Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 11 Issue 9 *www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org* **June 2007**

The Dark (MATTER) Side of the Moon

Decades ago, song writers used to write sappy love songs rhyming June, Moon, tune, and croon. June still brings out some lunacy.

A paper presented at the Meeting of Division of Particle and Field 2004, American Physical Society, by Hongjun Pan, Department of Chemistry, University of North Texas, has just been brought to our attention. The title of this paper is, "The evolution of the Earth-Moon system based on the dark matter field fluid model." Hongjon Pan himself sent the link to his paper [1] because it relates to our analysis of the distance between the Earth and the Moon, and implications for the time available for evolution to have occurred.

For those of you who tuned in late, here's the basic problem for evolutionists. The Moon is slowly getting farther away from Earth. This was known from radar measurements even before the Apollo astronauts placed a laser reflector on the Moon, allowing even more precise measurements. Millions of years from now, the Moon will be farther away from Earth than it is now. But that means millions of years ago the Moon must have been closer to the Earth than it is now. Many people (including us) have done the calculations and discovered that the Moon's orbit would have equaled the Earth's radius less than 3 billion years ago. [2] It would have been difficult, to say the least, for life to evolve with the Moon rolling around on the surface of the Earth. ☺

With that background, here is what Pan's paper says.

> The popular theory is that the tidal friction causes all those changes [in the distance between the Earth and the Moon]. However, based on tidal friction model and the current Moon-Earth system data, the tidal friction should be stronger and the recessional rate of the Moon should be greater in the past because the Moon was closer, the distance of the Moon would quickly fall inside the Roche's limit (for earth, 15500 *km*) in which the Moon would be torn apart by gravity in 1 to 2 billion years ago. This, however, never happened. Furthermore, geological evidence indicates that the recession of the Moon in the past was slower than the present rate, i.e., the recession has been accelerating with time. Based on tidal friction models, it must be concluded that tidal friction was very much less in the remote past than we would deduce on the basis of present-day observations (Stacey 1977). This was called "geological time scale difficulty" or "Lunar crisis" and is one of main arguments by creationists against the tidal friction theory (Brush 1983). Various models were proposed in the past to describe the evolution of the Earth-Moon system based on tidal friction mechanism to avoid this difficulty and put the Moon at quite a comfortable distance from Earth at 4.5 billion years ago (Hansen 1982, Kagan and Maslova 1994, Ray et al. 1999, Slichter 1963). The tidal friction theories explain that the present rate of tidal dissipation is anomalously high because the tidal force is close to a resonance in the response function of ocean (Brush 1983). Kagan gave a detailed review about those tidal friction models (Kagan 1997). However, all those models are based on many assumptions about geological (continental position and drifting) and physical conditions in the past, and many parameters (such as phase lag angle, multi-mode approximation with time-dependent frequencies of the resonance modes, etc.) have to be introduced and carefully adjusted to make their predictions close to the

[1] http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0704/0704.0003.pdf
[2] *Disclosure*, November 1997, "Our Escaping Moon"

> geological evidence. Therefore, they are not so convincing, and are still challenged by creationists. In the Meeting of Division of Particle and Field 2004, American Physical Society, University of California at Riverside, the author proposed a dark matter field fluid model (Pan 2005), the current Moon and Earth data agree with this model very well. This paper will demonstrate that the past evolution of Moon-Earth system can be described by the dark matter field fluid model without any assumptions about past geological and physical conditions. Although the subject of the evolution of the Earth-Moon system has been extensively studied analytically or numerically, to the author's knowledge, there are no theories similar or equivalent to this model. It should be noted that the proposed dark matter field fluid is more like the cosmic fluid in distinguishing to the galactic halo or clump type of the dark matter in current cosmological theories. [3]

Let's summarize what he had to say.

