

erv

If we're made in Gods image, God's made of gag, pol, and env.

Latest Posts

Archives

About

RSS

Contact

Search this blog

« Animal Witness: The Michael Vick Case | Main | REPOST: Alpharetroviruses: Bane of Chickens »

IDIOTS and ERVs

Category: ERVs

Posted on: August 25, 2008 3:45 PM, by ERV

Profile



I'm a graduate student studying

Over a year ago, I made a short series of posts addressing Creationists and endogenous retroviruses ([Old ERV](#), [New ERV](#)).

the molecular and biochemical evolution of HIV within patients and within populations. I also study epigenetic control of ERVs.

Casey Luskin is evidently unaware of this series, as he managed to smack his [lovely, lovely face](#) into a couple of them in his recent [blog post](#) 'news release' at Evolution News & Views (*Why* is EN&V indexed by Google News, again?).

Casey TARD: ID proponents would predict function for ERVs... As William Dembski wrote in 1998, "If, on the other hand, organisms are designed, we expect DNA, as much as possible, to exhibit function."

Recent Posts

- OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!
- Retroviral Promoters and Cancer, One Example
- REPOST: Alpharetroviruses: Bane of Chickens
- IDiots and ERVs
- Animal Witness: The Michael Vick Case
- EMAIL! Pulse-->Chase
- Harun Yahya challenges Dawkins to naked Jello wrestling match
- Immunology Woo: MHC Mates, Part 2
- Presidential candidates: "Screw science! I wanna talk about PIXIES!"
- Dog days of summer

Casey is referring to a recently published paper, [Retroviral promoters in the human genome](#), where they sifted through the human genome for potentially active ERV 'LTRs', and they found some. YAY! COOL!

But Casey thinks that means ERVs are 'functional'.

I dont think Casey knows what ERVs are.

If Ive said it once, Ive said it 1,000 times-- *You do not want ERVs to be functional*. Functional ERVs would be 'endogenous proviruses', thus *they could kill you*. Even though the most 'popular' retrovirus, HIV-1, doesnt cause cancer, *cancer* is retroviruses favorite trick! B-cell leukemias, T-cell lymphomas, erythroleukemia, myeloid leukemias, osteosarcomas, fibrosarcomas, carcinomas...

No one, including cdesign proponentsists, want ERVs to be functional!

What we do know, and have known [since at least 1990](#) (thats pre-ccdesign proponentsists, Casey) is that components of ERVs can be co-opted, through evolution, to perform other

• ScienceBlogs home



Last 24 Hours

Syndication Feeds (RSS)

Email Subscriptions

The SB Weekly Recap

Blogs in the Network

Advertisement

Top Five Most Active

1. [They're joking, right?](#)
PZ Myers
2. [The recent bigfoot flap...a little late](#)
PZ Myers
3. ["Outing" anonymous bloggers: A favorite technique of antivaccine cranks](#)
Orac
4. [About that Arctic sea ice ...](#)
Tim Lambert
5. [Barr Polling Strong in Key States](#)
Ed Brayton

Search All Blogs

Recent Comments

- Blaidd
Drwg on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Tatarize on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Alf on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Alf on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Mobius on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- clintea on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Jon on [REPOST: Alpharetroviruses: Bane of Chickens](#)
- darek on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)
- Richard Wolford on [IDiots and ERVs](#)
- Aaron Golas on [OKC ERV PARTYYYYYYYY!!](#)

Archives

- [August 2008](#)
- [July 2008](#)
- [June 2008](#)
- [May 2008](#)
- [April 2008](#)

Blogroll Other Information

[Technorati Profile](#)



tasks. 'LTRs' are the promoters for retroviruses (I havent gotten to them in the 'Intro to ERVs' series yet). Its possible that a retrovirus plops down next to a gene, and the genes like 'Whoa! Ur a better promoter! I keepsies you!! *hug*' Its also possible that a retrovirus plops down next to a gene, and the gene says 'Piss off.' Its also possible that a retrovirus plops down next to an [oncogene](#), and the cell cant turn off the viral promoter... YAY CANCER!

While we have been finding functional ERV promoters here and there (because they cause a disease, we notice them), no one has ever done a genome wide screen for LTRs that have been domesticated for 'normal' use by our cells. So Conley & Crew used a couple of [cool new](#) genetics tricks to determine just how many ERV LTRs have the potential to act as promoters. They found ~100 genes that were probably ERV-promoter-driven, and *lots* that might have ERV promoters as 'alternate' promoters.

