Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 12 Issue 5 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org February 2008

Valentine Flowers

Valentine's Day is our favorite holiday because it conjures up thoughts of unselfish love and romance. These are things evolutionists would rather not talk about.

In recent years it has become our custom to begin the February newsletter with an article about love or sex, and the problems they pose for the theory of evolution. You might think that after a few years we would run out of things to write about in February. But the February feature article is always one of the easiest to write because the evolutionary problems presented by love and sex are endless.

This month we are going to consider the specific problems flowers present to the theory of evolution; but to put the problem in context we will briefly review the general problem that evolutionists have with love and sex.

The Problem of Sex

Evolutionists believe that "simple" life forms evolved first, and gradually changed into more complex forms. Modern scientists know that simple life forms aren't very simple, but the terminology has stuck for lack of a better term. Simple life forms reproduced asexually (without a partner) "simply" by dividing in half. Of course, we now know that cell division isn't as simple as scientists in Darwin's day thought; but compared to sexual reproduction, it really is simpler.

There is no question that sexual reproduction is superior to asexual reproduction. Since offspring only inherit half of their genes from each parent, bad genes can be eliminated rather rapidly from the population. If one individual suffers a mutation that damages a gene, only half his children will inherit it. Then only one quarter of his grandchildren will inherit it, and one eighth of his great-grandchildren, *etc*. will inherit it. So, with each generation it affects a smaller and smaller percentage of the population. If the mutation hinders survival, and times are tough, then natural selection will tend to weed the bad mutation out of the small fraction of the population that has it.

So, there certainly is a long-term advantage to sexual reproduction. The problem for evolutionists is that the theory of evolution demands a short-term advantage to propagate a good mutation. Otherwise the good mutation will be diluted by half each generation, just like bad mutations are, and won't become wide-spread.

Supposedly there was a time before sexual reproduction evolved. Then, somehow, someway, a mutant species evolved that needed a partner to reproduce. That is a serious short-term disadvantage. It can be hard to find a mate. That's why we need eHarmony.com. ☺

Animals need to find a mate. They need to know what to do with the mate. Therefore, sexual instincts and emotions need to evolve along with the sexual differences. But we've written about animals before, so we won't go there again. This month we want to talk about flowers.

Romantic Flowers

Right down at the base of the evolutionists' Tree of Life, there is an immediate split between plants and animals. The Plant Kingdom and Animal Kingdom don't have any living things in common (other than the mythical common ancestor). The plants and animals both supposedly evolved separately. Therefore both, at some point in their evolutionary history, evolved sexual reproduction independently. Despite the short-term disadvantage, sex had to evolve at least twice.

Here's what a popular college biology textbook says about sexual and asexual reproduction in flowers.

> In Chapter 23, you encountered several

methods of asexual reproduction, including the spreading of runners by strawberries, bulb production by daffodils, and the sprouting of rhizomes by irises. Asexual reproduction is often highly effective, allowing plants to colonize an entire area where the original parent found optimal conditions.

However, if an offspring is genetically identical to its parent, then the offspring is only as well adapted to the environment as its parent was. What if the environment changes? Most sexually produced offspring combine genes from both parents, and therefore they may be endowed with traits that differ from those of either parent. The new combinations of traits may help the offspring cope with changing environments or survive in slightly different habitats. [1]

So, what is true of animals is true of plants, too. Asexual reproduction is efficient and has short-term advantages, but sexual reproduction has long-term advantages that make a population more adaptable.

Evolutionists have to explain how this radical change in reproduction methodology happened in two entirely unrelated kingdoms, despite the short-term disadvantages of sexual reproduction.

Here is the flower fable, straight out of a college biology textbook. This is the entire explanation.

How Did Flowers Evolve?

The flower is actually a sexual display that enhances a plant's reproductive success. By enticing animals to transfer pollen from one plant to another, flowers enable stationary plants to "court" distant members of their own species. This critical advantage has allowed flowering plants to become the dominant plants on land.

