

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 17 Issue 3

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

December 2012

GEOLOGIC LAYER NAMES

Most layer names are based on geography, not chronology.

Evolutionists sometimes claim that the fossil record proves evolution is true. In particular, **one evolutionist** told me the fact that primate [ape-like] fossils are not found in Devonian layers proves that apes had not evolved yet. He **claimed that all it would take to disprove evolution is to find a primate skeleton in a Devonian layer.**

He is wrong for two reasons. First, if anyone did find a fossilized ape in a Devonian layer, evolutionists would claim it was planted there by a creationist, and it would be ignored. (Or, they would say that it could not be a Devonian layer because there was a primate fossil in it.)

Second, creationists would not expect an ape to be found in a Devonian layer because the characteristics of rock layers are determined by geography, not time. **Finding an ape in Devonian strata would be just as troubling for a creationist as it would be for an evolutionist;** but let's not get ahead of ourselves.

GEOLOGIC STRATA

Rocks are generally found in strata (that is, layers which have a distinctive characteristic). **The distinctive characteristic of a layer might be the kind of minerals found in it, or the kind of fossils found in it, or something else.** Regardless, there is something unique about the layer that geologists recognize and think is significant.

Geologists, like biologists, like to classify similar things by giving a name to a group of similar things. This makes it easier to study the rocks, and talk to other geologists about the rocks.

What most people tend to forget is that **the name of the layer is generally determined by the place where the layer was first studied. It is important to understand why people tend to forget this;** but it is too soon to tell you that now.

THE DEVONIAN LAYER

Since this article began with a claim about the Devonian layer, let's start with that one.

It is named after Devon, England, where rocks from this period were first studied.¹

There are lots of fish fossils in this layer, but no primate fossils, as evolutionists love to point out. Why is this? **Is it because primates did not exist anywhere in the world when the Devonian rocks were formed? Or was it because apes don't live where fish live?**

To find fossils of extinct primates, paleontologists go to Tanzania or Kenya; but they don't find fish fossils there. Is that because fish did not exist **when *Homo habilis* or *Australopithecus Afarensis* lived?** Or is it because fish don't live on dry land **where *Homo habilis* or *Australopithecus Afarensis* lived?**

Fossils are formed when things get buried rapidly by a landslide, sandstorm, tsunami, flood, or any other disaster that might bury things. The things that get buried are the things that happened to be at the place that got buried.

On rare occasions, things get buried out of place. Someone might have caught a fish and

¹ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Devonian>

brought it back to camp just before a rockslide buried the camp, causing a fish fossil to be found mysteriously out of place. But that's a rare anomaly. Fossil-bearing strata overwhelmingly tend to contain fossils associated with a particular habitat. In fact, that's how paleontologists determine what the habitat was like.

GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

There are a few exceptions, but, generally speaking, strata have geographic names. For example,

The Jurassic is named after the Jura Mountains within the European Alps, where limestone strata from the period was first identified.²

The Mississippian is so named because rocks with this age are exposed in the Mississippi River valley.³

The Pennsylvanian is named after the American state of Pennsylvania, where rocks with this age are widespread.⁴

Notice that each layer is associated with an age. Why is that? Mississippian rocks are supposedly older than Pennsylvanian rocks; but Pennsylvania was a state before Mississippi was. Chronologically, the two names make no sense. That's because the names are based on geography, not time.

AGE ASSUMPTIONS

Dates have been assigned to these layers based on the assumptions of (1) evolution and (2) the old Earth model. The ages of the layers don't prove evolution—they are simply the result of an *a priori* belief in the sequence of evolution and how long it took various things to evolve.

The Jurassic layer consists of limestone, not lava. Should we assume that volcanoes had not evolved (or had gone extinct) during the "Jurassic period?" Of course not! That's so silly you probably think I am stupid for even suggesting it. But wait! Think about it. Why would it be dumb to suggest that volcanoes did not exist during the Jurassic period? That's not just a rhetorical question. The answer explains why it is dumb to think that certain creatures did (or did not) exist when the rock layer was formed.

It would be dumb to suggest volcanoes did not exist during the "Jurassic period" because nobody believes that rocks evolved and went extinct at various times in Earth's history. We know that the

reason some layers are sandstone, some are limestone, and some are lava, has nothing to do with time—it has to do with geography. It is as simple as that.

The reason why some layers have lots of fish fossils, and others have fossils of dinosaurs or mammals or birds, has nothing to do with time—it has to do with geography (and the habitat associated with that geography).