They also did a fun experiment with broad-reaching implications-- Test for ERV-driven transcription differences in human vs mouse tissue. They used '[GSTO1](#)', a gene with ERV promoters upstream, and has also been associated with 'cerebrovascular diseases including Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, vascular dementia and stroke.' Mice dont have an ERV north of GSTO1. Mice and humans both have GSTO2, and neither of us has an ERV north of that gene.

Mice and humans have similar transcription levels of GSTO2.

Mice and humans have *different* transcription levels of GSTO1, in part because our GSTO1 transcription uses an ERV promoter instead of the 'normal' one! This little exercise just demonstrated one of the reasons humans are different from mice (well, not just humans, all primates have this ERV insertion).

And think about what it leads towards-- Not only elucidating the teeny-tiny-differences that lead to speciation events, but what makes a breast cancer different from regular breast tissue? What makes a brain with Alzheimers different from a normal brain? We know there are transcript differences, but are the diseases caused by an alternate transcript initiated by an ERV promoter? Is it a loss of control of that ERV promoter that leads to disease? Can we give people therapies (ie epigenetic modifiers) to control wayward ERVs induced transcription?

Sweet.

This paper also does a great job of emphasizing the huge role retroviruses have played in the evolution of life on this planet:

The lineage-specific regulatory effects of ERV promoters can be attributed to the fact that ERV sequences result from past germline infections, many of which occurred relatively recently along specific evolutionary lineages. In fact, most of the ERV sequences in the human genome are primate-specific (Sverdlov, 2000), while most human genes are far more ancient and share orthologs with distantly related species (Lander et al., 2001). This means that regulatory effects exerted by ERV promoters will often lead to expression differences between primate and non-primate orthologs or between deeper evolutionary lineages for more ancient ERVs. In other words, ERV

promoters are likely to drive evolutionary changes in gene expression, long thought to be an important determinant of species divergence (King et al., 1975).

Of course, to [Caseys lovery, lovely ears](#), the authors are just 'pandering to the evilutionary para-dig-um'. lol.

Find

more

Comments

When I saw Casey's latest drivel on the DI website, I wondered how long it would take for you to respond with some real science.

#1

Poor Casey suffers dreadfully from delusions of adequacy.

For the life of me, I can't figure out if he's just a cynical liar for Jeebus, or merely stupid. Maybe he's both.

Posted by: [waldteufel](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:21 PM](#)

You immediately springs to mind the first moment I see that hack job on evolution news! seriously!

#2

Thanks for another great take down ERV, is there a chance you could do a Panda's Thumb version of it?

Posted by: [Draconiz](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:31 PM](#)

Im still doing another pulse-->chase today, but I wanted to get something out on this topic-- I will probably do a for realies PT post tomorrow night :)

#3

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:37 PM](#)

Boo ya!!

#4

Posted by: [Draconiz](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:40 PM](#)

HaHa! Casey Effin' Luskin!@ Denied again.

#5

BTW For those of you scoring at home, this makes it ERV 3, DI Hacks 0 in head to head competition.

Dembski and Behe are still smarting from their ERV smackdowns.

Posted by: [J-Dog](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:49 PM](#)

W filly xpct y t NT pst ths, bt w'll gv t whrl nywy.

#6

Pls rfr t:

< href="http://www.whsycrtr.cm/ndgns_rtrvrss.html" rl="nflw">http://www.whsycrtr.cm/ndgns_rtrvrss.html

Scrl t:

"Hw s t tht RVS r Cnsdrd Cps f Dss Prdcng xgns Rtrvrss bt Nn Hv Bn Prvn t Drctly Cs Dss?"
nd
"By Chnc, Wht Md RVS vlv nt "Th Cr," nstd f Rmngng Dss Rltd Vrss?"
nd
"By Chnc, Wht Md RV Imnts Chng Frm VrI ctvts t CIIlr ctvts nd Crt Nw ssntI Gns?"
nd
"RVS Crtd th Spc-Spcfc Rgltry Ntwrk tht Cntrl s th xprsn f CII s n CIIctv Mnnr. Wht Cm Frst i½
th Hst r th Rgltry Ntwrk?"
nf
"By Chnc, Wht Md RV LTRS mmdtly Trn nt ssntI Gn Rgltrs pn nsrtn?"
nd
"By Chnc, Wht Md LTRS Gn Trnscptnl blts fr ssntI Gns?"
nd
"Msc. xmpls f bsd nd nccrt rsrch nd pblctns:"
Pls nt tht thr r bt 50 + rsrch rtcls rfrncd s w lk frwr t yr rbttl.
(f y cn rstrn yrslf, t wld srv II f s wll f y wld dbt wtht nslts nd fl lngg.)

