Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 13 Issue 5 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org February 2009

Scientific American's Evolution Issue – Part 2

Scientific American *celebrates the 200th anniversary of Darwin's birth.*

Last month we began a review of the evolution articles in the January 2009 issue of *Scientific American*. Unfortunately, we didn't have space to cover it completely, despite adding two extra pages to our six-page newsletter. This month we will take up where we left off.

Human Evolution

We were really looking forward to what *Scientific American* would say about human evolution. They finally got around to it on page 60. But they only devoted four paragraphs to human evolution, and they needed really big margins to make the article take up the whole page. The first two paragraphs don't even talk about human evolution! Those first two paragraphs just say Darwin was reluctant to talk about human evolution, and so Huxley had to do it for him. Furthermore, they say, Huxley had "only a handful of human fossils" upon which to base his arguments. The article concludes with these two paragraphs of marginal substance.

> Since then [Huxley's time], abundant evidence from fossils and genetic analyses has validated Darwin's claims. We now know that our closest living relative is the chimpanzee and that humans arose in Africa between five million and seven million years ago, after our lineage diverged from that of the chimp. We have also learned that for much of human prehistory, our predecessors shared the planet with one or more other hominid species. Indeed, far from being a linear succession of increasingly upright creatures, the human family tree contains many dead branches.
>
> The story of our origins is far from complete. Paleontologists are eager to find fossils of the last common ancestor of chimpanzees and humans, for example. And exactly how, researchers have wondered, was *Homo sapiens* able to outcompete the Neandertals and other archaic humans? Many such mysteries about our collective past persist. Darwin's insights will no doubt continue to light the way to solving them. [1]

Despite her claims, they still don't have abundant fossil evidence. They have a few more fossils, but only speculative interpretations of how they are related. (We will get to that shortly when we examine the "skeletons in our closet.") They don't have any DNA from any of the so-called hominid ancestors except Neanderthal man, so there can't be any genetic analyses that validate Darwin's claims. (We wonder what she thinks Darwin could have claimed about these fossils, since they were unknown in his time.) Yes, chimpanzees are more like humans than any other creatures (and more like some particular humans than others ☺), but that doesn't mean they shared a common ancestor. Some people THINK humans arose in Africa, but we don't know that; and there are some evolutionists who reject the Out of Africa theory. Modern evolutionists are rejecting the linear succession theory because they can't make the dates of the fossils fit nicely into a linear pattern. Most of their so-called ancestors necessarily lead to dead ends, and are therefore irrelevant to the origin of human beings. The story doesn't hang together, so "many such mysteries about our collective past persist." Darwin didn't have any particular insights on these mysteries he knew nothing about, so it seems unlikely that Darwin's insights will "light the

[1] Wong, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "The Human Pedegree", page 60

way to solving them."

Following this mini-article is a three-page drawing of the "<B>Skeletons in Our Closet</B>." Just under the heading, the text says,

> The tree presented here is one of many interpretations of the hominid fossil record. Some scholars parse the remains into more species; others opt for fewer. And whereas some of the relationships between species are well supported (*red solid lines*), others remain tentative (*red dashed lines*). The accompanying panorama and portraits, for their part, imagine these hominids in the flesh and highlight the watershed events in the human odyssey. [2]

This heading agrees with a later article which says,

> Since then [the appearance of a small proto-human called *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* seven million years ago], our family has had a still disputed, but rather diverse, number of new species in it—as many as nine that we know of and others surely still hidden in the notoriously poor hominid fossil record. [3]

There are as many interpretations as there are paleontologists because the "evidence" is neither conclusive nor compelling. It consists of fragments of skeletons that came from nobody-knows-how-many species, so there is an argument over how many different species there were. Even if they knew how many species there were, they would not know how (or even if) they are biologically related. They "imagine" what these creatures looked like, and imagine how they might have been related. Furthermore, the *Scientific American* drawing shows one "open question" associated with every imaginary portrait, as if that were the only open question associated with that fossil.

Future Humanity

Not content to speculate about our past in the name of science, *Scientific American* feels the need to speculate about our future. We found the following notion particularly amusing.