THE GEOLOGIC COLUMN

The assumption that the layers represent periods of time has led to the creation of the mythical geologic column. Students have been led to believe that everywhere on Earth the rock layers are neatly stacked upon each other in chronological order—but that's not true. Geologists don't go to one spot where all the layers exist and drill down to the depth associated with the age they are studying because that one spot doesn't exist.

Yes, there are some places where there are several thick rock layers lying on top of each other—but they pose more questions for evolutionary geologists than they answer (if the evolutionary geologists dare to think about them). These thick layers look like they were formed rapidly, not like they were formed gradually over millions of years.

GRAND CANYON COAL MINES

One of the places where many rock layers are exposed is the Grand Canyon. At the bottom of the Grand Canyon, you find the oldest rocks, the Unkar Group.

The oldest section of the supergroup is the Unkar Group. It was laid down in an offshore environment. The first formation to be laid down in the Unkar Group was the Bass Limestone. A wave-eroded gravel that later lithified into a basal conglomerate is known as the Hotauta Member of the Bass Limestone. The Bass Limestone was deposited in a shallow sea near the coast as a mix of limestone, sandstone, and shale. It is 120 to 340 feet (37 to 100 m) thick and grayish in color. Averaging 1250 million years old, this is the oldest layer exposed in the Grand Canyon that contains fossils—stromatolites.⁵

As you hike down the trail from the South Rim to the bottom of the Grand Canyon, you take a journey through time from the present to 1250 million years ago (according to the park rangers). In your journey through time, you pass through

² <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jurassic>

³ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mississippian>

⁴ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pennsylvanian>

⁵ [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geology_of_the_Grand_Canyon_area)

[Geology_of_the_Grand_Canyon_area](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geology_of_the_Grand_Canyon_area)

the Carboniferous period, roughly 300 million years ago.

The **Carboniferous** is a geologic period and system that extends from the end of the Devonian Period, about 359.2 ± 2.5 Ma (million years ago), to the beginning of the Permian Period, about 299.0 ± 0.8 Ma (ICS, 2004). The name **Carboniferous** means "coal-bearing" and derives from the Latin words *carbo* (coal) and *ferre* (to carry), and was coined by geologists William Conybeare and William Phillips in 1822.⁶

These thick black layers are where the Grand Canyon coal mines are.

What? You never noticed the massive coal mines that spoil the beauty of the Grand Canyon? The environmentalists must have done a very good job of keeping them hidden from you! ☺

Seriously, there are no Carboniferous layers in the Grand Canyon. Is that because Arizona fell through some sort of time warp and didn't exist 300 million years ago? Or was it because the trees in the vast tropical rainforest of the Arizona desert never existed, and therefore weren't turned into coal.

According to Wikipedia,

Vast swathes of forest covered the land, which would eventually be laid down and become the coal beds characteristic of the Carboniferous system. A minor marine and terrestrial extinction event occurred in the middle of the period, caused by a change in climate. The latter half of the period experienced glaciations, low sea level, and mountain building as the continents collided to form Pangaea.⁷

From time to time there have been places where "vast swathes of forest covered the land, which would eventually be laid down and become the coal beds," but there was no time period where forests covered the entire planet. That's why you don't find coal everywhere.

The Carboniferous is often treated in North America as two geological periods, the earlier Mississippian and the later Pennsylvanian.⁸

That's not because "A minor marine and terrestrial extinction event occurred in the middle of the period, caused by a change in climate." It's because the forests in Pennsylvania were slightly different from the forests along the Mississippi River, which resulted in slightly different kinds of

coal beds in those locations.

THE GREAT MISUNDERSTANDING

It is very simple. The kinds of plants and animals present when the rocks were formed depends on geography (that is, ecological zone), not time. That's why most have geographic names. But evolutionists have thoroughly indoctrinated generations of students to believe that rock layers are associated with time, not places.

Any kind of catastrophe that would cause rapid burial of a large area today (flood, rock slide, avalanche, sandstorm, volcanic eruption, *et cetera*) could produce a rock layer containing fossils. Those fossils would depend entirely upon what kinds of plants and animals were in that geographic location at the time of the disaster. The absence of some fossils in that newly created rock layer would not prove that certain species currently alive in other parts of the world had not yet evolved. Nor would it prove species currently alive in other parts of the world today had gone extinct.

The past is no different from the present. The fossils found in rocks are fossils of things that lived there.