The earliest seed plants were the gymnosperms, represented today mainly by conifers, a group that includes pines, firs, and spruces. As we described in Chapter 21, conifers do not produce flowers; instead, they bear male and female gametophytes on separate cones. During early spring, the small, male cones release millions of pollen grains that float about on breezes (Fig 24-3). So many grains are floating around that some enter the pollen chambers located on the scales of the female cones, where they are captured by sticky coatings of sugars and resins. The pollen grains germinate and tunnel to the female gametophytes at the base of each scale. Sperm are liberated and fertilize the eggs within a female gametophyte, and a new generation begins.

Clearly, wind pollination is an inefficient operation, because most of the pollen grains are lost. In a world of stationary plants and mobile animals, if a gymnosperm could entice an animal to carry its pollen from male to female cone, it would greatly enhance its reproductive rate and hence its evolutionary success. As it happens, gymnosperms and insects were poised to establish just such a relationship about 150 million years ago.

Insects, especially beetles, are among the most abundant animals on Earth. They exploit nearly every possible food resource on land, including the reproductive parts of gymnosperms. About 150 million years ago, some beetles fed on both the protein-rich pollen of male cones and the sugar-rich secretions of female cones. Beetles can make quite a mess when they feed, and pollen feeders often wind up with pollen dusted all over their bodies. If the same beetle were to visit one plant, eat pollen, and then wander over to another plant of the same species to dine on the sugary secretions of a female cone, some of the loose pollen would quite likely rub off on the female cone.

The stage was set for the evolution of flowering plants. Efficient pollination by insects requires that a given insect visit several plants of the same species, pollinating them along the way. For the plants, two key adaptations were necessary. First, enough pollen or *nectar* (the sugary secretions) must be produced within the reproductive structures so that insects will regularly visit them to feed. Second, the location and richness of these storehouses of pollen and nectar must be advertised to the insects, both to show them where to go and to entice them to specialize on that particular plant species. Any mutation that contributed to these adaptations would enhance the reproductive success of the plant that carried the mutation and would be favored by natural selection. By about 130 million years ago, flowers had evolved with exactly these adaptations. The advantages of flowers are so great that in today's temperate and tropical zones, flowering plants are overwhelmingly dominant, and numerous animals, including bees, moths, butterflies, hummingbirds, and even some mammals, feed at and pollinate flowers. [2]

The textbook then goes on to describe the intricate design (but they don't use that word!) of flower anatomy.

[1] Audesirk & Audesirk, Biology, Fifth edition, pages 483-484.

[2] *ibid.*, pages 485-6.

The Assumption of Evolution

Let's look at the fable piece in detail, separating truth from fiction.

"The flower is actually a sexual display that enhances a plant's reproductive success. … This critical advantage has allowed flowering plants to become the dominant plants on land." Certainly this is true. But the real question is, "How did plants obtain this sexual display that enhances reproductive success." The typical mindless, knee-jerk reaction of evolutionists is, "It exists; therefore it must have evolved." Where is the evidence that it evolved, rather than the result of a conscious design? There isn't any.

The Motivation for Pollination

They say, "By enticing animals to transfer pollen from one plant to another, flowers enable stationary plants to 'court' distant members of their own species. … Clearly, wind pollination is an inefficient operation, because most of the pollen grains are lost. In a world of stationary plants and mobile animals, if a gymnosperm could entice an animal to carry its pollen from male to female cone, it would greatly enhance its reproductive rate and hence its evolutionary success." Audesirk & Audesirk don't really believe plants consciously entice animals and court members of their own species. They are just using figures of speech. But we have to wonder, why did they use these figures of speech? Subconsciously, at least, they must recognize some purposeful intent somewhere in the process. Something has to make the animals pollinate the plants. If there is nothing intentionally causing the animals to pollinate plants, the only alternative is random chance. They think it was just dumb luck that caused animals to pollinate flowers. But there had to be a series of fortunate accidents to make them do it.