> Another point of view is that genetic evolution continues to occur even today, but in reverse. Certain characteristics of modern life may drive evolutionary change that does not make us fitter for survival—or that even makes us less fit. Innumerable college students have noticed one potential way that such "inadaptive" evolution could happen: they put off reproduction while many of their high school classmates who did not make the grade started having babies right away. If less intelligent parents have more kids, then intelligence is a Darwinian liability in today's world, and average intelligence might evolve downward.
>
> Such arguments have a long and contentious history. [4]

We get it now! Smart people believe in evolution, and dumb people don't. Since smart people are having fewer children than dumb people, the number of people who believe in evolution is decreasing. That's why the theory of evolution is in a crisis today! It all makes perfect sense. ☺

Near the beginning of the article, the author asks these questions.

> Will we become larger or smaller, smarter or dumber? How will the emergence of new diseases and the rise in global temperature shape us? Will a new human species arise one day? Or does the future evolution of humanity lie not within our genes but within our technology, as we augment our brains and bodies with silicon and steel? Are we but the builders of the next dominant intelligence on the earth—the machines? [5]

He never answers these questions because he obviously can't. He is just teasing you to get you to read the article.

He ventures into some dark speculation about what might happen if we help evolution along too much. It is pointless for us to comment on the details of all his fantastic speculation. But generally speaking, his article shows that what one believes about evolution can impact what one thinks about political issues. (Racism, eugenics, abortion, and genetic engineering come immediately to mind.) Ward's article raises some political issues about which you can draw your own conclusions.

Psychology

The next article in *Scientific American*'s special issue discusses the theory of evolution's impact on the field of modern psychology. The editors added a sidebar to the article outlining the key concepts of the article. Here is the first one:

> Among Charles Darwin's lasting legacies is our knowledge that the human mind evolved by

[2] *Scientific American*, January 2009, "Skeletons in Our Closet", page 61

[3] Ward, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "What Will Become of Homo Sapiens?", pages 68 - 73

[4] *ibid.*

[5] *ibid.*

some adaptive process. [6]

We, of course, object to the word, "knowledge." We think the word, "assumption," would be more accurate. But we agree that the notion that the human brain evolved from an ape-like ancestor's brain has influenced psychology to a significant degree.

The editors also provide us with this definition:

> As used in this article, pop evolutionary psychology, or Pop EP, refers to a branch of theoretical psychology that employs evolutionary principles to support claims about human nature for popular consumption. [7]

What this means is that the assumption that human brains evolved from ape-like ancestors leads to popular ideas about morality. This manifests itself in attitudes toward promiscuity, war, abortion, animal rights, racism, government, and religion. If the premise that human brains evolved from animal brains is incorrect, then it invalidates the foundation for the views an individual might have about these moral issues. It can be terribly traumatic to consider the possibility that everything one has previously believed about promiscuity, war, abortion, animal rights, *etc.*, has been based on a lie. Therefore, some people refuse to even consider the possibility.

With that background, the importance of the article is evident from its title and subtitle.

> **Four Fallacies of Pop Evolutionary Psychology**
>
> Some evolutionary psychologists have made widely popularized claims about how the human mind evolved, but other scholars argue that the grand claims lack solid evidence [8]

The body of the article argues that we really know nothing about the social interactions of hominids, and so the four fallacies are all based on unwarranted speculation. Buller effectively demolishes the speculation and the fallacies based upon them. We could talk about all the arguments in detail, but let's just cut to the chase. Here's the concluding paragraph of the article.

> Of course, some speculations are worse than others. Those of Pop EP are deeply flawed. We are unlikely ever to learn much about our evolutionary past by slicing our Pleistocene history into discrete adaptive problems, supposing the mind to be partitioned into discrete solutions to those problems, and then supporting those suppositions with pencil-and-paper data. The field of evolutionary psychology will have to do better. Even its very best, however, [it] may never provide us knowledge of why all our complex human psychological characteristics evolved. [9]

In other words, Pop EP is a completely useless field of study. It is waste of scientific time, talent, and money; and it is based on evolution. Remember, they claim evolution is "the most powerful idea in science," but in this case it is leading scientists on a wild goose chase.

The Usefulness Claim

The *Scientific American* cover promised to tell us how useful the theory of evolution is in everyday life. Here are the first four paragraphs of the article that attempts to fulfill that promise.