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 25, 2008 4:52 PM](#)

Since it isn't your blog, I don't think anyone gives a fuck about foul language...also, why is it that IDiots always think people with brains are out to censor them? #7

Posted by: PalMD | [August 25, 2008 5:21 PM](#)

who is your creator: Two word response: Fuck You. #8
who is your creator: longer response:
Who gives a shit about your "arguments", which are your cutting and splicing selectively quote-mined text which you retards don't have a clue about. Go stick your empty heads in your Wholly Babble.
Posted by: waldteufel | [August 25, 2008 5:34 PM](#)

#6 I don't need foul language for a rebuttal. There still isn't a single piece of data in support of old-school or new-school creationism in peer-reviewed scientific research papers, and no amount of quote-mining can alter that fact. #9
Posted by: James F | [August 25, 2008 5:39 PM](#)

I can has edukashun? #10
Posted by: [Christopher Sisk](#) | [August 25, 2008 5:40 PM](#)

pwned! #11
Yay ERV!
Posted by: Scott | [August 25, 2008 5:40 PM](#)

PaIMD: Classic projection. Try posting criticism of id on uncommon descent and see how long your account lasts.

#12

Posted by: Hank | [August 25, 2008 5:44 PM](#)

Yeah, when i get opposition trolls at my place, i only censor them when they get too nasty. If they actually want to have an honest debate, they can have their own goddamned thread and go to town. At UD, creationwiki, etc, no descent = no dissent.

#13

Posted by: PaIMD | [August 25, 2008 6:13 PM](#)

@6;

Anyone with beyond a first year biology education could answer that... I'll get to it in a moment, it's really not very complicated...

#14

Posted by: Jared | [August 25, 2008 7:20 PM](#)

It's getting to the point that I'm thinking we could even make a science out of creationist behavior. (Actually, it's probably been at that point for a few decades now ...)

#15

Though it's fascinating how organisms could have taken advantage of parts of an ERV such that they would be used in lieu of the original promoters. Was it helped out by a mutation that occurred just at the right time, or did the ERV itself somehow got parts of it used?

Posted by: Yoo | [August 25, 2008 7:53 PM](#)

ID proponents would predict function for ERVs... As William Dembski wrote in 1998, "If, on the other hand, organisms are designed, we expect DNA, as much as possible, to exhibit function."

#16

Why would they make this prediction? There is nothing in ID which would imply any such prediction. ID has nothing to say about methods and motives, remember Casey? The same Bill Dembski tells us those aren't scientific questions. ID also 'predicts' no function at all just as well.

ID is useless on so many levels.

Posted by: Dave S. | [August 25, 2008 8:29 PM](#)

Thank you for your very recent and scientific response, and will now see that not only have you provided the right answers to my questions but also have provided the right answers to my questions.

#17

Will look forward to your response and will see that not only have you provided the right answers to my questions but also have provided the right answers to my questions.

It's truly fascinating that this blog is called 'scientific'...

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 25, 2008 9:06 PM](#)

@ who is your creator #6:

#18

We fully expect you to NOT post this, but we'll give it a whirl anyway.

Why would you think that? It's pretty obvious ERV isn't afraid of much and certainly not the likes of you.

Scroll to: "How is it that ERVs are Considered Copies of Disease Producing Exogenous Retroviruses but None Have Been Proven to Directly Cause Disease?"

Deciding to give you a chance, I followed your instructions. The statement above is NOT supported by the associated reference:

Whether other examples of pathogenic endogenous retroviruses will be found, particularly in the human, is unknown. Numerous reports of retroviral particles in human tumor specimens have not been verified. For now, it appears that few, if any, replication-competent human endogenous retroviruses capable of causing disease exist. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/bv.fcgi?rid=emed.section.4250>

You use a reference and example that is specifically related to cancer tumors and virus and try to generalize it to pertain to *all* ERVs. James F in comment #9 above states the situation succinctly.

Maybe the answer to your question above is: Only the disease causing exogenous retroviruses that didn't kill the human before said human could breed became ERVs *after* the human's defense mechanisms disabled (or not) the disease-causing exogenous retrovirus. That's what ERV means by: "*Its possible that a retrovirus plops down next to a gene, and the genes like 'Whoa! Ur a better promoter! I keepsies you!! *hug*' (and 'Its also possible that a retrovirus plops down next to an oncogene, and the cell cant turn off the viral promoter... YAY CANCER!')*".

Having a limited amount of time in my life to suffer fools, I didn't further check out your website.

I'm a layperson who loves science (my educational background is Physics) so the only thing I know about ERVs is what I've read (so far) in the textbook "LIFE - The Science of Biology" and various layfolk-friendly books/videos/science blogs which, of course, includes ERVs website.