First, he talks about the Roche Limit. We didn't discuss this in our analysis because it unnecessarily complicates the problem. We simply computed how long ago the Moon's distance would have been equal to the radius of the Earth, but catastrophic things happen when the Moon is closer to the Earth than the Roche Limit. This makes the time available for evolution even shorter. Without resorting to mathematics, here is a simple explanation of the Roche Limit.

Imagine two satellites orbiting the Earth in the same direction, but at different altitudes. Suppose that one satellite is initially directly above the other. After one orbit, the lower satellite will be ahead of the higher satellite. There are two reasons for this. First, the circumference of the lower orbit is shorter. Second, the velocity of the lower satellite must be faster to maintain that lower orbit. Since the lower satellite has to go a shorter distance, and is going at a faster rate, it will quickly get ahead of the higher satellite.

Imagine that those two satellites are connected by a rubber band. As the lower satellite gets farther and farther ahead, the rubber band will stretch. At some point, depending upon the strength of the rubber band, it will break.

Now, suppose that the two satellites represent points on the near side and far side of the Moon. The point on the near side of the Moon tries to orbit the Earth faster than the point on the far side does, causing a strain. The Moon, of course, is so far away that the speed difference and orbital circumference difference of the near side and the far side are small. Furthermore, the Moon is stronger than a rubber band, so it doesn't stretch or break as easily. But if the Moon got very close to the Earth, the Moon would break just like a rubber band. The distance at which this would happen is the Roche Limit.

Pan says that, if tidal interaction between the Earth and the Moon has always been the same, then the Moon could not have been orbiting the Earth for more than 1 or 2 billion years, because 1 or 2 billion years ago the Moon would have been closer to the Earth than the Roche Limit. This is consistent with our calculations.

Pan missed the point when he said, "This was called 'geological time scale difficulty' or 'Lunar crisis' and is one of [the] main arguments by creationists against the tidal friction theory." Creationists don't say the tidal friction theory is wrong! Creationists say the tidal friction theory is absolutely correct. It is based on sound physics. It is a scientific fact that the Moon's gravity does cause the tides. It is a scientific fact that the tides work against the Earth's rotation, causing the Earth to spin slower. Conservation of angular momentum explains why the Moon has to move farther from the Earth as the Earth slows down. All the momentum and energy equations work out perfectly. There is nothing wrong with the tidal friction theory.

Because the calculations are incompatible with an old Earth, evolutionists have tried to fudge the numbers to make them work out to their satisfaction. Pan cites several studies from 1963 to 1999 that attempt to explain how the Moon could still have been a "comfortable distance" away 4.5 billion years ago. Remember, he said, "all those models are based on many assumptions about geological (continental position and drifting) and physical conditions in the past, and many parameters (such as phase lag angle, multi-mode approximation with time-dependent frequencies of the resonance modes, etc.) have to be introduced and carefully adjusted to make their predictions close to the geological evidence."

If only crackpot creationists who don't know anything about math or physics had done the studies, then creationists could simply be silenced by showing that they used the wrong equations, or made arithmetic errors. But the problem is that when "real scientists" do the math, they come up with the same conclusion. If the present truly is the key to the past, then the Moon could not have been circling the Earth for anywhere close to 4.5 billion years. The only way for the Moon to have circled the Earth for so long is for things to have been different in the past. Evolutionists have to

[3] http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0704/0704.0003.pdf, pages 1 - 2

assume that "the present rate of tidal dissipation is anomalously high," and concoct some imaginary reason for why it was lower in the past.

Pan has examined these attempts to explain away the obvious conclusion and has found them unsatisfactory. Therefore, he is faced with two choices. Either the Earth isn't nearly as old as he believes, or the whole notion of tidal friction is wrong. Since the first choice is absolutely unacceptable, he must take the second.

The Dark Side of the Force

If classical Newtonian physics don't give the desired answer, then one must search for a non-Newtonian solution. Pan goes over to the dark side and finds his salvation in "dark matter."