> Charles Darwin surely had no clue of the technological advances that his studies of beetles and birds would unleash. Our progress in comprehending the history and mechanisms of evolution has led to powerful applications that shape a wide variety of fields today.
>
> For instance—as the *CSI* franchise of television shows has popularized—law-enforcement agencies now commonly use evolutionary analyses in their investigations. Knowledge of how different genes evolve determines the kind of information they can extract from DNA evidence.
>
> In health care, phylogenetic analysis (studies of DNA sequences to infer their evolutionary relatedness, or genealogy) of a pathogen such as bird flu or West Nile virus can lead to vaccines and to guidelines for minimizing the disease's transmission to and among people. A laboratory process called directed evolution that rapidly evolves proteins can improve vaccines and other useful proteins.
>
> Among other examples, computer scientists have adapted the concepts and mechanisms of evolution to create a general system known as genetic programming that can solve complex optimization and design problems. And a recently developed approach known as metagenomics has revolutionized scientists' ability to survey the kinds of microbes living in a region, bringing about the most dramatic change in our understanding of microbial diversity since the advent of microscopes. [10]

All of the processes referred to as "evolution" in these paragraphs really have nothing to do with

---

[6] The Editors, *Scientific American*, January 2009, page 74

[7] *ibid.*

[8] Buller, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "Four Fallacies of Pop Evolutionary Psychology", pages 74 - 81

[9] *ibid.*

[10] Mindell, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "Evolution in the Everyday World", pages 82 - 89

the controversial theory of evolution as taught in American public schools.

Yes, knowing about differences in genes can tell us what kind of information DNA analysis can yield; but it doesn't matter at all how those differences arose. So, from a law enforcement point of view, it doesn't matter if they evolved from apes or not. All that matters is that the differences are there.

Police can use tire tracks found at the scene of a crime to identify vehicles that have been there. A perfect tire track of an distinctively worn tire can uniquely identify a vehicle. Even a partial track can tell police if the getaway vehicle was an off-road vehicle, compact car, motorcycle, or bicycle. So, it is helpful for police to learn how to recognize distinguishing characteristics of tire treads. But it is of no use at all for police to speculate whether Goodyear or Michelin developed the tread design first, or whether both manufacturers' designs evolved from an earlier manufacturer.

If the DNA evidence at the crime scene includes a very rare gene, and the suspect has that very rare gene, it is as incriminating as a distinctive tire tread. But it is of no use to the police to speculate how that rare gene arose.

Yes, doctors can compare strains of flu, and modify vaccines that work on a similar strain to work on the strain currently infecting the world; but that has nothing to do with preventing the flu virus from turning into a fish. There are two processes that are called "evolution." One has to do with variations of exiting things. The other has to do with one living thing turning into another kind of living thing. The first process really happens; the second doesn't. This article confuses the two.

Yes, "genetic programming" is a term preferred by some computer scientists for "trial and error programming" because it sounds more scientific. There are some computational problems that are most easily solved by brute force. Since modern computers can try thousands (or millions) of solutions in a second or two, sometimes that is the easiest way to solve a problem. It isn't very elegant, but it works. It has nothing to do with whether or not a reptile can grow hair and breasts to become a mammal.

Simulated Evolution

Computer programmers have long simulated geometric patterns that grow and change based on certain rules. Spore is one such program. The subtitle of the article about Spore says,

> A computer game illustrates the difference between building your own simulated creature and real-life natural selection [11]

The difference is critical.

> Which brings us to the greatest difference between Spore and evolution by natural selection, namely, that whereas evolution is an emergent phenomenon with no conscious "selector," Spore quite obviously has one: the user. It is the user who selects for or against things at every juncture: body parts, traits, behaviors, colors, textures, patterns, shapes. Spore does not in fact proceed by natural selection at all but rather by artificial selection. Indeed, putting the player in the position of an omnipotent creator makes the game more a simulation of intelligent design than of real-world Darwinian selection.
>
> Spore may well be the ultimate computer game, the high-water mark of computer animation. You may find it mesmerizing or boring, sophisticated or silly, more Disney than Darwin. [12]

Computers can simulate anything, and routinely do to create special effects for modern movies. Some things on the movie theater screen look realistic, but they have no basis in reality. Computers can simulate evolution by any one of a variety of methods; but that doesn't have anything to do with real life.