I find your post and your website to be unhelpful in furthering my understanding of ERVs. I did appreciate seeing yet one more example of the disingenuous tactics you cdesign proponentsists will use in your attempt to pervert Science for the sake of an invisible Sky-Daddy.

Next time you get sick, do the world a favor and pray instead of seeing a doctor. In other words, see comments #7 and #8 above.

ERV Abbie, thank you so much for your informative blog, your creative humor, your skill to communicate with layfolk as well as professionals, and your extraordinary courage!

Posted by: foxfire | [August 25, 2008 9:39 PM](#)

@ who is your creator # 17:

Thank you all for your very articulate and scientific responses, and we'll now assume that none of you have any evidence that might prove ERVs initially evolved as

#19

virulent viruses.

Assumption and Faith seem to describe your modus operandi, so why consider Science and Reason as alternatives?

Feel free to "rock-on" dudes (I'm assuming the "we" is NOT the royal "we"), as your current tactics have been *just so* successful with your Wedge objective, not to mention side effects, like discovering cures that actually might work.

Posted by: foxfire | [August 25, 2008 10:04 PM](#)

[...] and we'll now assume that none of you have any evidence that might prove ERVs initially evolved as virulent viruses.

#20

The royal "we", eh?

W.I.Y.C. is barking up the wrong tree, anyway. Everybody knows that viruses are the result of Zeus pissing in the gene pool. Prove me wrong!

Posted by: [Blake Stacey](#) | [August 25, 2008 10:24 PM](#)

Blake-- We need to create a Creationist literacy campaign or something, because evidently [we' cant read either](#).

#21

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 25, 2008 10:44 PM](#)

who is your creator: you worry about what you call "crass language", but I've got another concept for your weak mind.

#22

You are the merchants of "crass language", because you are also the asswipes who poison the minds of young children with the bullshit of a 6,000 year old earth and the other obscene images of your Wholly Babble. You, "who is your creator", are the scum who would teach children to toss reason and knowledge to the wind in favor of your bronze age creation myths of a desert warrior tribe who knew nothing about how the world really works.

"who is your creator": all you have to do to find obscenity, stupidity, and ignorance is to look into a mirror.

Posted by: waldteufel | [August 25, 2008 11:50 PM](#)

Julie Haberle, AKA "Who is Your Creator" --

#23

I'd like to invite you to take your claims up at Panda's Thumb _

[After the Bar Closes](#) where I can guarantee you your own personal thread, minimal profanity and a bevy of sciency types who are willing to instruct you in the errors of your ways. Or, you can opt to go one-on-one with a single poster.

Beyond your clumsy attempts at co-opting, mangling, and cherry-picking ERV papers -- I noticed that the one thing actually lacking in that post on your website is any actual data supporting your belief that viruses were "created good" (and presumably became "bad" due to "The Fall" -- per the laughable blather of AiG's Jerry Bergman) but are now "serving the purposes of the Creator."

You say on your site that you can't wait to hear the evolutionary side of your cartoon version of science and history, so I'll urge you to hie yourself on over to AtBC.

Posted by: deadman_932 | [August 26, 2008 1:00 AM](#)

By the way, Julie Haberle... I *would* have replied in full to your claims at your site, but you seem to have failed to allow that on your website. Coincidence? I think not.

#24

I hope that you'd have the courage of your convictions to debate your claims openly, in a more appropriate setting, rather than these hit-and-run forays onto blogs.

Posted by: deadman_932 | [August 26, 2008 1:09 AM](#)

Please note that there are about 50 + research articles referenced so we look forward to your rebuttal.

#25

Quote mining and out of context references are not equal to support of your position.

Posted by: [Rev. BigDumbChimp, KoT](#) | [August 26, 2008 7:55 AM](#)

"If, on the other hand, organisms are designed, we expect DNA, as much as possible, to exhibit function."

#26

Tsk tsk tsk, silly Billy. Don't you know that the genome has degraded and filled with gunk since *the Fall*? Really. Why do *we* have to keep *their* story straight for them?

Posted by: Sili | [August 26, 2008 2:05 PM](#)

who is your creator @ #6

#27

Evidence:

ERVs have copies (though not necessarily functional ones) of GAG, POL, and ENV genes, pretty much by definition as I understand it. These three genes are shared by almost all if not all viruses. Since there is a clear-cut mechanism for retroviruses to transcribe their genes into whatever DNA is present in an infected cell and since the human genome has no real use for a bunch of non-functional copies of genes used to code for viral proteins, the simplest and most likely explanation is that ERVs are genetic imprints of retroviruses that transcribed their genes into our ancestral DNA and then mutated until they stopped producing viruses.

