

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 19 Issue 10 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info July 2015

DINOSAUR RETROSPECTIVE

The blockbuster movie, Jurassic World, highlights how much the "truth" about dinosaurs has changed over the years.

Jurassic World is breaking movie box office records, so this is a good time to look at how the "truth" about dinosaurs has changed over the years. Other articles in this month's newsletter review the latest scientific articles about dinosaur metabolism and Jurassic climate change. This article, however, is a personal stroll down memory lane, reminiscing about how dinosaurs have been portrayed on TV, in movies, museums, and amusement parks over the years.

JURASSIC WORLD VS. JURASSIC PARK

Since it is a sequel, there are many similarities between 1993's *Jurassic Park* and 2015's *Jurassic World*. Both movies begin with thought-provoking dialog about risk versus reward, safety versus profit, questioning the morality and wisdom of creating living things which may not integrate well with modern society, and so on. That dialog is the reason why I've watched the beginning of *Jurassic Park* several times. The beginning of *Jurassic World* is also worth watching multiple times for the same reason.

Both movies end with an excessively long, boring, predictable segment in which dinosaurs eat people who don't want to be eaten. If you fall asleep 30 minutes after the movie starts, you won't miss anything. (If you do stay awake, you might notice that more people are hurt by other people during the panic that ensues, than by the dinosaurs on the loose.)

How accurate is the portrayal of dinosaurs in *Jurassic World*? That's not a fair question

because the main dinosaur is one the scientists created through genetic modification, with no intention of accurately recreating an animal that ever existed. They just wanted to combine the most terrifying aspects of several different creatures to create the most terrifying dinosaur the world has ever known (or, more accurately, that the world had never known) to satisfy the public's craving for something new. It took a lot of intelligent design for the scientists to create *Indominus rex*. Blind chance didn't create such a terrible monster.

GENETIC ENGINEERING

"Dinosaur Jack" Horner, from Montana State University, is the go-to-guy *Jurassic World* used for technical advice. He was interviewed by *Nature*, and made this observation about genetic engineering:

How plausible is such a dino-hybrid?

Jurassic World is set in the future. If you can clone a dinosaur, you can modify its DNA and combine it with that of other animals. We already have lots of tools for modifying an animal. We have been breeding them for centuries. Now we are getting to the point where we can take genes out of one organism and put them into another, for example taking fluorescent genes out of jellyfish and putting them into the embryos of other animals to make them glow in the dark. The challenge is finding ways of changing a creature without killing it. And I think we will.¹

¹ *Nature*, 04 June 2015, "Q&A: The dinosaur doctor",

The more we learn about DNA modification, the more we learn that new functionality could not happen by chance, and that changes usually have fatal consequences.

ACCURATE REPRESENTATION

The supporting cast of dinosaurs was supposed to consist of accurate recreations of real dinosaurs; but the velociraptors were not feathered because,

The science has got ahead of the films, but we cannot really change the way the dinosaurs look. If suddenly the raptors had feathers, it would destroy consistency.²

They got it wrong (according to current consensus) on purpose! Horner also gave this revealing answer about how dinosaurs behaved:

They were more like robins than crocodiles. Their spikes and shields were too flimsy for fighting and were more likely to be for display, like the bony crests on some modern birds. Some dinosaurs had feathers and probably 'danced' like birds. ... I wrote a script once for a film where scientists come out of their time machine to see triceratops dancing and showing off their coloured shields. Nobody would go to that movie.³

Maybe in the sequel to *Jurassic World* there should be some dialog about the propriety of a theme park (or museum, or movie) intentionally misrepresenting science to avoid making the visitors uncomfortable by challenging their preconceived notions.

A TRADITION OF IGNORANCE

Museums and public attractions have a long tradition of playing fast and loose with science in order to please their guests. Perhaps the best example comes from Disneyland.