You've probably heard about dark matter before in the context of the Big Bang. The Big Bang theory predicts that there should be a certain amount of matter in the Universe. When astronomers estimate the mass of all the stars and other visible objects in the sky, they come up short. They come up very short. There isn't nearly enough matter in the universe as the theory predicts.

In most cases, when measurements disagree with the theory, scientists discard the theory. When it comes to the Big Bang, astronomers have chosen to keep the theory and discard the measurements. They claim that 2% of the matter in the universe is ordinary matter, but 98% of the matter in the universe is undetectable "dark matter." (Some more conservative astronomers say that 10% is ordinary matter, and just 90% is dark matter. ☺) They can't see the dark matter, but it must be there because, if not, the theory is wrong.

So, one must accept, by faith, that dark matter exists. Having done this, Pan makes some assumptions.

> In this proposed model, it is assumed that:
>
> 1. A celestial body rotates and moves in the space, which, for simplicity, is uniformly filled with the dark matter which is in quiescent state relative to the motion of the celestial body. The dark matter possesses a field property and a fluid property; it can interact with the celestial body with its fluid and field properties; therefore, it can have energy exchange with the celestial body, and affect the motion of the celestial body.
>
> 2. The fluid property follows the general principle of fluid mechanics. The dark matter field fluid particles may be so small that they can easily permeate into ordinary "baryonic" matter; i.e., ordinary matter objects could be saturated with such dark matter field fluid. Thus, the whole celestial body interacts with the dark matter field fluid, in the manner of a sponge moving thru water. The nature of the field property of the dark matter field fluid is unknown. It is here assumed that the interaction of the field associated with the dark matter field fluid with the celestial body is proportional to the mass of the celestial body. The dark matter field fluid is assumed to have a repulsive force against the gravitational force towards baryonic matter. The nature and mechanism of such repulsive force is unknown. [4]

After several pages of calculations based on his fanciful assumptions he says,

> From the above results, one can see that the current Earth-Moon data and the geological and fossil data agree with the model very well and the past evolution of the Earth-Moon system can be described by the model without introducing any additional parameters; this model reveals the interesting relationship between the rotation and receding (Eq. 17 and Eq. 18) of the same celestial body or different celestial bodies in the same gravitational system, such relationship is not known before. [5]

If you just throw out Newtonian physics, and assume that dark matter has some unknown field properties, including anti-gravity, then "the geological and fossil data agree with the model very well!" That's comforting. Not only that, the model reveals an unexpected and unobserved relationship between rotation and recession.

Since Mars is also moving through this dark matter field fluid, it will affect the rotation of Mars, too.

> We shall feel confident that the reliable data about the angular rotation acceleration of the Mars will be available in the near future which will provide a vital test for the predication of this model. However, there are also other factors which may affect the Mars rotation rate such as mass redistribution due to season change, winds, possible volcano eruptions and Mars quakes. Therefore the data has to be carefully analyzed. [6]

In other words, future data about Mars will confirm the accuracy of the model—unless it doesn't! ☺

Oh, the lunacy people will go to, just to believe the moon is billions of years old!

---

[4] *ibid.*, page 3
[5] *ibid.*, page 11
[6] *ibid.*

Stanley Miller's Final Word

Dr. Stanley Miller was still looking for the origin of life when he died.

We truly had genuine respect for Stanley Miller, and the work that he did, and were saddened by news of his death on May 20, 2007. Unfortunately, his life work was usually reported inaccurately. His *LA Times* obituary is typical.