Tricks

The final article in the special evolution issue addresses the creationists "new tricks." [13] Actually, it is just Eugenie Scott's same old claim that creationists are just attacking evolution to try to get Christianity into the public schools. She thinks that intelligent design is simply creationism in disguise.

Ironically, what Ms. Scott apparently fails to recognize is that the new evolutionary theory of evo-devo is really creationism on steroids in disguise.

Creationists believe that, in the beginning, God created many different "kinds" of creatures. There was a dog kind; a horse kind; a pigeon kind; a goldfish kind; and a human kind, *et cetera.* Each of these kinds was created with a rich genetic heritage allowing a certain amount of variation in size, shape, strength, color, agility, *etc*. which gives the creature some measure of adaptation to its environment.

---

[11] Regis, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "The Science of Spore", pages 90 - 91

[12] *ibid.*

[13] Branch & Scott, *Scientific American*, January 2009, "The Latest Face of Creationism", pages 92 - 99

For example, it is advantageous for people living in tropical zones to have dark skin to protect them from ultraviolet light. It is better for people living in polar regions to have fair skin because it facilitates the production of vitamin D. Biblical creationists believe that Noah's three sons (and their wives) had enough genetic variation that their offspring could have light skin, dark skin, and various intermediate shades. Because dark skin is advantageous in tropical regions, that's where it naturally predominates. Light skin predominates in northern climates because it is more advantageous there. Light-skinned people tan when exposed to long periods of sunlight. Skin color is a normal adaptation to environmental conditions.

Evo-deo is based on the notion that the first living thing (we like to call it "Frankencell") came to life spontaneously through some unknown, but undirected natural process. For reasons not fully understood, Frankencell had a fantastically rich "tool kit" (Sean Carroll's term) of genetic information. These tools used themselves to build different structures in different circumstances. In other words, Frankencell did not have eyes, but Frankencell had the genetic potential necessary to evolve lots of different kinds of eyes later in evolutionary history as the need arose.

Creationists believe an intelligent designer gave all living things some limited potential for adaptation. Evo-devo rests on the belief that some accidental, undirected process gave Frankencell unlimited potential for adaptation. That's why we say evo-devo is really creationism on steroids.

Since it is difficult for some people to imagine different kinds of living things intentionally created with the ability to adapt within limits to their environment, it can be extremely difficult for people to believe that one kind of living thing accidentally arose from inanimate material with the ability to adapt apparently without limit to its environment. That's why evo-devo is so controversial among evolutionists.

All Together Now

Last month and this month we examined *Scientific American*'s special issue on The Evolution of Evolution. What did we learn?

- Darwin's theory has been dramatically revised because Darwin got it mostly wrong. Furthermore, most of the aspects of evolution that are "true" today will be rejected in the future.
- There is no molecular proof that natural selection is responsible for all the life forms on Earth.
- Nobody knows how life could possibly invent complex traits.
- The story of human evolution is far from complete because there are only a handful of fossils, resulting in many different interpretations.
- The future of human evolution is potentially disastrous if we try to accelerate evolution artificially.
- The foundation of pop evolutionary psychology is baseless speculation, resulting in four major fallacies which affect human attitudes toward morality.
- Some computer programs and a few other things incorrectly called "evolution" are really useful, but they don't really have anything to do with biological evolution.
- Most importantly, we can't tell any of our public school students these things because it might lead to Christianity! ☺

Happy 200th Birthday, Darwin, from your friends at *Scientific American*.

Evolution in the News

Life Not Nearly Created

A misleading Life Science article on the Fox News site makes it appear that life was nearly created in the lab.

A major problem for evolutionists is that the theory is dead on arrival. The story starts out on a lifeless planet, and somehow life arose through some spontaneous natural process that has never happened again, despite scientists' best efforts to reproduce it. Without the natural, spontaneous appearance of Frankencell, there is nothing to evolve. Therefore, evolutionists desperately need to come up with some plausible explanation of how it happened.

> One of life's greatest mysteries is how it began. Scientists have pinned it down to roughly this:
>
> Some chemical reactions occurred about 4 billion years ago "perhaps in a primordial tidal soup or maybe with help of volcanoes or possibly at the bottom of the sea or between the mica sheets" to create biology.
>
> Now scientists have created something in the lab that is tantalizingly close to what might

have happened. [14]

It sounds like they have figured it out, especially since the article's title is, "Life As We Know It Nearly Created in Lab."