Inefficiency

They are correct when they say, "wind pollination is an inefficient operation." Since that is true, why did it evolve in the first place? They have no answer for that. Their assumption is simply that since wind pollination does exist today, it must have evolved.

Even though it is inefficient, wind pollination does work **now**. There are enough pine trees in the world now that sooner or later some pollen is going to wind up in the right place. But that would not have been the case when pollen supposedly evolved.

We have "endangered species lists" today in recognition of the fact that when a population becomes very small, it is in danger of going extinct. The fewer individuals there are, the fewer chances there are to find a mate. The same would have been true when pinecones first evolved. If there weren't very many pinecones, and not much pollen, the probability that wind would blow pollen onto a pinecone is small. Natural selection would work against pine trees that depended upon wind pollination for survival.

A Baseless Assumption

They say, "The earliest seed plants were the gymnosperms, represented today mainly by conifers, a group that includes pines, firs, and spruces." Why do they believe this? They believe this because gymnosperms are simpler than flowering plants, so they must have evolved first. This will lead them to think that rock layers having traces of flowers in them are younger than rock layers containing just cones.

Unanswered Questions

"During early spring, male cones release millions of pollen grains that float about on breezes (Fig 24-3). So many grains are floating around that some enter the pollen chambers located on the scales of the female cones, where they are captured by sticky coatings of sugars and resins. The pollen grains germinate and tunnel to the female gametophytes at the base of each scale. Sperm are liberated and fertilize the eggs within a female gametophyte, and a new generation begins." It sounds so logical, if you don't think about it. But when you start to think about it, there are almost as many questions as there are pollen grains. **Why do the male cones produce pollen grains? Why do they release them? Why does it happen in spring? Why are the female cones sticky? What causes a plant, which has gone to all the trouble to manufacture sugars and resins for food, let them leak outside onto its female cones? What causes the sugars and resins to make the pollen grains germinate? Why do the pollen grains tunnel into the female gametophytes?** It all seems so purposeful and coordinated, but evolutionists believe it was just dumb luck.

Storytelling

Now comes the really fanciful part. "Insects, especially beetles, are among the most abundant animals on Earth. They exploit nearly every possible food resource on land, including the reproductive parts of gymnosperms. About 150 million years ago, some beetles fed on both the protein-rich pollen of male cones and the sugar-rich secretions of female cones. Beetles can make quite a mess when they feed, and pollen feeders often wind up with pollen dusted all over their bodies. If the same beetle were to visit one plant, eat pollen, and then wander over to another plant of the same species to dine on the sugary secretions of

a female cone, some of the loose pollen would quite likely rub off on the female cone." It all is because of the messiness of beetles! If beetles had just cleaned their plates better when eating the pollen, none of this would have happened. But no! Rather than feeding off just one cone, eating all the pollen set in front of it, the beetle stopped feeding and wandered off (with a pollen mustache) to a female cone of the same species for dessert, smearing pollen all over it.

"The stage was set for the evolution of flowering plants. Efficient pollination by insects requires that a given insect visit several plants of the same species, pollinating them along the way. For the plants, two key adaptations were necessary. First, enough pollen or *nectar* (the sugary secretions) must be produced within the reproductive structures so that insects will regularly visit them to feed. Second, the location and richness of these storehouses of pollen and nectar must be advertised to the insects, both to show them where to go and to entice them to specialize on that particular plant species. Any mutation that contributed to these adaptations would enhance the reproductive success of the plant that carried the mutation and would be favored by natural selection. By about 130 million years ago, flowers had evolved with exactly these adaptations." Well, aren't we just lucky! Plants just happened to produce pollen and nectar and brightly colored flowers that dumb insects would realize contained delicious food.