> Stanley Miller, the UC San Diego chemist who was the first to demonstrate that the organic molecules necessary for life could be generated in a laboratory flask simulating the primitive Earth's atmosphere, died Sunday from heart failure in a hospital in National City. He was 77. [7]

He certainly was not "the first to demonstrate that the organic molecules necessary for life could be generated in a laboratory flask simulating the primitive Earth's atmosphere," but that is what is commonly reported in the popular press, and in public school textbooks. A somewhat more accurate report of his real contribution can be read at a University of California at San Diego web site article honoring his 70th birthday. [8] He worked at UCSD until shortly before his death. We encourage you to read about his work there. [9]

Dr. Miller's significant contribution to science is that he, more than anyone else, is responsible for the origin of exobiology research (abiogenesis). His famous 1953 experiment showed that organic molecules could be formed rather quickly and easily. The organic molecules he produced were neither "the organic molecules necessary for life," nor were they produced in an environment "simulating the primitive Earth's atmosphere," as is commonly reported. But his initial experiment was significant because it encouraged many other scientists to perform countless experiments about the ways in which organic compounds could be naturally produced.

He spent his whole life looking for ways to produce organic molecules that could have produced the first living cell, but was unsuccessful. Many other lesser men have also tried, and failed, to demonstrate a plausible way in which life may have originated naturally. Their failures have less impact because they aren't men of Dr. Miller's caliber. But the fact that Dr. Miller searched so hard for so long without success is a good indication that there is no plausible way life could have originated naturally.

We would like to share with you portions of the last paper that Dr. Miller published. He submitted it on February 2, 2000. It appeared in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* three months later. But first, let us give you some background.

There is much more to life than just some amino acids and proteins. For life to begin, all the chemicals have to have a method of reproducing themselves, and passing along genetic information to the offspring. Modern living things use deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) to do this. But DNA is a much too complex molecule for it to have originated in the first living cell, and the biologic processes needed to decode it are much too complicated, too. Therefore, evolutionists have been looking for a simpler molecule than DNA that might have the required properties. One such candidate is ribonucleic acid (RNA), which spawned the "RNA world hypothesis." But Dr. Miller wisely observed,

> Numerous problems exist with the current thinking of RNA as the first genetic material. No plausible prebiotic processes have yet been demonstrated to produce the nucleosides or nucleotides or for efficient two-way nonenzymatic replication. [10]
>
> The discovery of the catalytic activity of RNA brought the concept of an RNA world into wide acceptance. However, the instability of ribose and other sugars, the great difficulty of prebiotic synthesis of the glycosidic bonds of the necessary nucleotides, and the inability to achieve two-way non-enzymatic template polymerizations have raised serious questions about whether RNA could have been the first genetic material, although there are dissenting opinions. [11]

Dr. Miller recognized that the RNA world hypothesis was a non-starter. So, he was looking for another way. In his final paper he said,

> One proposal offers peptide nucleic acids (PNA) as a possible precursor to RNA because PNA binds DNA and forms double and triple helical structures that are related to the Watson-Crick helix. [12]

---

[7] Thomas H. Maugh II, LA Times Staff Writer, May 24, 2007, "Stanley Miller, 77; chemist was a pioneer in studying the origins of life"

[8] http://exobio.ucsd.edu/birthday_70.htm

[9] http://exobio.ucsd.edu/research.htm

[10] Kevin E. Nelson, Matthew Levy, and Stanley L. Miller, PNAS, April 11, 2000, vol. 97, issue 8, "Peptide nucleic acids rather than RNA may have been the first genetic molecule", pages 3868-3871

[11] *ibid.*

[12] *ibid.*

> Peptide nucleic acid (PNA) is a promising precursor to RNA, consisting of *N*-(2-aminoethyl)glycine (AEG) and the adenine, uracil, guanine, and cytosine-*N*-acetic acids. However, PNA has not yet been demonstrated to be prebiotic. We show here that AEG is produced directly in electric discharge reactions from CH_4, N_2, NH_3, and H_2O. … Preliminary experiments suggest that AEG may polymerize rapidly at 100°C to give the polypeptide backbone of PNA. The ease of synthesis of the components of PNA and possibility of polymerization of AEG reinforce the possibility that PNA may have been the first genetic material. [13]

He admits that, "PNA has not yet been demonstrated to be prebiotic." In other words, there is no evidence that PNA existed before life began. But, for PNA to exist, AEG (and adenine, uracil, guanine, and cytosine) would have had to exist. He was looking for a way to produce AEG naturally as a stepping stone to PNA.