You're not looking for a simple explanation for why broken virus genes are all over the human genome. You've already decided that God put them there and you're trying to justify that belief by latching on to anything that looks like it might fool somebody into thinking that's the case. That's pretty much the opposite of scientific, so why don't you quit the posturing, open your mind, and try to actually learn a thing or two about science before running off your mouth.

Posted by: Dan L. | [August 26, 2008 2:30 PM](#)

*Its possible that a retrovirus plops down next to a gene, and the genes like 'Whoa! Ur a better promoter! I keepsies you!! *hug**

#28

So. Full. Of. WIN.

Posted by: [thingsbreak](#) | [August 26, 2008 4:16 PM](#)

Hi J-Dog,

#29

I propose Abbie as the scientifically literate Jew who could explain to DI mendacious intellectual pornographer Michael Medved why ID doesn't pose a "challenge" to evolution (You may recall a certain posting of his in which he acknowledged that ID isn't a valid scientific theory, but is still rather useful as a "challenge" to evolution.).

Cheers,

John

Posted by: John Kwok | [August 26, 2008 4:39 PM](#)

Hi J-Dog,

#30

Hope you're right about the ERV smackdowns of Dembski and Behe. Dembski seems to act as though he hasn't heard of Abbie, while every now and then, I think I sense some lingering hostility from dear ol' Mikey towards Abbie over at his Amazon.com blog. Wonder why....

Cheers,

John

Posted by: John Kwok | [August 26, 2008 4:41 PM](#)

Sooner or later these idiots are going to learn to read. Or at least I hope they are as they're *really* getting boring now.

#31

Posted by: The Chimp's Raging Id | [August 26, 2008 5:06 PM](#)

I just dropped by for the boobies, but the only one on display was "who is your creator."

#32

Posted by: Gary Hurd | [August 26, 2008 5:34 PM](#)

WIYC:

#33

The problem with your view of "crass language" is that it forgets one principle point of etiquette that no one seems to give much thought to: if you're doing it for any reason other than keeping your elbows out of someone else's plate, you're missing the point. And as a layperson, I bet I can answer a couple of these myself:

"How is it that ERVS are Considered Copies of Disease Producing Exogenous Retroviruses but None Have Been Proven to Directly Cause Disease?"

Because they've been inactivated by regulation mechanisms we're still learning about. Inactive ERVs are like commented-out code in computer programming -- they're there, but the compiler/ribosome ignores them.

"By Chance, What Made ERVS Evolve into "The Cure," Instead of Remaining Disease Related Viruses?"

They aren't the cure for anything. Not sure where you get your ideas from -- those that aren't somehow incorporated into the host genome do nothing.

"By Chance, What Made ERV Elements Change From Viral Activities to Cellular Activities and Create New Essential Genes?"

Abbie has discussed this quite a few times. Go look through the archives.

"ERVs Created the Specie-Specific Regulatory Network that Controls the Expression of Cells in a Collective Manner. What Came First $\frac{1}{2}$ the Host or the Regulatory Network?"

First off, your premise is a little out of whack -- show me that the difference between, for example, a protist and a sponge or a Chlamydomonas and a Volvox are virally derived. There's no particular reason to assume that multicellular life forms required viral DNA to function as they do; it's certainly possible, but not the only likely route.

That said, considering that poorly- or undifferentiated multicellular species like Volvox and sponges do exist, it's entirely possible the host came first.

"By Chance, What Made ERV LTRS Immediately Turn into Essential Gene Regulators Upon Insertion?"

Those that did landed in just the right place at just the right time to be ignored by the transcription mechanisms and set the organism off on a completely different course.

"By Chance, What Made LTRS Gain Transcriptional Abilities for Essential Genes?"

Uh... I can't even parse this, although to me it reads like a tautology with the answer "uh... because they were there?" Abbie?

Posted by: [Brian X](#) | [August 26, 2008 7:23 PM](#)

Great job, BrianX! For the last one-- This paper makes it clear that the ERV LTRs are 'alternate' promoters. Where retroviruses insert is random, so if one happens to plop down near an 'essential gene' (I thought all genes were 'essential' to Creationists?), the gene can be transcribed with its old promoter OR the ERV LTR promoter. If the ERV LTR one turns out to be 'better', then it will become the 'dominant' promoter.

#34

But we dunt know all that yet :) This group found ~100 genes that defiantly use an ERV promoter at some point, and thousands more that could be used for an alternate transcript.

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 26, 2008 7:32 PM](#)

(Why is EN&V indexed by Google News, again?)

#35

For much the same reason that your blog is in all probability. Yes, Google News indexes scienceblogs.com.