How can any biology teacher tell this story with a straight face? How did we ever get to the point that we accept fanciful storytelling as science?

Real Science

Certainly some of the things the biology textbook says are correct. "The advantages of flowers are so great that in today's temperate and tropical zones, flowering plants are overwhelmingly dominant, and numerous animals, including bees, moths, butterflies, hummingbirds, and even some mammals, feed at and pollinate flowers." That is absolutely correct. Their explanation of how cone-bearing and flowering plants reproduce is right on. That's real science. You can do experiments in the classroom with flowering plants, allowing some to pollinate and preventing others from pollinating.

But this story about what beetles supposedly did 150 million years ago is not science! It is baseless conjecture. Mixing the truth about plant reproduction with a fantasy about the amazing series of lucky accidents that caused plants to reproduce this way is not helpful. It confuses students about what science is, and makes them doubt real science.

Half-Baked Evolution

Scientific American reports that cooking caused our chimplike ancestors' brains to get smarter. If that isn't a half-baked idea, we don't know what is!

Just when we thought evolutionists could not come up with anything dumber, we read this article in last month's *Scientific American*. Here is the title and subtitle.

> **Cooking Up Bigger Brains**
>
> Our hominid ancestors could never have eaten enough raw food to support our large, calorie-hungry brains, Richard Wrangham claims. The secret to our evolution, he says, is cooking [3]

Here is Wrangham's hypothesis. Try not to laugh.

> "What would it take to convert a chimpanzeelike ancestor into a human?" Fire to cook food, he reasoned, which led to bigger bodies and brains. [4]
>
> Cooking could have made the fibrous fruits, along with the tubers and tough, raw meat that chimps also eat, much more easily digestible, he thought—they could be consumed quickly and digested with less energy. This innovation could have enabled our chimplike ancestors' gut size to shrink over evolutionary time; the energy that would have gone to support a larger gut might have instead sparked the evolution of our bigger-brained, larger-bodied, humanlike forebears. [5]

This is not science. It is speculation.

The Scientific Approach

He believes that eating cooked food caused human ancestors to evolve bigger brains. OK. So far, so good. He has a hypothesis. There is nothing wrong with that. That's how scientific inquiry begins. But he doesn't know what to do with the hypothesis. The next step is to devise an experiment to test his hypothesis. He should acquire a number of laboratory animals (mice, rats, guinea pigs, or gerbils) and divide them into two groups. Feed one group raw food, and feed

[3] Gorman, *Scientific American*, January 2008, "Cooking Up Bigger Brains", page 102
[4] *ibid.*
[5] *ibid.*

the other group cooked food. Then use some sort of intelligence test (run a maze, figure out how to push a button for a reward, *etc*.) to see if the group that eats cooked food is smarter (and grows bigger brains) than the group that eats raw food. That's what a scientist does. He tests his hypothesis with an experiment.

The experiment can't end there. In the immortal words of Charles Darwin,

> Any variation which is not inherited is unimportant for us. [6]

Even if eating cooked food does produce smarter, bigger brains in the individual that eats the cooked food, it only matters if that improvement is inherited by the offspring. Otherwise, evolution has to start over again with every generation. So, the scientist has to repeat the experiment with several generations, showing that the brain improvement is inherited, and is cumulative.

Why hasn't Wrangham proved his hypothesis this way? You know the answer as well as we do. Feeding cooked food to an animal isn't likely to make it any smarter. Even if it does, there is no reason to believe that eating cooked food will cause a mutation in the DNA making the offspring smarter. He could feed cooked food to countless generations of rats, and they would never get smart enough to cook the food themselves.