Fifty years ago, the 1964 New York World's Fair closed. When it did, Walt Disney moved *It's a Small World* and the *Grand Canyon/Primeval World* diorama (which could be called, *It's a Jurassic World* ©) from New York to Disneyland. In the former attraction, boats move people past moving dolls representing the stereotypical cultures of the world, reflecting the racist views of the time. In the latter, a railroad train moves people past moving dinosaur dolls representing the stereotypical primeval world, reflecting the scientific views of the time.

pp.32-33,
<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v522/n7554/full/522032a.html>

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

2

In Disneyland's *Grand Canyon/Primeval World* diorama, visitors are first taken past an accurate representation of the Grand Canyon as it appears today, with real taxidermy showing the animals living there today. But then, visitors are taken back in time to see what the Grand Canyon looked like millions of years ago.⁴ It looks real enough that one might really believe it accurately portrays the behavior of the dinosaurs living in the Grand Canyon back then, based on the dinosaur fossils found there.

There are just two problems. The first is that there is no fossil evidence that dinosaurs ever lived in the Grand Canyon. According to the National Park Service,

What about dinosaur fossils? Not at Grand Canyon! The rocks of the canyon are older than the oldest known dinosaurs.⁵

The rocks the Grand Canyon goes through are supposedly older than the dinosaurs, but last month *Science News* alleged the canyon itself is much younger.

Triceratops and Tyrannosaurus rex never peered over the Grand Canyon's steep slopes, new research suggests.

Estimates of the canyon's origins vary from under 6 million (*SN: 1/25/14, p. 22*) to more than 70 million years ago (*SN Online: 11/29/12*) — old enough for dino visitors. A comparison of the Colorado Plateau's rocky features now concludes that the older, western section of the canyon had to have been carved out much more recently than 12 million years ago.⁶

Second, the timing is all wrong (according to the evolutionary myth).

In 1966, the diorama was expanded with a prehistoric theme to become the "Grand Canyon/Primeval World" diorama, with Audio-Animatronic dinosaurs from Walt Disney's 1964 New York World's Fair attraction *Ford Magic Skyway*, where the diorama was viewed from a Ford Mustang convertible. The attraction was transferred to Disneyland in 1965. The dinosaurs include a Tyrannosaurus Rex, a Triceratops and a Stegosaurus, despite the fact that these animals lived millions of years apart.⁷

⁴ You can virtually experience the ride on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PQU1rAUYv_g

⁵ <http://www.nps.gov/grca/learn/nature/fossils.htm>

⁶ Thomas Sumner, *Science News*, June 18, 2015, "Dinosaurs may not have seen the Grand Canyon after all", <https://www.sciencenews.org/blog/science-ticker/dinosaurs-may-not-have-seen-grand-canyon-after-all>

⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disneyland_Railroad

One could argue that there are lots of other scientifically incorrect things in Disneyland—starting with the *Dumbo the Flying Elephant* ride—so it doesn't really matter. But when people are repeatedly exposed to mythical science at amusement parks, on TV, in movies, and in museums, they start to believe the myth. *It's a Small World* is just a ride—but it does reinforce the idea that Hawaiians don't do anything but surf and dance the hula. The ride ends when all the dolls wear white, and sing in perfect harmony. *It's a Small World* is just a ride—but it does teach subconscious racial lessons to young minds. Showing dinosaurs in the Grand Canyon also teaches subconscious lessons.

We don't mean to single out Disneyland as especially evil. I take my grandkids there every time they come to California. I love Disneyland. We just think Disneyland is a good example of how popular culture affects attitudes because so many people visit there every day. We could make the same point about Morrill Hall⁸ in Lincoln, Nebraska—but you've probably never been there to see it for yourself, so writing about Morrill Hall would not mean as much to you. Sadly, the natural history museum closest to you probably isn't much different from Disneyland or Morrill Hall.