In his 1953 experiment, he used an atmosphere consisting of methane, hydrogen, ammonia, and water vapor. In his last reported experiment he substituted nitrogen for hydrogen. That's reasonable because today's atmosphere is 79% nitrogen and 0% hydrogen. If the present really is the key to the past, then it is reasonable to assume life began with nitrogen in the atmosphere (and water vapor, too). But the only place you are likely to find methane and ammonia in the air today is near a diaper pail.

Notice, too, that his simulated atmosphere is still oxygen-free. All origin of life experiments use oxygen-free atmospheres. That, of course, is because oxygen would immediately break down any AEG his experiment produced. The only reason for believing the Earth ever had an oxygen-free environment is because organic compounds could not possibly have originated naturally in the presence of oxygen.

His last experiment showed that a spark in an atmosphere radically different that Earth's present atmosphere could produce AEG at 100^{o} C (the boiling point of water). He concludes that if AEG existed, it might possibly have helped in the natural formation of PNA, which might somehow have acted sort of like RNA in some sort of unknown replication process. But let us not unfairly put words in his mouth. Here is the concluding paragraph of his last published paper.

> **Polymerizability and Suitability as the First Genetic Material.** The above results show that the components of PNA are likely prebiotic compounds and, under favorable conditions, could be major constituents of the primitive milieu. Still to be worked out are the prebiotic syntheses of the monomers and mechanisms for their polymerization, but prebiotic polymerizations are imposing problems for any potential early genetic system. Our preliminary experiments indicate that AEG polymerizes readily at 100°C to give AEG oligomers and does so much more efficiently than mixtures of α-amino acids at higher temperatures. Although PNA also has stability problems of its own, they are highly sequence-dependent and may be alleviated by blocking or acetylating the N terminus. There is also the more difficult problem of PNA replication, which may be complicated by cyclization of the monomers. Nevertheless, this demonstration that the PNA components are prebiotic suggests the possibility that PNA or similar molecules may have been the first genetic material. However, other possibilities need to be considered because there may be other backbones and bases that were more abundant and more efficient for prebiotic replication. [14]

Just in case you didn't follow all that, he found a way to produce AEG which might have allowed PNA to form through a process that is "still to be worked out" in spite of "imposing problems for any potential early genetic system." But, if it did form naturally it might have disintegrated before it had a chance to replicate because "PNA also has stability problems of its own." And then, "there is also the more difficult problem of PNA replication."

So, after all that work, Dr. Miller never found what legend says he did—the building blocks of life. Some might say he wasted his whole life on a wild goose chase, but we would disagree. We say that if there had been a wild goose, Dr. Miller would have caught it. He left behind a wonderful legacy of research showing the insurmountable difficulties that prevent life from arising naturally.

Hopefully, years from now, history will correct the errors of the careless popular press. Dr. Miller should not be celebrated for being "the first to demonstrate that the organic molecules necessary for life could be generated in a laboratory flask simulating the primitive Earth's atmosphere." He should be celebrated for being the one who most conclusively showed that the organic molecules necessary for life could not have been generated in the primitive Earth's atmosphere through his exhaustive research down every blind alley.

[13] *ibid.*

[14] *ibid.*

Email

Evolution and Abiogenesis

Stanley Miller's work was in the area of abiogenesis, which some people don't consider to be part of the theory of evolution.

We commonly get email complaints from evolutionists who object to us including abiogenesis as part of the theory of evolution. They claim that the theory of evolution is limited to natural selection, and says nothing about the spontaneous origin of life through natural processes (abiogenesis). Here is part of a typical email.