His Non-scientific Approach

> "I tend to think about human evolution through the lens of chimps," he remarks. "What would it take to convert a chimpanzeelike ancestor into a human?" Fire to cook food, he reasoned, which led to bigger bodies and brains.
>
> And that is exactly what he found in *Homo erectus*, our ancestor that first appeared 1.6 million to 1.9 million years ago. *H. erectus*'s brain was 50 percent larger than that of its predecessor, *H. habilis*, and it experienced the biggest drop in tooth size in human evolution. "There's no other time that satisfies expectations that we would have for changes in the body that would be accompanied by cooking," Wrangham says. [7]

Notice what he DIDN'T say. He didn't say that scientists had previously found lots of evidence of the controlled use of fire at *H. erectus* sites, and no evidence of fire at *H. habilis* sites, which led him to his theory. The theory came first. Then he went looking for data to back up his theory.

> Wrangham points to some data of early fires that may indicate that *H. erectus* did indeed tame fire. At Koobi Fora in Kenya, anthropologist Ralph Rowlett of the University of Missouri–Columbia has found evidence of scorched earth from 1.6 million years ago that contains a mixture of burned wood types, indicating purposely made fire and no signs of roots having burned underground (a tree struck by lightning would show only one wood type and burned roots). The discoveries are consistent with human-controlled fire. Rowlett plans next to study the starch granules found in the area to see if food could have been cooked there. [8]
>
> Still, most researchers state that unless evidence of controlled fire can be regularly confirmed at most *H. erectus* sites, they will remain skeptical of Wrangham's theory. [9]

Evolutionists sometimes criticize creationists for having a preconceived belief, and then looking for data to support that belief. This evolutionist is doing the same thing. Actually, there is nothing wrong with looking for evidence to support your previously held belief. But it is wrong to accept only the data that supports your theory and ignore all the data against it.

A Long Lunch Hour

> Wrangham and his colleagues calculated that *H. erectus* (which was in *H. sapiens*'s size range) would have to eat roughly 12 pounds of raw plant food a day, or six pounds of raw plants plus raw meat, to get enough calories to survive. Studies on modern women show that those on a raw vegetarian diet often miss their menstrual periods because of lack of energy. Adding high-energy raw meat does not help much, either—Wrangham found data showing that even at chimps' chewing rate, which can deliver them 400 food calories per hour, *H. erectus* would have needed to chew raw meat for 5.7 to 6.2 hours a day to fulfill its daily energy needs. When it was not gathering food, it would literally be chewing that food for the rest of the day. [10]

If *Homo erectus* spent the whole day gathering and chewing food, he wouldn't have time to commute to work, assemble data into an Excel spreadsheet, give a presentation to the boss, and commute home! ☺ Seriously, do animals have anything better to do than to spend all day every day looking for food and eating it?

---

[6] Darwin, 1859, On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life, Chapter 1

[7] Gorman, *Scientific American*, January 2008, "Cooking Up Bigger Brains", page 102

[8] *ibid.*

[9] *ibid.*

[10] *ibid.*

I wrote to a friend (vegetarian from birth) who switched to a raw food diet more than a year ago. I asked him how much he eats, and how long it takes to eat it. Here's what he wrote back:

> Here is a summary of my menu:
> Breakfast - 15 Minutes
> 16 oz fruit (fresh bananas, apples, oranges)
> 2 oz nuts
> Lunch - 30 Minutes
> 16 oz lettuce, spinach, sprouts
> 2 oz tomato
> 2 oz avocado
> 4 oz olives
> 2 oz nuts
> Dinner - 15 Minutes
> 16 oz fruit
> 2 oz nuts

That adds up to nearly 4 pounds, and one hour of eating time. This gives him a big enough brain, and plenty of time to drive to a secret location 30 miles away out in the desert, take weapons data, put it into an Excel spreadsheet, present it to his boss, and drive home.

Tabloid Science

In fairness, *Scientific American* acknowledges that most scientists think this idea is absolutely nuts. The theory has no merit whatsoever. But why would they print the story if they didn't think it was credible? Did they print it just to sell magazines?

It is intentionally misleading. There are people who don't read much more than the headline. If one just reads the headline and subheading, one could easily get the impression that it has been proved that cooking caused human evolution.