PLASTIC TOY DINOSAURS

One of the characters in *Jurassic World* has some plastic toy dinosaurs on his console. Those things have been around for as long as I can remember. I had some, and knew everything there was to know about those dinosaurs because I read Roy Chapman Andrews book, *All About Dinosaurs*, in 1953. (If Andrews was not the model for the character, Indiana Jones, he certainly could have been.)



Although I lost my copy of *All About Dinosaurs*, years ago, I was able to find another one on the Internet. So, let's travel back to 1953, with plastic dinosaurs in hand, to see how much the "truth" about dinosaurs has changed. Here's what I learned from Andrews:

⁸ <http://museum.unl.edu/exhibits/index.html>

Triceratops

Of all the armored dinosaurs, Triceratops (*Tri-cer'-a-tops*) is the most interesting and spectacular. He belongs to the group known as Ceratopsia (*Cer-a-top'-si-a*). Of course, you know what an army tank looks like. Well, if Triceratops were alive, and standing at a distance in the grass, you might think he was a tank. You would see a thick, squat body, 30 feet long, and an enormous head ending in a great flared shield. From its center, two "guns" point forward. But as you come close, what appear to be the muzzles of machine guns, turn out to be a pair of long horns. On the nose, above the hooked, parrot-like beak, stands the third upright horn, shorter than the others. The three horns give it the name Triceratops. If you looked Triceratops squarely in the face, you would notice a thick guard of overhanging bone in front of each eye.

This dinosaur was a terrible fighting machine. None could stand against him except the King of Tyrants. I doubt if even that creature of destruction often attacked a Triceratops.⁹

Remember, we just quoted Jack Horner as saying, "Their spikes and shields were too flimsy for fighting and were more likely to be for display." Triceratops must have evolved stronger horns and shields in the last 62 years! ☺

Here are some other things I learned from Andrews' book:

Dinosaurs were cold-blooded reptiles related to crocodiles, snakes, and lizards. At one time they ruled the entire world.¹⁰

People often ask if there are any dinosaurs living today. The answer is, no. They all died out at the end of the Age of Reptiles.¹¹

Ape-like human beings did not exist until one million years ago.¹²

First, there are a few facts that must be explained. The earth is about two billion years old.¹³

The "fact" that dinosaurs were cold-blooded reptiles is disputed today, as we report in this month's *Evolution in the News* column, "Lukewarm Dinosaurs."

The "fact" that there are no dinosaurs living today has also been disputed.

⁹ Roy Chapman Andrews, *All About Dinosaurs*, 1953, Random House, pages 84-85

¹⁰ *ibid.* page 3

¹¹ *ibid.* page 6

¹² *ibid.* page 6

¹³ *ibid.* page 53

LUKEWARM DINOSAURS

The dinosaur body temperature compromise remains controversial.

In this month's feature article, we said that, sixty years ago, dinosaurs were known to be cold-blooded reptiles. Back then it was inferred that dinosaurs had to have been cold-blooded because they were so big they could not possibly eat enough food to nourish their huge bodies. Furthermore, big, warm-blooded animals produce lots of internal heat when moving, with proportionally less surface area to allow that heat to escape, so they would have had a "heat shedding" problem. **Dinosaurs could not be warm-blooded.**

A few years later, some scientists said **dinosaurs could not be cold-blooded** because a large cold-blooded animal could not absorb enough heat from the environment to remain active, especially in cold weather. Therefore, they must have been warm-blooded, like birds.

We examined this long-standing controversy last August¹⁷, partly because of an article that ran in *Science* just a few weeks previous to that newsletter. That *Science* article stated,

Over the past few decades, the original characterization of dinosaurs by early paleontologists as lumbering, slow-metabolizing **ectotherms [cold-blooded animals]** has been challenged. Recent studies propose that dinosaurs were capable of an active lifestyle and were metabolically similar to **endothermic [warm-blooded]** mammals and birds.

... recent advances in metabolic theory provide a theoretical framework for evaluating metabolic rate on the basis of growth.