Evolution in the News

DO BUGS HEAR WHAT I HEAR?

An evolutionist was shocked to discover a similarity between insect ears and human ears.

This holiday season we are so thankful for the theory of evolution. It is the gift that keeps on giving mirthful entertainment. In particular, we really enjoyed an article titled, "Convergent Evolution of Hearing." It gives us the excuse to remind you of our song parody, "I Heard It Through My Jaw Bones,"⁹ which includes our explanation of impedance matching, of which we are immodestly proud.

BLESSED IF YOU DO, BLESSED IF YOU DON'T

The article in question gives us yet another example of how everything is evidence of

⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carboniferous>

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *Disclosure*, April 2012, "I Heard it Through My Jaw Bones",

<http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v16i7f.htm>

evolution, in their eyes. If two creatures have a feature that is the same, it is because they both inherited it from a close common ancestor. If two creatures have a feature that is different, it is proof that evolution changed that feature. Similarity is proof of evolution—and so is difference!

“Convergent evolution” is a special case of this thinking. It is the evolutionists’ way of explaining things that are the same—but should not be. Evolutionists believe that humans and chimps should have similar hearing because they both evolved from some unknown ancestor. Humans and insects should not have similar hearing because they don’t have such a close common ancestor. Therefore, any similarity has to be explained by convergent evolution.

In intellectual speak, “The problem space confines the solution.” In plain English, if a problem only has one solution, and many people are trying to solve the problem, eventually several of them will independently come upon the same solution because it is the only solution. This applies to evolution in the sense that every living thing is trying to solve the problem of how to survive in its environment. Therefore, it is not surprising (to evolutionists) that evolution will force unrelated species to evolve the same solution to the survival problem.

YOU HEARD IT HERE FIRST!

It certainly is reasonable to say that the same solution can be found independently by different people. For example, the realization that hearing is dependant upon impedance matching is such an important scientific observation that it deserves to be published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal. The fact that we published it months earlier is not proof that the article in *Science* was based on our work, and that we were unjustly denied the credit. There is no doubt in our mind that the “real scientists” who published the article in *Science* did not read our article. (If they had plagiarized from us, they would have done a MUCH better job of explaining impedance matching! ☺)

INSECT EARS

Here’s how an editor described the article.

On page 968 of this issue, Montealegre-Z. *et al.* show that although the hearing organ of a rainforest insect looks very different from a human ear, it can be divided into the same three functional entities, providing evidence for convergent evolution. ... In both humans and katydids, this coupling mechanism efficiently transfers and amplifies vibrational energy from air to fluid, solving the problem of impedance mismatch. ... The parallelism in anatomy and

function is the result of convergent evolution between the ears of humans and katydids. It is as surprising as it is remarkable and has important implications for comparative auditory research. ... Given the discovery of such an unexpected hearing anatomy in an insect, it may be valuable to revisit the phylogenetic spread of sensitive hearing and frequency tonotopy not only in insects but across all invertebrates.¹⁰

Surely I am not the only engineer rolling on the floor, laughing, because this editor is so gobsmacked [astonished] by this obvious discovery. It is like being surprised at the remarkable, unexpected discovery that both birds and insects use wings to fly! ☺

The actual article that impressed the editor isn’t quite so silly; but it does make the unsubstantiated assertion that convergent evolution deserves the credit for arriving at the required solution.

Thus, two phylogenetically remote organisms, katydids and mammals, have evolved a series of convergent solutions to common biophysical problems, despite their reliance on very different morphological substrates.¹¹

(Remember, mammal ears evolved from jawbones! ☺)

REAL SCIENCE

All this nonsense aside, there is some scientific value in the article. Specifically, it describes the remarkable technology they used to study insect ears. If you thought dissecting a frog was difficult in high school, imagine trying to dissect an insect to figure out how its ears work. They deserve a lot of credit for figuring out exactly how insect ears function.