If you have ever read a supermarket tabloid (come on, admit it, even if you didn't buy it), you know how misleading their headlines are. But sensational headlines sell tabloids. *Scientific American*, *Discover*, and *National Geographic*, are facing the same economic pressures that other print magazines and newspapers are. They have to do something to increase circulation, so they print bogus stories like these at the cost of credibility.

Unfortunately, many readers will confuse this tabloid science with real science. Cooking food does not make people smarter, and it certainly does not change their DNA so that their children will have bigger brains.

Email

We Often Agree

Creation/evolution discussions are primarily about differences. Occasionally, we should examine those things upon which we agree.

Sometimes we aren't really sure what the writer wants to know. Consider Paul's email, for example.

```
   From: Paul
   Date: 1/30/2008 10:18 PM
   Subject: I am teaching a class
   in Feb based on Behe's book EDGE OF
EVOLUTION.  It breaks Darwinism down into 3
sub theories, all of which must be true for
Darwinism to be true. Behe states common
decent is surely true because of common errors
found in different branches of the tree.  This
seems like a good argument. Is Behe missing
something? (I know about junk DNA)  Behe does
not believe random mutations have much
creative power. Therefore mutations (changes)
at the genetic level are non random.  I plan
to assert that creation at the base pair level
is every bit as "special" as creating whole
species.  Therefore the theist should target
randomness as the problem, not common
ancestry.
   Please comment.
   Paul
```

It seems to us that Paul's fundamental problem is that he doesn't know what creationists and evolutionist agree upon. We don't reject EVERYTHING evolutionists say.

Evolutionists, Biblical creationists, and Intelligent Design advocates all agree that all breeds of dogs descended from a common ancestor that lived several thousand years ago. The only disagreements are the number of thousand years ago, and whether or not the ancestral pair was on Noah's ark. Variation in a kind is real phenomenon acknowledged by all.

There are some differences of opinion about specific cases. For example, Clydesdales, mustangs, quarter horses, and Kentucky thoroughbreds certainly are all breeds of horses; but what about zebras and donkeys? Are horses, zebras, and donkeys three distinct kinds of animals that look very similar but don't share a common ancestor? Or are zebras and donkeys simply horses that have varied so much from the ancestral form that we incorrectly consider them to be different species? Opinions differ.

Biblical creationists are especially interested in determining just what the "created kinds" are. If they can show that horses, zebras, and donkeys are all the same kind, then there only needs to be one pair of animals on the ark instead of three. The fewer the number of basic kinds, the fewer the number of animals on the ark, and the more

plausible the flood story is. Therefore, Biblical creationists are just as interested in showing descent from a common ancestor as evolutionists are. Intelligent Design advocates have less of an axe to grind in this area.

Junk DNA

Modern DNA analysis might be helpful in determining common ancestry, but probably not. There are too many questionable assumptions one has to make about the origin of DNA differences, especially in junk DNA.

When scientists first started decoding DNA, they discovered some parts of the DNA molecule contain the code for producing specific proteins. Most of the DNA molecule, however, seemed to have no purpose. Therefore it was called "junk." In recent years scientists have discovered that a lot of that junk DNA really does have a purpose. Some of it apparently regulates gene expression. Some of it seems to contain redundant information that makes the DNA molecule more robust. As our ignorance about the function of the DNA molecule decreases, the percentage of the DNA molecule that we think is junk decreases.

The traditional view is that there are large sections of the DNA molecule that is junk that does not affect the development of the organism. Therefore, natural selection will not eliminate copying errors in the junk portion of the DNA molecule. So, if you see the same "errors" in the junk DNA of two different species, then they both must have inherited those errors from a common ancestor. The fallacy of this logic is that the "errors" may not be errors at all. They might be sequences that have an undiscovered purpose that were intentionally inserted by an intelligent designer.

