Natural forces, on the other hand, tend to disorganize things into a state characterized by lower energy and increased randomness.

Another aspect of the analogy is that some people might object to the notion that a cabin in the wilderness is an improvement. One can't really improve on the pristine beauty of nature. The log cabin is a blight on the land, and its removal is an improvement. This could lead to a digression about progress that has nothing to do with the issue of recognizing intelligent design.

The same thing happens when people disagree about whether or not mutations are beneficial or not. Improvement is in the eye of the beholder. The real issue is whether or not blind chance, filtered by natural selection, can create a cardiovascular system complete with blood cells that carry oxygen all through the body. Arguments about whether or not sickle cell anemia is a blessing or a curse are irrelevant.

Evolution in the News

ANOTHER UNKNOWN HUMAN

Genetic clues “prove” another hominid race not revealed by fossils.

In the good old days, one had to (at least) find a fossil in order to believe an extinct creature once existed. In the case of the Denisovans,² they found a few teeth and part of a finger to

² Disclosure, July 2013, “Denisovans”, <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v17i10n.htm>

justify their DNA analysis that the Denisovans existed. Now, computer analysis concludes that there must have been another species of human beings for which no fossils have ever been found!

Traces of long-lost human cousins may be hiding in modern people's DNA, a new computer analysis suggests.

People from Melanesia, a region in the South Pacific encompassing Papua New Guinea and surrounding islands, may carry genetic evidence of a previously unknown extinct hominid species, Ryan Bohlender reported October 20 at the annual meeting of the American Society of Human Genetics.³

It was reported at the annual meeting of the American Society of Human Genetics, so it must be true! ☺

This mysterious relative was probably from a third branch of the hominid family tree that produced Neandertals and Denisovans, an extinct distant cousin of Neandertals. While many Neandertal fossils have been found in Europe and Asia, Denisovans are known only from DNA from a finger bone and a couple of teeth found in a Siberian cave (*SN: 12/12/15, p. 14⁴*).⁵

And that's not all!

Bohlender isn't the first to suggest that remnants of archaic human relatives may have been preserved in human DNA even though no fossil remains have been found. In 2012, another group of researchers suggested that some people in Africa carry DNA heirlooms from an extinct hominid species (*SN: 9/8/12, p. 9⁶*).⁷

³ Tina Hesman Saey, *Science News*, 12 November 2016, “DNA data offer evidence of unknown extinct human relative”, p. 13,

<https://www.sciencenews.org/article/dna-data-offer-evidence-unknown-extinct-human-relative?mode=magazine&context=192525>

⁴ Bruce Bower, *Science News*, 16 November 2015, “DNA puts Neandertal relatives in Siberia for 60,000 years”, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/dna-puts-neandertal-relatives-siberia-60000-years>

⁵ Tina Hesman Saey, *Science News*, 12 November 2016, “DNA data offer evidence of unknown extinct human relative”, p. 13,

<https://www.sciencenews.org/article/dna-data-offer-evidence-unknown-extinct-human-relative?mode=magazine&context=192525>

⁶ Tina Hesman Saey, *Science News*, 31 July 2012, “DNA hints at African cousin to humans”, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/dna-hints-african-cousin-humans>

This computer-aided speculation is characterized in the *Science News* headline as, “evidence.” That’s not what we call, “evidence.”

Simple definition of EVIDENCE

- : something which shows that something else exists or is true
- : a visible sign of something
- : material that is presented to a court of law to help find the truth about something ⁸

Bohlender just used a computer program to compare DNA from Europeans and Asians to compute what the DNA of a common ancestor would be. That program could be modified to compare the DNA from reindeer and fireflies to determine what a red-nosed reindeer’s DNA would be. That’s not evidence. It proves nothing!

Email

BLIND FISH

Have blind fish evolved or devolved?

Joseph asks,

Frankly, I'm still trying to wrap my head around this "blind fish" thing. There is no advantage to being a blind fish; moreover, only a percentage of a blind fish's offspring will also be blind, and if it continues to mate with other normal fish, the blind mutation will be weeded out.

So how did the blindness remain in the gene pool? Don't we normally need to do inbreeding just to get variations of dogs? (Hence problems such as German Shepherds having hip problems.) How could a fish, in the wild, with a disadvantage (as slight as it may be) mate in such a way that it preserved the blind mutation?