The article goes on to say,

> To understand the remarkable breakthrough, detailed Jan. 8 in the early online edition of the journal *Science*, you have to know a little about molecules called RNA and DNA. [15]

Better still, we believe, one has to know what the article in *Science* actually said. It begins,

> A longstanding research goal has been to devise a nonbiological system that undergoes replication in a selfsustained manner, brought about by enzymatic machinery which is part of the system being replicated. [16]

In other words, the goal is to create a situation in which inanimate (nonbiological) chemicals assemble themselves into a self-sustaining biological system that grows and reproduces itself. The first process they tried used the R3C RNA enzyme.

> This process was inefficient because the substrates formed a non-productive complex that limited the extent of exponential growth, with a doubling time of about 17 h[ours] and no more than two successive doublings. [17]

That didn't work. It took too long, and it didn't continue very long. So, they tried Plan B.

> The R3C ligase subsequently was converted to a crosscatalytic format … This too was inefficient because of the formation of non-productive complexes and the slow underlying rate of the two enzymes. [18]

So, Plan B didn't work, either. On to Plan C!

> The catalytic properties of the cross-replicating RNA enzymes were improved using in vitro evolution, optimizing the two component reactions in parallel and seeking solutions that would apply to both reactions when conducted in the cross-catalytic format. The 5´-triphosphate bearing substrate was joined to the enzyme via a hairpin loop (B´ to E, and B to E´), and nucleotides within both the enzyme and the separate 3´-hydroxyl-bearing substrate (A´ and A) were randomized at a frequency of 12% per position. The two resulting populations of molecules were subjected to six rounds of stringent in vitro selection, selecting for their ability to react in progressively shorter times, ranging from 2 h[ours] to 10 milliseconds. Mutagenic PCR was performed after the third round to maintain diversity in the population. Following the sixth round, individuals were cloned from both populations and sequenced. [19]

We know that after reading their explanation it is unlikely that you understand exactly what they did. All you really need to understand is that they did a lot of stuff that would not happen naturally. There was a lot of goal-directed work that was done intentionally. It isn't as if they just poured five different chemicals into a test tube and suddenly a reproducing cell formed. They worked hard to get this stuff to reproduce. And what was the result?

> The optimized enzymes underwent robust exponential amplification at a constant temperature of 42 °C, with more than 25-fold amplification after 5 h[ours], followed by a leveling off as the supply of substrates became depleted.
>
> Exponential growth can be continued indefinitely in a serial transfer experiment in which a portion of a completed reaction mixture is transferred to a new reaction vessel that contains a fresh supply of substrates. [20]

For you American readers who don't know the Celsius scale, and don't happen to live just outside Death Valley, like I do, you need to know that 42 ^{o}C is 107.6 ^{o}F. So, they had to keep the solution "comfortably warm" ☺, and they had to keep taking a little bit of it out and putting it in a new environment with "a fresh supply of substrates" to keep the reaction going.

The article ends with these words:

> In order to support much greater complexity it will be necessary to constrain the set of substrates, for example, by using the population of newly-formed enzymes to generate a daughter population of substrates. An important challenge for an artificial RNA-based genetic system is to support a broad range of encoded functions, well beyond replication itself. Ultimately the system should provide open-ended opportunities for discovering novel function, something that likely has not occurred on Earth since the time of the RNA world, but

[14] Britt, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,479777,00.html, 13 January, 2009**, "**Life As We Know It Nearly Created in Lab"
[15] *ibid.*
[16] Lincoln and Joyce, http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/rapidpdf/1167856v1.pdf, 8 January 2009, "Self-Sustained Replication of an RNA Enzyme"
[17] *ibid.*
[18] *ibid.*
[19] *ibid.*
[20] *ibid.*

presents an increasingly tangible research opportunity. [21]

A "research opportunity" still exists because they aren't even remotely close to creating life in the lab, even by simulating the mythical RNA world, despite what the Live Science article quoted by Fox News said.

Evolution in the News

No Love For Lucy

Interest in evolution is waning.

After six years of steadily increasing traffic at our web site (from 3,000 to 30,000 visits per year), we've noticed that traffic has remained constant for the last four years. Membership and contributions were both down about 10% in 2008. Since we don't track hate mail quantitatively we don't have any numbers; but we guess our hate mail is down about 90%! Apathy about evolution has been apparent at the last several Community Dinners. But we aren't the only ones who have been affected.