So, the bottom line is that one can compare the DNA from different species and find similarities and differences, but those similarities and differences can't positively be ascribed either to common ancestry or common design.

Chance

Now let's get back to the similarities and differences in the beliefs of creationists and evolutionists. As we said before, everyone agrees that all breeds of dogs have a common ancestor. All breeds of horses have a common ancestor. All varieties of roses, and varieties of corn, came from an original stock. That's the similarity.

The difference is that evolutionists believe that random changes to the DNA of an egg-laying, cold-blooded reptile can turn it into a live-bearing, warm-blooded, mammal with sweat glands and mammary glands. Somehow random changes to reptile DNA made those sweat glands respond to temperature, producing sweat to cool the body when it gets too hot. And random DNA changes made hormones that cause the mammary glands to produce milk only at the conclusion of a pregnancy.

So Paul is correct when he realizes that randomness is the real issue, not common ancestry. Creationists believe there were many ancestral kinds which have experienced limited variation. Evolutionists believe there was a single ancestral kind which has experienced virtually unlimited variation due to random changes. The difference in opinion has to due with amounts.

Creationists and evolutionists agree that random changes to the DNA molecule could cause a change in eye color. The disagreement is whether or not random changes to a DNA molecule could produce a vision system consisting of an iris, lens, photosensitive cells, optic nerve, and 3-D image processing algorithms in the brain.

Evolutionists correctly state that small changes in all kinds of plants and animals have been observed. Then they make the incorrect inference that given enough time, small changes will accumulate without limit into large changes. Certainly small changes in size might accumulate over several generations and become a large change in size, but that isn't the issue. Small changes in size won't accumulate over several generations to become a functioning vision system.

Larger size, or smaller size, might provide a survival advantage in some environments. A mutation might cause larger size, or smaller size, and therefore be beneficial. Beneficial mutations are possible. The issue isn't beneficial mutations. The issue is CREATIVE mutations. Can a mutation, or series of mutations, produce an eye in an animal that has never had eyes before? That's where the disagreement lies.

Evolutionists can tell all the fanciful stories they want about imaginary light-sensitive spots that luckily formed behind transparent cells that just happened to act like a lens, and muscles that just happened to aim and focus the lens, but that isn't science. They are just blowing smoke, trying to justify an irrational belief.

So, Paul is correct. The discussion should not be about common ancestry. The discussion should center upon the feasibility of random changes producing functional systems and structures.

by Lothar Janetzko

American Scientific Affiliation

http://www.asa3.org/

"A Fellowship of Christians in Science"

This month's web site review looks at the web site of the American Scientific Affiliation (ASA). On the home page you learn that ASA is "a fellowship of men and women in science and disciplines that relate to science who share a common fidelity to the Word of God and a commitment to integrity in the practice of science. In matters of science and Christian faith, we offer Christian scholarship, education, fellowship and service to ASA members, churches, educational institutions, the scientific community, and society".

The home page is organized by providing links to Home, About ASA, Annual Meeting, Publications, Resources and Members. Each one of these links is actually a drop down menu where you can select more related information. For example, the Resources link drop down menu contains links to 1) FAQ, 2) Faith-Science News, 3) Bible & Science, 4) Creation/Evolution, 5) Whole Person Education, 6) Audio/Video, 5) Email List Archives and 6) ASA Related Groups.

The home page also contains an area entitled Learn More which provides links to About Science, Apologetics, Archaeology-Anthropology, Astronomy-Cosmology, Bible & Science, Book Reviews, Teaching & Research, Creation-Evolution, Education, Environment, Ethics, Historical Studies, Mathematics, Origin of Life, Philosophy, Physical Science, Psychology-Neuroscience, Science & Technology Ministry, Worldview, Youth Page and Whole-Person Education.

There is a wealth of information to explore on this web site and I am sure the reader of this site will find topics of interest regarding the creation versus evolution debate.

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