

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

“The Drake Equation is a probabilistic argument used to arrive at an estimate of the number of active, communicative extra-terrestrial civilizations in the Milky Way galaxy.”
(Wikipedia.org)

This is based on a ‘scientific’ hypothesis concocted by a scientist, Dr Frank Drake. The trouble is, it is not very scientific. (Burchell, M.J. [2006]. “W(h)ither the Drake equation?”. *International Journal of Astrobiology* 5 (3): 243–250 and <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1112/1112.1506.pdf>). So, to say it is ‘probabilistic’ is rather far-fetched. I do not even rate it as ‘possible’. Also, it is evolutionist in concept.

Instead of being founded on actual or strongly suspected real civilizations, it is based on unrelated factors, such as the average rate of star formation; the fraction of formed stars that have planets, etc. Here the language of guesswork comes into play, e.g. *“the planets that can potentially support life”*

. Then comes sheer fairy tale speculation –

“planets... that actually develop life”

(none found thus far). From this guesswork comes an *assertion*

(that assumes the previous idea has evidence to back it up):

“the fraction of planets bearing life on which intelligent, civilized life has developed”.

This is how evolutionism works – see how the idea moves swiftly from idea to speculation to assertion! It is then assumed that such (mythical) civilizations have developed communications that can be detected from space.

This 1961 myth by Dr Drake is more to do with UFOs than with real science. To be fair, his ideas were used not as a scientific law, but as a way to get scientists at least exploring the idea of populations in space. That, however, does not bother fake science, which laps-up any idea that opposes biblical Creation, even if it is absurd. From this initial prompt came a formal body to study extraterrestrialism: SETI (Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence). What a waste of time, effort and tax money!

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier

Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

The Wikipedia article accepts that some of Drake’s statements are ‘conjectural’, **“the net result being that the error associated with any derived value**

(Ed. in the equation – see it in the article)

is very large, such that the equation cannot be used to draw firm conclusions.”

That is a truthful analysis, but scientists prefer pseudo-science to real science, when it supports their unscientific bias.

I am still amused by the ‘definite’ communication with aliens that came from the chief radio-telescope in Australia. The excited but unscientific scientists told the world that it had at last received communications from outer space. After a few weeks a more intrepid scientist discovered that what caused the ‘communication blips’ was the microwave oven in the rest room: every time its door was opened, the blips occurred!! (The Telegraph, 23rd November, 2015, but also reported earlier in the year).

Oh dear. No little grey men. Just someone heating their snack next door! Sadder – this went on for 17 years. That is the closest science has come to communications from somewhere out there. (That is, out there in the rest room!).

Despite these kitchen capers, science, spurred on by such exciting prospects, suggested there were about one million planets with life on them. (Prof Harlow Shapley, Harvard University), using Drake’s Equation. I am not sure, but perhaps one of those million was the microwave in the rest room. He said this was the estimated figure *“where life has been forged by evolution”*. (8 November 1959, “Life On Other Planets?”. Sydney Morning Herald).

Drake himself tried to find ET signals, *“it was unsuccessful”* over the three month, six-hour-a-day project. Again – Oh dear! It is said that the project was ‘well designed’... but so what, when the presupposition itself was guesswork, an unproved evolutionary tale?

Drake called for another SETI meeting in 1961 at the Green Bank facility, USA. It was only after calling the meeting that Drake realised he had to have an agenda – so formulated the equation

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier

Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

in readiness. He thought that when all the values in his equation were used, he would arrive at the answer, ‘N’ (the number of communicable civilisations). He said *“This was aimed at the radio search, and not to search for primordial or primitive life forms”*.

(“The Drake Equation Revisited: Part I”. *Astrobiology Magazine*. 29 September 2003).

To me, the number of guesses and speculation in the equation tells me that the words *“probabilistic argument”*

are not useful at all, but deceptive. They are the words often found in evolution hypotheses (none of which ever reach the stage of scientific theory or law).

“Therefore, the usefulness of the Drake equation is not in the solving, but rather in the contemplation of all the various concepts which scientists must incorporate when considering the question of life elsewhere.”

(Burchell, M.J.[2006]. “W(h)ither the Drake equation?”. *International Journal of Astrobiology* 5 (3): 243–250. And “Chapter 3 — Philosophy: “Solving the Drake Equation”. SETI League. December 2002).

The SETI group, however, tends to misrepresent this guesswork the equation by saying it is a *“basis for scientific analysis”*.

How can this happen when the equation contains so many guesses and speculation? Scientific analysis can only analyse what is scientific, real data!

The SETI role is to stimulate outer space discussion. Nothing wrong with that. But, when it assumes a scientific form, it is not science. Rather it is an assumption that the universe is evolving much as earth is said to have ‘evolved’ (“What do we need to know about to discover life in space?”. SETI Institute). Here we have an institute based only on speculation... which is the real basis of all cosmological research... and on the unproved hypothesis of evolution, *and* on the idea that intelligence evolved. (“The Search For Life: The Drake Equation 2010 - Part 1”. BBC Four. 2010).

Because SETI is based on evolution, it is bound to fail. It is one speculation built upon another speculation. Like a space body missing the earth by a few inches, it may as well miss by a million miles! Intelligence was built-into humans and life itself, by the Creator, God. It is not evolved, but is the same as it always was. There is no proof whatever that it has ‘evolved’ in ANY sphere.