> … And from http://www.talkorigins.org/faqs/faq-misconceptions.html:
> "One should also note that the theory of evolution doesn't depend on how the first life began. The truth or falsity of any theory of abiogenesis wouldn't affect evolution in the least."
> If you intend to show the flaws in a theory, you must be familiar with its wording and content. Errors such as this leave you struggling with false arguments, whilst the proponents of the theory gleefully advertise your mistake as willful ignorance.
> I hope this helps,
> -Johnny

TalkOrigins would love to limit evolution to natural selection. If schools taught nothing more than natural selection, then there would be no controversy. The well-known creationists all agree that (natural or artificial) selection produces limited variations in living things. That's why we have different breeds of dogs, horses, pigeons, corn, and roses.

There is controversy because the theory of evolution, AS IT IS TAUGHT IN AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, is not limited to natural selection. It includes the origin of life, creative mutations, and long ages. This can be seen from the table of contents of this typical college biology textbook.

> …
> Unit 3 – Evolution
> Chapter 14 – Principles of Evolution
> Chapter 15 – How Organisms Evolve
> Chapter 16 – The Origin of Species
> Chapter 17 – The History of Life on Earth
> …[15]

The *History of Life on Earth* chapter falsely presents Stanly Miller's 1953 origin of life experiment as a plausible explanation for how life began.

Here's part of another college biology textbook's index.

> …
> Chapter 34 Theory of Evolution
> Early Theories of the Origin of Life
> …[16]

The table of contents for Cliff's Notes on Biology (let's face it, that's what kids really read) says,

> Chapter 12: Principles of Evolution
> Chapter 13: The Origin and Evolution of Life
> Chapter 14: Human Evolution

If the origin of life isn't one of the principles of evolution, then human evolution must not be one of the principles of the theory of evolution, either.

Schaum's outline on Biology has just one chapter on evolution, and it is "Chapter 15 Evolution and Origin of Life."

Since Evolution and Origin of Life are in the same chapter, does that make them part of the same thing? Or does the fact that they are listed as a pair imply that they are two different things?

We could argue at length as to whether the origin of life and evolution are two separate things, but arguing about whether or not the origin of life technically is part of the theory of evolution is exactly what evolutionists would like us to do. It is simply a red herring used to divert discussion away from evolution. Every page we write about whether or not abiogenesis is part of the theory of evolution is one page we haven't written about the weaknesses of the theory of evolution.

The natural spontaneous origin of life, abiogenesis, is scientifically absurd. Nobody knows any way that it could happen. Louis Pasteur, Stanley Miller, and many others have found many reasons why it cannot. But it is the foundation of the theory of evolution taught to our school children.

Because abiogenesis is so clearly false, most evolutionists want to separate it from the theory of evolution. They want to start with a living cell and proceed from there. But that is cheating. You have to start at the starting line. You have to start with a dead planet that naturally and spontaneously produces the first living thing. Scientifically, evolution as an explanation for the existence of all the various forms of life on Earth, is a non-starter.

[15] Audesirk and Audesirk, Biology: Life on Earth (5th edition) 1996, page xx

[16] Roohk and Karpoff, Introducing Biology, (3rd edition), 1990, page vi

Evolutionists Help Creation Museum

For people who think they are so smart, evolutionists sure do some dumb things.

In case you haven't heard, Answers in Genesis opened an impressive new creation museum just outside Cincinnati on May 28. You probably have heard, because evolutionists have been throwing a tantrum about it. If they hadn't, you would not know about it unless you were already on the Answers in Genesis mailing list.

Answers in Genesis brags about their special effects. You might be inclined to write it off as exaggerated advertising. But the opponents say,

> There are 52 videos in the museum, one showing how the transformations wrought by the eruption of Mount St. Helens in 1980 reveal how plausible it is that the waters of Noah's flood could have carved out the Grand Canyon within days. There is a special-effects theater complete with vibrating seats meant to evoke the flood, and a planetarium paying tribute to God's glory while exploring the nature of galaxies.
>
> Whether you are willing to grant the premises of this museum almost becomes irrelevant as you are drawn into its mixture of spectacle and narrative. Its 60,000 square feet of exhibits are often stunningly designed by Patrick Marsh, who, like the entire museum staff, declares adherence to the ministry's views; he evidently also knows the lure of secular sensations, since he designed the "Jaws" and "King Kong" attractions at Universal Studios in Florida. [17]

Evolutionists say it is dazzling and interesting, so it must be worth a visit. AIG could not have bought advertising like that!