Actually I wished they had an option to exclude all blogs from Google News searches. Blogs don't work very well with news search. Search for *human evolution* and Google News returns a bunch of Greg Laden posts that are not about human evolution because Google News for some reason thinks that because the full title of his blog includes "human evolution" that every entry of his blog is a new item on human evolution. I am sure that Greg would agree that is not good indexing.

Posted by: a lurker | [August 26, 2008 10:13 PM](#)

Th rspns n #18 rspndng t r chllng f "Hw s t tht RVS r Cnsdrd Cps f Dss Prdcng xgns Rtrvrss bt Nn Hv Bn Prvn t Drctly Cs Dss?" pstd n #6:

#36

"Myb th nswr t yr qstn bv s: nly th dss csng xgns rtrvrss tht ddn't kll th hmn bfr sd hmn cld brd bcm RVs ftr th hmn's dfns mchnsms dsblld (r nt) th dss-csng xgns rtrvrs."

"Myb" mght b cmpllng vduc fr yr fillwrs, bt w prfr mprcl vduc gnd by bsrvt n d gntc rsrch. t's ntrstng tht mst f y wn't ccpt vlt nry rsrch whn t cntrdct yr rlg n f vlt n. Why dn't y cntr t wth "qt-mnng" f cnflctng rsrch (S #9)?

Cld t b tht t dsn't xst?

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 27, 2008 9:34 AM](#)

WIYC, you have received several answers to your questions and have not responded to any except to play with the satirical use of 'maybe'.

#37

You seem incapable of real debate and as noted by several and experienced by many more, id/creationists cannot debate on their own websites, only blind obedience is acceptable.

Posted by: Acleron | [August 27, 2008 11:20 AM](#)

n rgrd t #37 bv, pls rfrnc ny rsrch rtcls tht rft r clms s tht s th prcss f bg nng n ctl dbt.

#38

Th nly thng w s n ths blg s bnch f nsbstnttd pnns nd prsnl hypthss (s ntd n #33).

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 27, 2008 11:33 AM](#)

Well, if your approach to "refuting" the big bang is in any way similar to your approach to this ERV business, I can understand the reluctance the biologists here have in talking to you. I'll give you an example. On your website you have a quote in a sidebar which says:

#39

The first, and main, problem is the very existence of the big bang. One may wonder, what came before? If space-time did not exist then, how could everything appear from nothing? What arose first? The universe or the laws determining its evolution? Explaining this initial singularity—where and when it all began—still remains the most intractable problem of modern cosmology.

Did you, or did you not read that article in its entirety? If you did, then by isolating the quote and presenting it as scientific dissent regarding the big bang you are being dishonest. If you did not, then it's my sad duty to inform you that you have made the serious mistake of citing someone who does not dispute that it did happen and, indeed, is a supporter of eternal inflation and *not* of a creation. What's more, he [says mean things about Christianity](#).

You are either dishonest, in which case there is nothing which can be gained by taking the time to present facts which you will distort, or you do not pay attention, in which case there is nothing to be gained by taking the time to present facts which you will ignore. Now run along and take your pick axe... I hear they need some more people in the quote mines.

Posted by: Dustin | [August 27, 2008 12:50 PM](#)

n rpsns t #39 bv:

#40

1. Snc y'r chngng th sbjct, w'll ssm tht y r thrwng n th twl nd cn ffr N mprcl vdcnc t spprt th clms tht RVs rgnlly vlvd s vrInt nd ddly vrss.

2. f y wsh t dscss th bg bng, pls strt thrd n:

< href="http://pb17.brvt.cm/frm/1424646898" rl="nflw">http://pb17.brvt.cm/frm/1424646898

3. Whn y rvrt t yr 'cd' wrds f, "dshnst", "dstrt", "qt-mnng", "strw mn", nd n f th mst cmmn phrss, "Y jst gnr th fcts nywy", w'll tk t tht y cn't ffr ny mprcl rsrch/vdcnc cntrng r clms.

f y d cm p wth nythng, dbts wrk bttr f y ct spcfc sntncs/prgrphs s w knw xctly y r rfrng t s w cn cntr.

Ths s wht s cll'd 'dbtng' ...

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 27, 2008 1:23 PM](#)

WIYC-- Your question is answered in the OP. Twice. Are you trolling, or are you mentally handicapped?

#41

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 27, 2008 1:28 PM](#)

When you revert to your 'code' words of, "dishonest", "distort", "quote-mining", "straw man", and one of the most common phrases, "You just ignore the facts anyway"

#42

See, this is what I'm talking about. Clearly, you've had it said to you before that you're dishonest and that you've already drawn conclusions which no evidence can overturn -- yet, you don't change what you're doing. That's not "debating". That's "masturbating". You made this a game for one at the outset, and now you're complaining that nobody wants to play with you.