Yet, the SETI idea is the *“backbone of astrobiology”*... a branch of ‘science’ that is really

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier

Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

pseudo-science, because it is grounded not on proven principles, but on many speculations. The StarTrek believers in astrobiology claim that they work in “*hypotheses that fit firmly into existing scientific theories*”.

What? In other words, guesses based on other guesses! How can a guess ‘fit’ into scientific theories... unless those other theories are also speculative? That is – evolution! Evolution does not fit science – it is like a soap bubble inside another soap bubble; both will burst.

I have no problem with speculation in science, so long as it is defined as, and admitted to be, speculation. But, I reject any science that mixes speculation and science as if they were equal. That is why I loathe evolution science.

“Some 50 years of SETI have failed to find anything, even though radio telescopes, receiver techniques, and computational abilities have improved enormously since the early 1960s, but it has been discovered, at least, that our galaxy is not teeming with very powerful alien transmitters continuously broadcasting near the 21 cm hydrogen frequency.”

(SETI: A celebration of the first 50 years. Keith Cooper. Astronomy Now. 2000).

Just like its mother, evolution itself, SETI and the Drake Equation have come up with absolutely nothing. And, just like its mother, the underlying idea is faulty. Because of this, SETI zealots are changing the terms used. They keep on trying! And others follow on like sheep. Such as the BBC (which will support anything but Creation). See <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20120821-how-many-alien-worlds-exist>

Instead of using the language of philosophy/speculation, the BBC, in an article, said, for example, “*While we wait to establish contact...*”, thus asserting that there *is* life ‘out there’, instead of saying *there is life...*”.

“If

On the other hand, it does say “(ETs) may exist”, which puts it back into the hands of Star Trekkies.

Meanwhile, back in the land of speculation, SETI adherents continue to cut-and-paste the Drake Equation, so that it *might* work. Otherwise they will get their funding stopped! It is why CO₂ haters invent such elaborate but unworkable ideas about the environment and ‘global warming’.

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier

Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

It is all part of the same make-believe pseudo-science, populated by ‘great names’ who indulge in cosmology, a pseudo-science that cannot ever come up with actual, proven, full theories that justify tax-paid funding for scientists with nothing but speculation to sell.

What if I am wrong, and there are ETs out there? Well, I would be wrong. That is something else I am not concerned with. Do I believe there are ETs in space? No, I do not, because otherwise the Lord would have mentioned something about little grey people with big black eyes! Such space-folks would also be mentioned in terms of sin and salvation. This is a logical conclusion.

But, what if they DO exist? Well, someone must learn outer-space-ese quickly, so they could be evangelised! I do not think this will ever be necessary, though – our world is God’s special creation, and He put special beings on it: human beings. Earth is His centre of interest. The planets, stars, etc., are said to be only baubles to adorn the universe and to give light.

Another matter arises if SETI is on the right course – that of unusual sightings in the skies, commonly known as UFOs. If other beings exist, then they could possibly be hovering around us to see how doughnuts are made, or why some prostrate themselves before a god representing the moon and commanding them to kill everyone else. Most weird!

Do I believe in UFOs? Yes, of course I do. A UFO is an ‘Unidentified Flying Object’ and there seems to be plenty of these around. Do I believe they are craft driven by ETs? No, I do not. I believe UFOs are ordinary things misinterpreted by people with gullible minds. Those who are hyper-gullible become ‘Ufologists’ and see many big-eyes under many beds. They are fed by their own delusions. These assume that ETs are (of course) far more intelligent than we are.

If I do not believe in other planets with beings on, then I would hardly believe those mythical creatures were more intelligent and could fly things that move faster than light but never seem to be recorded for all to see! Odd, that! Unless, of course, they do not exist. Most appear to be unexplained but natural phenomena. A very few cannot be explained by any means and, in certain cases, there is every reason to suspect psychological imbalance. This is when people say they have been ‘abducted’ or have actually talked with grey beings with large black eyes. Hmm , right!

The Drake Equation “does not equate”

Written by K B Napier

Friday, 27 January 2017 17:49

But, there are a very small number of cases to which demons can be attributed. It is interesting, after all, that with so many ‘sightings’, no actual ET has been really seen *and* recorded, and there are no actual evidences they have been here, apart from fast moving lights, etc. Caution and intelligence must be used, but if a person approaches these phenomena as if they *were*

extra-terrestrial, then he will automatically think these unexplained happenings are from outer space, because he has conditioned himself to think it. Perhaps there are sightings, but of a military craft. Maybe.

Whenever I see something I cannot explain I just leave it there, unexplained; I definitely do not suggest to myself they are something to do with ETs. Begin with a mind convinced there are ETs and you are bound to be swayed towards ETism with every new thing. Begin with a mind that simply acknowledges you cannot explain what you see, and you will not suddenly be ‘abducted’ or convinced you have seen an ET or a spacecraft! Simple as that.

So, is it wise to say Drake’s Equation is worthwhile? No, I do not think so. It chases after dreams and visions, and begins with an assumption, without proof, that ETs are real. Scripture does not mention in any way the existence of other inhabited worlds. And that is my real measure.

Christians should be rigid in their rejection of anything to do with evolution, whether in the study of little cells or the pseudo-study of cosmology and its vast playground. Reject it out of hand, because evolution is godless and perverts science which, in turn, brainwashes minds to accept the ideas of bad scientists who present myths as truth.

© November 2015

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}