Evolutionists were determined to keep people away. Even the British journal, *Nature*, said,

> Protesters are planning a "Rally for Reason" at the museum's May 28 opening. [18]

How did that work out? The Associated Press tells us,

> The dozens of demonstrators argued Monday that the Creation Museum's central tenets conflict with scientific evidence that the Earth is several billion years old. … The privately funded museum had more than 4,000 guests on opening day, said Mark Looy, a co-founder of the $27 million facility 20 miles southwest of Cincinnati. The parking lot was filled with license plates from dozens of states. [19]

All this fuss, and only a few dozen protesters! But the height of stupidity is the pull-quote from the *New Scientist* article.

> **Parents should be ready to bring lawsuits for any school system that uses public funds to bring students to this museum** [20]

It would be foolish for evolutionists to do this. Americans don't like censorship. Any attack like this simply creates sympathy and support for the museum. Furthermore, one of two things will happen if they sue—they will win, or they will lose. If they lose, it gives credibility to the museum. If they win, it creates a precedent that creationists can use. Creationists can sue any school that takes children to a natural history museum containing incorrect displays. Therefore, schools might be afraid to take children to any natural history museum that contains a display that says Stanley Miller's experiment proved how life began, for example. From the school's point of view, a field trip is an expensive, dangerous hassle. They have insurance that protects them from physical harm that may befall the students while on the field trip, but they don't have insurance against lawsuits. Schools could save money by eliminating field trips completely.

Most of the children you see in natural history museums are there with school groups, not parents. Evolutionists should not risk losing school-sponsored trips to museums that are filled with evolutionary propaganda by encouraging lawsuits.

[17] New York Times, May 24 2007, "Adam and Eve in the Land of the Dinosaurs" http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/24/arts/24crea.html?_r=2&pagewanted=1&oref=slogin

[18] *Nature*, 24 May 2007, "Creationist museum to open in Kentucky", page 365

[19] AP, 29 May 2007, "Ky. Creation Museum opens to thousands" http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070529/ap_on_re_us/creation_museum_opening

[20] Krauss, New Scientist, 26 May 2007, "Museum of misinformation" page 24

by Lothar Janetzko

Evolution News & Views

http://www.evolutionnews.org/

"The misreporting of the evolution issue is one key reason for this site."

This month's web site review looks at a site recommended by a reader of our newsletter. Evolution News & Views is actually a blog produced by the Discovery Institute's Center for Science & Culture (CSC). The Center was started in 1996 and 1) supports research by scientists and other scholars challenging various aspects of neo-Darwinian theory; 2) supports research by scientists and other scholars developing the scientific theory known as intelligent design; 3) supports research by scientists and scholars in the social sciences and humanities exploring the impact of scientific materialism on culture; and 4) encourages schools to improve science education by teaching students more fully about the theory of evolution, including the theory's scientific weaknesses as well as its strengths.

On the main page of the blog you will find links to Contributors, Contact Us and Syndicate. The Contributors link provides a list of CSC Contributors and links to access articles written by them. A brief bio about the contributor is also included. The Contact Us link provides information on how to send in questions you may have. The Syndicate link is provided to allow you to set up an RSS feed to the blog.

Under the heading About This Site it states that "The misreporting of the evolution issue is one key reason for this site. Unfortunately, much of the news coverage has been sloppy, inaccurate, and in some cases, overtly biased. Evolution News & Views presents analysis of that coverage, as well as original reporting that accurately delivers information about the current state of the debate over Darwinian evolution".

This site has links to Recent Posts and Archives. The Archives go back to December 2004.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of

Twenty-first Century Science Against EVolutiON

P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org