Posted by: [Dustin](#) | [August 27, 2008 1:32 PM](#)

I'll tell you what, WIYC, you have a chance to prove me wrong when I say you can't be convinced of anything. Since the very article which the Andre Linde quote on your website came from was actually a discussion about various models of inflation, and that the quote was meant as a motivational question to start the presentation of his model, you have a big opportunity to tell us that you were wrong, and that the presence of the quote on your website misrepresents his position. Once you have removed this quote, we'll know that there is a chance of convincing you that you're wrong. Then you'll have to address the repeated use of the fallacy of many questions you injected into your first post. Because you have phrased the questions in such a way as to suggest, disingenuously, that they cannot be answered, people are right to assume that you will not listen to any answers they give.

#43

So, correct these issues, ask your questions honestly, and you'll find that the people here will be perfectly happy to answer them.

Posted by: [Dustin](#) | [August 27, 2008 1:44 PM](#)

[WIYC, do the references that you claim support your viewpoint *really* support your viewpoint?](#)

#44

We've been here so many times before. It is depressing that people still aren't getting it. Keep up the good work, Abbie! Oh, and don't forget ERVs and MS - [this paper](#) was, for me, the most compelling evidence to date that re-expressed ERVs are involved in human disease.

Posted by: [Cath@VWXYNot?](#) | [August 27, 2008 5:18 PM](#)

who is your creator @#36

#45

"“Maybe” might be compelling evidence for your followers, but we prefer empirical evidence gained by observation and genetic research.'

Actually no you don't. What you do prefer is that some archetypal heroic defender putatively written about by an irrefutable, unerring, all powerful authority figure will save you at the last moment. The only basis you have for your beliefs is the word of an unevidenced, untestable and completely unverified human creation. That is far from evidence and it certainly is not subject to direct observation.

Your standards you hold are different for your beliefs and that of others. The standards you hold for your own beliefs are low enough that using those same standards, the Iliad can be accepted as proof of Greek gods. In contrast to that your standards for science are high enough that no evidence can be accepted.

The irony of this is that you know that, which is why you attempt to lower science to the level of religion in the hopes that in doing so the playing field will be leveled for religion. Unfortunately, for you at least, religion based on your authority of choice has so much less evidence (basically none) than science, your attempts are futile.

I can understand this frustrates you to no end. The fact that the evidential imbalance is so much in favour of science which so uncompassionately pushes your god into smaller and smaller boxes making it more and more impotent pushes you to search out (and manufacture) knowledge gaps that you feel you can cram your god into.

If you really want to show science is wrong, and you value evidence based research, then instead of using quote mines and the inevitable existing gaps in scientific knowledge (science doesn't have all the facts and knows it) take all the knowledge we do have, do some research and then show us how your research supports your hypotheses and provides a better explanation.

And be willing to modify your hypothesis to match the data.

What we don't know does not automatically make what we do know, or think we do, false. That is basic logic. It is unfortunate you do not understand that.

Posted by: Gary Bohn | [August 28, 2008 12:09 AM](#)

Heh, I just took a look at Julie Haberle's (Who is Your Creator) "forum"

#46

A person tells her that science does not claim absolute immutable truths.

Julie responds by saying:

" Since you claim that NOTHING has been proven and that all research is based on mathematics and good arguments, it would be impossible for you to engage in such

scientific debates, so your further postings will be deleted."

<http://pub17.bravenet.com/forum/1424646898/fetch/775028>

You're not playing with a full deck, are you, Julie Haberle "Who is Your Creator" ?

Posted by: deadman_932 | [August 28, 2008 7:23 AM](#)

n rgrd t #46:

#47

1. t's crs tht y wsh t mk ths prsnl ss by sng my fill nm. nlss vryn grs t rfr t th nm f ch prtcpnt (nclndg yrs), sggst y kp ths dlq s nn-prsnl s pssbl.

2. Snc y dn't blv tht 'fcts' xst, sggst y rg yr fillw vltns t dlt thr fillwng clms, nd sbsqnt ns tht wll b prsntd:

rgnl pst:

Wht w d knw, nd hv knwn snc t lst 1990 (thts pr-cdsgn prpntsst, Csy) s tht cmpnts f RVs cn b c-ptd ...

Mc nd hmns hv smlr trnscrptn lvls f GST2.

Mc nd hmns hv dffrnt trnscrptn lvls f GST1, n prt bcs r GST1 trnscrptn ss n RV prmtr nstd f th 'nrm!' n!