Joseph

There is no advantage or disadvantage to being blind in total darkness, so natural selection (as it applies to sight) does not come into play.

The association of hip problems with German Shepherds is what Darwin called, “correlation of growth.” That is, people bred German Shepherds for particular traits, and genetic hip problems just came along for the ride. That is, the breeding pairs that were selected for the desired genetic German Shepherd traits also happened to have genetic hip problems. Breeding for one trait turned out to be breeding for both.

⁷ Tina Hesman Saey, *Science News*, 12 November 2016, “DNA data offer evidence of unknown extinct human relative”, p. 13, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/dna-data-offer-evidence-unknown-extinct-human-relative?mode=magazine&context=192525>

⁸ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/evidence>

The first blind fish might also have had another mutation that did provide some sort of survival advantage that had nothing to do with blindness. That other mutation could have caused blind fish to predominate.

Regardless, loss of sight has nothing to do with how vision in any living thing originated.

If a bumper accidentally falls off a dirt-track stock car, it will make it lighter, so it might go faster. That’s an advantage in a race (as long as the car doesn’t crash). But the fact that a bumper can fall off a stock car accidentally doesn’t prove a bumper could accidentally fall onto a stock car. Nor would it prove that bumpers spontaneously come into existence.

Yes, creatures can have accidental mutations which cause a loss of functionality—but that doesn’t prove that accidental mutations can create new functionality and insert that new functionality into the proper place in the genome.

About Us

OUR MAILING LIST

It is just a monthly reminder.

Our newsletter comes out on the third Tuesday of every month. After uploading it, we send out a one-line email message saying, “The [month] Science Against Evolution newsletter is on-line at <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/new.shtml>.”

The link in the email takes you to a page containing links to the entire newsletter in PDF format as well as links to the individual articles in HTML format. There are also boxes which take you to our home page, topical index, and all our previous newsletters and websites of the month, too.

The email is sent BCC, so nobody else on the mailing list gets your email. We don’t reveal your email address to anyone else, and we don’t use your email address for any other purpose than to send you the monthly reminder.

From our home page you can also use the RSS link to subscribe to our newsletter. That way you get a notification whenever we upload a new copy of the newsletter, and even we don’t know who you are.

Anytime anyone sends us an email, we add that email address to our mailing list because that person has expressed interest in the newsletter. Occasionally people request to be taken off the mailing list, which we do immediately.

MICROEVOLUTION VS. MACROEVOLUTION: WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

Internet sites don't agree.

This month's web site review considers a topic that often arises when searching the Internet about information regarding the creation vs. evolution controversy. To begin the discussion from **Wikipedia.org** you learn that the terms "macroevolution" and "microevolution" were first coined by Russian entomologist Yuri Filipchenko in 1927. The meanings of these two terms have changed several times since then.

On the **About.com** website you will find the following definitions for Microevolution vs. Macroevolution. "Microevolution is used to refer to changes in the gene pool of a population over time which result in relatively small changes to the organisms in the population – changes which would not result in the newer organisms being considered as different species. Macroevolution, in contrast, is used to refer to changes in organisms which are significant enough that, over time, the newer organisms would be considered an entirely new species. In other words, the new organisms would be unable to mate with their ancestors, assuming we were able to bring them together."

On creation web sites, such as **ICR.org** (Institute for Creation Research) you learn that microevolution might better be called variation, or adaptation and that macroevolution has never been observed.

Other terms you will encounter when reading about micro and macro evolution are gradualism and punctuated equilibrium. These terms are used to try to explain how species have changed over time and what the fossil record shows.

What you will quickly notice when reading about microevolution vs. macroevolution is that there is little agreement as to even basic definitions about these terms. Evolutionists will tell you that "there is no known mechanism that would prevent small changes (microevolution) from ultimately resulting in macroevolution" and creationists claim that microevolution can occur but macroevolution cannot.

Although there is little agreement about basic definitions when discussing micro and macro evolution, when searching the Internet about these subjects you will find an abundance of information from both evolutionists and creationists that try to provide answers to persuade you to their point of view about these terms. Just read some of the many articles found on the net regarding this important topic of the creation vs. evolution controversy.



**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**.