Impedance conversion is crucial to hearing in terrestrial mammals, yet it is unknown in insects. Here, we identify and characterize auditory mechanisms in an insect that are markedly convergent with those of mammalian ears. We studied the South American rainforest katydid *Copiphora gorgonensis* (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae: Copiphorini) and show that impedance transformation arises from unconventional tympanal mechanics, relying on

¹⁰ Ronald R. Hoy, *Science*, 16 November 2012, “Convergent Evolution of Hearing”, pp. 894-895, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/338/6109/894.full?sid=fb786559-978d-414f-ab5d-8bc364418863>

¹¹ Fernando Montealegre-Z, *Science*, 16 November 2012, “Convergent Evolution Between Insect and Mammalian Audition”, pp. 968-971, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/338/6109/968.full>

a lever and fulcrum system and a favorable surface-area ratio to amplify and drive vibrations into the auditory sensory organ. Next, we show that frequency analysis is enabled by the action of a newly identified organ, a fluid-filled vesicle, joining with the mechanosensory organ to support dispersive wave propagation and tonotopy. Our results reveal a notable case of convergence, whereby organisms with the most remote phylogenetic histories (such as mammals and katydids), have evolved to hear in a markedly analogous way.

¹²

Most of the article brags about the state-of-the-art equipment they used, and the frequencies bugs can hear. It was all very interesting to me; but probably not to you, so let's cut to the chase.

Sophisticated hearing is possible at the microscale; katydid ears provide valuable inspiration for the construction of miniaturized smart acoustic sensors, contributing to the expanding panoply of insect-inspired technology.¹³

Of course, they are right. Engineers have long been inspired by nature, and created products based on designs taken from nature. No doubt subminiature microphone design will benefit from their work.

DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

As far as proving evolution goes, this work fails miserably. In fact, it argues much more strongly for design than chance.

Hearing depends upon the detection of sound waves traveling through air. Air is a much less dense medium than the material in the sensing organs. Therefore, there has to be some sort of impedance transformation. Furthermore, any communication more complex than Morse Code depends upon frequency discrimination. Therefore, engineers do not find impedance matching and frequency discrimination in insects surprising, unexpected, or remarkable. Those are two design requirements for audio detection.

Since insects obviously communicate with each other through chirping, they must have some impedance matching device and a frequency discriminator (not to mention the mental software required to encode and decode the information). Until now, we have never had the technology to inspect tiny insects to the required accuracy and precision to expose the hardware portion of the design. Knowing how this can be done at such a small scale might enable engineers to build even

smaller cell phones.

The evolutionary assumption stood in the way of scientific advancement in this case. If one assumes insects evolved by chance, there is no reason to believe that they would have a sophisticated auditory system.

If a scientist starts from the assumption that insects are the product of a conscious decision, and have some reason for existence, then that scientist is likely to look for purpose and functionality. Looking is the beginning of discovery. Someone who knows he must have left his car keys somewhere, and is actively looking for them, is more likely to find them than someone who isn't looking for them.

JUST FOR FUN

I usually save my song parodies for the April Fool issue, but since I happened to be in a festive, holiday spirit, I recorded a song parody based on this article and a familiar Christmas song. Even katydids can hear me sing and play it at <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/music/bugs.mp3>. ☺

Do Bugs Hear What I Hear?

Said the scientist to the katydid,
Do Bugs Hear What I Hear?
Sitting on a leaf, katydid,
Do Bugs Hear What I Hear?
A band, a band, playing in the night
With guitars so distorted and bright
With guitars so distorted and bright

Said the katydid to the mocking bird,
Do you hear what I hear?
Flying through the sky, mocking bird,
Do you hear what I hear?
A song, a song, high above the trees
With a drum as big as the sea
With a drum as big as the sea

Said the mocking bird to the mighty king,
Do you know what I know?
In your palace warm, mighty king,
Do you know what I know?
All life on Earth, did not evolve by chance
No, we didn't get here by chance
No, we didn't get here by chance

Said the king to the people everywhere,
Listen to what I say
Listen up, people everywhere,
Listen to what I say.
"The truth, the truth at last has come to light.
Charlie Darwin just wasn't right."
Charlie Darwin just wasn't right.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ *ibid.*

JEFF'S SAD EXPERIENCE

These are the times that try men's souls.

Jeff sent us this series of emails, which are (sadly) typical. Here's the first.

Hi David,

I know you probably keep stats on your website visitors. I'm going to evolutionists' YouTube videos and posting, "If you want to read a website that destroys evolution with science and never mentions God or Jesus or the Bible, go to ScienceAgainstEvolution dot info." I will be doing this for 30 days between 10-12 videos a day. Please let me know if this has any impact at all on your website visitation. If there is no increase, I'll try to think of a better way to steer people to your site - it is the best answer to honest truth seekers who don't want religion involved in the answers.