#27

RVs hv cps (thgh nt ncssrly frctnl ns) f GG, PL, nd NV gns

#34

Ths ppr mks t clr tht th RV LTRs r 'litrnt' prmtrs

Ths grp fnd ~100 gns tht dfntly s n RV prmtr t sm pnt.

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 28, 2008 9:04 AM](#)

WIYC vowels seem to be stuck. There is [an easy way to fix this](#), WIYC.

#48

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 28, 2008 10:34 AM](#)

Julie Haberle, AKA "who is your creator" you seem to have some real cognitive issues.

#49

You see, I was quoting a person on your own site, Julie. That does NOT mean that I don't accept that facts exist.

Oh, and Julie Haberle? Since when did "evolutions" become a noun referring to person or persons? Are you afflicted by some form of aphasia?

And as far as your suggestions, Julie Haberle, I'll suggest you write them on a nice thick sheet of paper, fold it into sharp corners, then bend over and stick it in your oubliette. You're 58 years old and ignorant of any relevant topic that you blithely disparage, Julie Haberle. Grow up.

I've read your threads at your site and your approach is simply littered with fallacies and sheer ignorance. You redefine terms such as "evolution" so that they are antithetical to what they MIGHT mean in actual science, then you play games with equivocation, quote-mining and actually editing posts that show you to be wrong. I've dealt with your delusional kind

before, Julie, and whatever you imagine yourself, don't mistake it for competent.

In your little mind, you might fancy yourself of some consequence, but in the real world of science, you're insignificant. Now, I specifically invited you to post your tripe at <http://www.antievolution.org/cgi-bin/ikonboard/ikonboard.cgi?s=48b6b224ae297bde;act=SF;f=14> or you can choose any other site where you DON'T have the ability to dissapear my posts, and I'll be glad to slap you around as you so richly deserve, Julie Haberle. Alternatively, ERV can do so, since you're fouling her site with your incontinence.

If you can't manage the ethics and basic morals to do so, well, then that's your choice, but it'll certainly be indicative, won't it?

Posted by: deadman_932 | [August 28, 2008 10:36 AM](#)

wsm! Y hv prpsly crprtd r pstngs frm th lst cpl f dys.

Thnk y fr cknwldgng tht w r thrt t yr 'ntllctl hnsty' nd w lk frwrd t sng ths 'scntfc' blg s n xmpl f hw sm vltnsts 'dbt.'

Posted by: [who is your creator](#) | [August 28, 2008 10:39 AM](#)

#50

Im sorry, while its very difficult to read your last post, WIYC, it doesnt appear to contain any tits. Were you asking for advice on how to operate your webcam? Maybe what file storage program to use? Photobucket is good, but they take nudes down pretty fast.

Posted by: [ERV](#) | [August 28, 2008 10:45 AM](#)

#51

Didn't your mommy tell you never to talk with your mouth full, Julie? Now, get back to munching.

ERV: you really don't wanna see the dug on this critter, there's a pic of her floating around google images.

Posted by: deadman_932 | [August 28, 2008 10:47 AM](#)

#52

ERV: you really don't wanna see the dug on this critter, there's a pic of her floating around google images.

#53

Damn, you made me look. This must be [her](#) (the caption even included "Who's your creator"). Now after seeing that combined with Abbie's request there goes lunch.

Posted by: jj | [August 28, 2008 12:39 PM](#)

Great, thanks a lot JJ; the link didn't work until I fiddled with it, but just great. Hmm, the thing is that now it's as if I'm at the scene of an accident; I don't want to, but FSM damn it I just HAVE to see her tits.

Posted by: Richard Wolford | [August 28, 2008 4:32 PM](#)

#54

Post a Comment

(Email is required for authentication purposes only. Comments are moderated for spam, your comment may not appear immediately. Thanks for waiting.)

Name:

Email Address:

URL:

Comments: (you may use HTML tags for style)

[Having problems commenting? \(UPDATED\)](#)

More science news from **seedmagazine.com**

- Focus

- News

- Seed's Daily Zeitgeist:
8/7/2008

- Magazine

- The Shape of Music
- The Transcript: Tom Wolfe + Michael Gazzaniga
- Cribsheet #16: Synthetic Biology
- The Reality Tests
- A Proliferation of Mistakes?
- Distant Mirrors
- Carnivores Like Us
- Marc Hauser + Errol Morris

FREE TRIAL ISSUE OF SEED

YES! Send me a free issue of Seed.



If I like what I see, I'll receive 5 more issues (6 in all) for just \$14.95. That's 50% off the cover price! If I'm not completely satisfied, I'll simply write "cancel" on the invoice and owe nothing. The free issue is mine to keep.

First Name:

Last Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip Code:

Email:

(Non-U.S. subscribers, [click here.](#))