Perhaps the most famous alleged human ancestor is an *Australopithecus afarensis* popularly known as "Lucy."

> Lucy is a 3.2 million-year-old fossilized partial skeleton of a species with chimplike features that walked upright. The discovery in 1974 in Ethiopia forced a major revision of theories about the evolution of *Homo sapiens*. [22]

Lucy's bones are usually kept safely in Ethiopia, not on public display. Only certain paleontologists have been allowed to study them. Exact replicas can be seen in museums all over the world, including this one in Ridgecrest, at the Biblical Archeology and Anthropology Museum (BAAM). [23]

Some museum officials thought that interest in evolution was so high that people would flock to see Lucy. They were wrong.

> Who loves Lucy? Far fewer people than a Seattle science center hoped when officials paid millions to show the fossil remains of one of the earliest known human ancestors.
>
> Halfway through the five-month exhibit, the Pacific Science Center faces a half-million-dollar loss resulting in layoffs of 8 percent of the staff, furloughs and a wage freeze, President Bryce Seidl said Friday. [24]

Other museum officials who planned to show Lucy are changing their minds.

> The Field Museum in Chicago withdrew from the tour because of the cost. Debate over whether the irreplaceable fossil should be shipped around the globe led the Denver Museum of Nature & Science to drop the idea after early consideration.
>
> "Lucy may not be anywhere other than Ethiopia after Seattle," Seidl said. [25]

Despite these facts, at least one famous evolutionist remains delusional.

> But Donald Johanson, the American anthropologist who discovered Lucy, said fascination with the skeleton remained strong. [26]

We didn't read any stories about museums losing money when they paid Egypt a pharaoh's ransom to show King Tut's artifacts. Lots of people (including me) went to the Pacific Science Center to see the Titanic artifacts. Attendance figures (and the resulting income) represent reality. How people spend their money is a better indication of what people believe than mere words. People aren't fascinated by the evolution myth any more. That's why they didn't go.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter.

You are also permitted (even encouraged) to send a donation of $15/year to Science Against Evolution, P.O. Box 923, Ridgecrest, CA 93556-0923, to encourage us in our work. ☺

---

[21] *ibid.*

[22] http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090125/ap_on_sc/who_loves_lucy_2, 24 January 2009, "Seattle shows little love for Lucy fossil exhibit"

[23] http://www.baamonline.org/

[24] http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20090125/ap_on_sc/who_loves_lucy_2, 24 January 2009, "Seattle shows little love for Lucy fossil exhibit"

[25] *ibid.*

[26] *ibid.*

by Lothar Janetzko

Creation & Evolution

http://www.pilgrimtours.com/creation/index.htm

The Theory of Evolution vs. Creation Science

This month's web site review looks at what the Pilgrim Tours web site has to say about creation and evolution. The site discusses six scientific disciplines (astronomy, geology, paleontology, genetics, biochemistry and mathematics) and presents a brief discussion about: 1) What the Theory of Evolution Says, 2) What Evolutionists Say We Ought to See, 3) What We Actually Observe in Nature, 4) What Scientists Say and 5) Creationist Explanation.

The topics discussed under the various disciplines are as follows: 1) Astronomy – the Big Bang theory, 2) Geology – transitional life forms and age of the earth, 3) Paleontology – evidence for macroevolution and the Cambrian Explosion, 4) Genetics – laws of inheritance and "neo-Darwinism", 5) Biochemistry – the discovery of DNA, the genetic data bank, and 5) Mathematics – calculating the probabilities of certain biological changes occurring over a given time.

Below the links to the information about the scientific disciplines you will find information about what the Pilgrim Tours web author believes regarding creation and evolution. "The information shown in the disciplines above is our attempt to briefly, yet honestly show each side of the disciplines listed. Some of you have contacted us with corrections and additional information and we thank you for your help to this end. Below you will find our personal viewpoint from an admittedly biased position. However, we do believe our theory holds more evidence toward scientific and rational observation than does the majority of teaching today."

The personal viewpoint mentioned in the above quote is presented under the title Creation Science – Simple Reasoning. Here you will also find many links to topics of interest regarding creation and evolution.

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