Thanks,
Jeff

We do, in fact, keep track of visits to our home page. We gave Jeff our blessing, and told him we would tell him if his efforts are bearing any fruit. Two days later, he wrote,

Well it sure didn't take long. A guy by the name of "Reptillian [sic] Freemason" is going behind me on all my posts and putting this up.

"It may not blatantly talk about Jesus but it is CLEARLY a religiously motivated website who's [sic] conveniently unnamed author/s are OBVIOUSLY creationists. It's a creationists [sic] website that refuses to admit it in the desperate attempt to deceive."

Also, I am part of a discussion forum website. It's Bible-based and concerns Ultimate Reconciliation VS. eternal torture. One of the members made disparaging remarks about Genesis because of evolution and the "myth" of the flood. I recommended your website and 2 came back and told me it was hard to navigate, and it was in HTML, and looked like it was designed a long time ago.

Anyway, thought you might appreciate the input. Some people will think of any excuse not to read anything that is different than what they believe.

Jeff

What kind of person chooses the pen name, "Reptillian Freemason?" Apparently, one who doesn't know how to spell "reptilian," doesn't know the difference between "who's" and "whose," and can't click on the name of the "conveniently unnamed author/s" at the top of the articles to find out more about them.

Since they can't find anything factually wrong, they complain that the website looks "like it was designed a long time ago." Yes, it was initially designed a long time ago, and retains that same design style so that it loads quickly over a dial-up

connection, and prints correctly on any printer.

The next day, Jeff sent us this email:

Hi David,

I'm sorry but my experiment is being brought to an end. For every YouTube post I put out I got 2 responses calling me names, and repeating the mantra of "evolution is fact and evolution has been proven science" even "evolution has been the most studied of all the sciences and has more absolute proof than any other discipline."

I felt if I didn't respond, readers would take that as they were right and I was wrong, so I replied asking for what it was specifically at the website they didn't agree with or thought was in error. This brought another barrage of insults to my intelligence and moral character. Answering these poor misguided buffoons took way too much time so maybe when they get out of ninth grade and see the real world they may be more amenable to at least looking at contrary evidence. I even commended one of the respondents for actually forming a coherent sentence and not calling me a name in it.

Jeff

Jeff has discovered what we learned many years ago. This is why we do not participate in forums. Specifically, here is what we have learned:

- These people cannot give a logical reason for believing in evolution. They have been told evolution is true ever since they were small children (which hasn't been that long ago, in most cases), and it frustrates them when they realize they can't put forth a coherent reason for believing in evolution.
- In their frustration they make personal attacks.
- It is all about religion to them. They fear that if evolution isn't true, then the Bible MUST be true. (Of course, the Biblical story of creation is not the only other possible explanation. But Biblical creation is the one that seems most plausible to them, and is the most frightening to them.)
- Fear of God causes them to reject all valid scientific evidence against evolution.

Fear trumps reason. Someone who is afraid of God is never going to listen to reason. That's a fact that we have learned to accept. That's why we don't go to forums trying to convert evolutionists.

Instead, we provide information to people who really want to know if evolution is true or not. We put the facts out there. Take it or leave it. We don't argue.

It certainly is true that when one stops believing in the myth of evolution, it leaves a hole that needs to be filled. That hole can be filled with Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Buddhism,

Confucianism, or any one of a number of other religions. It can also be filled by Superstring Theory or Quantum Physics or some other non-theistic theory.

Debating whether or not Christianity, Buddhism, Quantum Physics, or any other alternative is a better explanation for the origin and diversity of life than Darwinian evolution is counter-productive. It simply gives the evolutionist the opportunity to turn the discussion away from the scientific evidence against the theory of evolution, and talk instead about Jesus, Buddha, or multiple universes that pop in and out of existence depending upon whether or not someone is looking. That's why we don't offer an alternative explanation for how life came to be on this planet.

A few days later, Jeff sent us this email:

Hi David,
In answering responses on YouTube, it seemed every time I'd respond to one person, 2 more would respond to my response like a hydra. Easily 30+ post responses a day. ... I have to quit responding to responses.

I can't understand how in 3rd grade we thought we'd never be able to write 500 words on a subject and now I reach the 500 word limit (per response) almost before I even get started.

I thought you might be interested in the most typical responses. (Name calling left out.) I know you've heard it all before but this is somewhat cathartic for me since I sure get no sympathy "out there."

- 1.) Evolution is a scientific fact.
- 2.) Evolution is proven.
- 3.) Only religious fanatics deny the tons of evidence supporting evolution.
- 4.) Evolution is the unifying principle behind all of Biology.
- 5.) Intelligent Design and Creationism have both been proven false.
- 6.) "Your [sic] a liar."
- 7.) You don't know what you're talking about.
- 8.) You're misinformed.
- 9.) You don't have a clue.
- 10.) You can't possibly understand science.
- 11.) Every single secular scientist in the world says evolution is correct.
- 12.) How can you reject the mountains of evidence proving evolution?
- 13.) You don't understand science and that's proven by your posts.
- and my favorite:
- 14.) You f..., why don't you just f...in kill yourself?

...
I'm astounded.

They all seem to think evolution is a proven scientific fact. That ALL of science is tied into the truth of evolution, and that creationists (normally referred to as creatards or creanderthals) don't understand the first thing about science.

One insisted on the horse evolution as proof positive. I quoted from a book that said it had been refuted in 1961. Unbelievably, he said that didn't count because the book I had quoted from was 20 years old and that a lot has changed since then.

Abiogenesis either doesn't count, or one of Miller's students (Jeff Bada) went on to

complete his work and they have created self replicating molecules.

When asked to explain how invertebrates became vertebrates, one answered, "R U that f... stupid? invertebrate--> vertebrate."

I asked if anyone could explain to me how any of the three types of flight or even feathers developed, only one took a stab. He said, "escaping from predators, a squirrel like creature would jump from the tree and some were able to survive the drop and then because they were able to survive this quality was passed on." I said, "You explained how creatures can survive jumping down out of trees. Can you answer my original question about flight or feathers?" I got back, "You just don't understand how anything can happen given enough time." My response was the only time I wasn't cordial, as I had had an exceptional amount of name calling yesterday. I wrote, "...and you evolutionists call ME stupid??"

Anyway, I've stopped answering posts and it's starting to die down.

It was an interesting experience, thank you for letting me vent.

The traffic on our website increased about 30% right after Jeff started posting his comments. Our hate mail did go up slightly, including an email from William about ape fossils in the Devonian, which prompted this month's feature article. There was no noticeable increase in the amount of fan mail during that period.

Traffic has slowly returned to normal now that Jeff has ended his experiment. We presume the temporary increase in traffic was due to visits from the militant evolutionists who patrol the web, attacking anyone who dares to point out the scientific impossibility of abiogenesis and macroevolution.

We are grateful to Jeff for trying to steer more visitors to our website, and we encourage you to do the same. However, we need to warn you that your experience will certainly be the same as Jeff's. You will be personally attacked. No matter how hard you try to keep the discussion scientific, the evolutionists will change the topic because they can't win a scientific debate—science is against their theory.

They will try to bring religion into the discussion because (1) evolution is their religion, and (2) they can eliminate scientific arguments by talking about religion. It is all about religion to them, so they assume it is all about religion to you.

They believe in evolution, not because of science but in spite of science. Therefore, they assume you believe in religion not because of science, but in spite of science.

They have been indoctrinated by the public school system to equate evolution with science. They believe anyone who is against evolution is against science.

THE CREATION TIPS CLASSROOM

<http://www.creationtips.com/begin.pdf>

Clear, short answers on creation and evolution

This month's web site review looks at an article I found while searching the Internet for information about creation and evolution. The article, which is a pdf file, contains a short *Creation Tips* four-part course titled *Creationology for Beginners*. The four lessons are short and should take you only about 15 minutes to read. The lessons cover "some main points in the creation-evolution debate".

Lesson 1 answers the question "What's the difference between creation and evolution?" Here you will find definitions for creation scientists and evolutionists and what they believe.

Lesson 2 discusses three fatal flaws in evolution: 1) There is no known scientific law that allows something to evolve from nothing, 2) No scientific law can account for non-living things coming to life, and 3) There is no known scientific law that would allow one kind of creature to turn naturally into a completely different kind.

Lesson 3 asks the question "Is the evidence for creation better than evidence for evolution?" Here you will find a discussion of how evolutionists and creationists believe living things appeared on earth. Also you will find a discussion of what the fossil record shows.

Lesson 4 makes the point "Small changes don't prove evolution!" Here you will find a discussion that is often talked about on creation and evolution web sites and that is the difference between microevolution and macroevolution.

At the end of the lessons you will find a link to the Creation Tips website. The link is incorrect. The correct link is <http://www.creationtips.com>. Just follow the link to "learn more about creation science and more problems with evolutionary explanations."



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

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at **ScienceAgainstEvolution.org**.