...
We used a comparative approach to characterize the energetics of dinosaurs and other extinct taxa. We examined the empirical and **theoretical relationship between growth and resting metabolic rate**, using a broad database of major vertebrate clades, and used our results to examine the energetics of Mesozoic dinosaurs.

Birds are dinosaurs not just because they evolved from dinosaurs, but because they are more closely related to some of the extinct dinosaurs than those dinosaurs are to each other! So next time that someone tells you that dinosaurs are extinct, you can tell them that, actually, **there are probably more species of dinosaur alive today than there were in the Mesozoic!**¹⁴

Evolutionists now believe that ape-like creatures really did exist one million years ago. In fact,

The new Ethiopian fossil, announced online by the journal *Science*, pushes **the arrival of Homo** on the East African landscape back almost half a million years, to **2.8 million years ago**. The date is tantalizingly close to the last known appearance, around three million years ago, of *Australopithecus afarensis*, an upright-walking, small-brained species best known from the skeleton called Lucy, believed by many scientists to be the direct ancestor of our genus. The new jaw, known as LD 350-1, was found in January 2013 just a dozen miles from where Lucy was found in 1974.¹⁵

Nobody (neither creationists nor evolutionists) believes that **the Earth is 2 billion years old**. According to evolutionists,

The age of the Earth is 4.54 ± 0.05 billion years.¹⁶

We anticipate getting emails from people saying, **"Well, that's just what they believed in 1953. We know better, now!"** We suspect that in 2077 people will laugh at what today's evolutionists say, and casually dismiss it by saying, **"Well, that's just what they believed in 2015, We know better now!"**

People believed Newton's Three Laws of Motion in 1687, and they still believe them today. That's because Newton's Laws were discovered and proved by experimental science. **Consensus about when dinosaurs lived, how they lived, their metabolic rate, and why they went extinct, is just constantly changing speculation. Consensus is not science.** Consensus is for evolution; but science is against evolution.

¹⁴ <http://paleocave.sciencesortof.com/2013/06/why-are-birds-dinosaurs/>

¹⁵ Jamie Shreeve, *National Geographic*, March 5, 2015, "Oldest Human Fossil Found, Redrawing Family Tree", <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2015/03/150304-homo-habilis-evolution-fossil-jaw-ethiopia-olduvai-gorge/>

¹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_Earth

¹⁷ *Disclosure*, August 2014, "Dinosaur Delusions", <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.info/v18i11f.htm>

From empirical studies, we constructed ontogenetic growth curves and determined a maximum rate of growth for each species. Environmental temperature was standardized by only considering growth rates in ectotherms from tropical and subtropical climates or from laboratory settings between 24° and 30°C, comparable to temperatures experienced by dinosaurs during the Mesozoic.

Our results find that mass-independent growth rates in dinosaurs were intermediate to, and significantly different from, those of endothermic [warm-blooded] and ectothermic [cold-blooded] taxa (table S2). Although some dinosaur growth rates overlap with high-power ectotherms or low-power endotherms, they cluster closest to energetically and thermally intermediate taxa, such as tuna (Fig. 2). Further, our analyses uphold the somewhat surprising finding that feathered dinosaurs, including protoavian *Archaeopteryx*, did not grow markedly differently from other dinosaurs (Fig. 4). It appears that modern avian energetics did not coincide with feathers or flight, which is consistent with fossil evidence that modern bone histology in birds did not appear until the late Cretaceous.

Past work has often struggled to fit dinosaurs into a simple energetic dichotomy; our work suggests that an intermediate view is more likely. Although dinosaur growth rates vary, they cluster most closely to those of thermally intermediate taxa (Figs. 1 and 2), which we term mesotherms. Mesothermic tuna, lamnid sharks, and the leatherback turtle rely on metabolic heat to raise their body temperature (T_b) above the ambient temperature (T_a) but do not metabolically defend a thermal set point as endotherms do. This reliance on metabolic heat distinguishes them from other large homeothermic reptiles, such as crocodiles, which bask to elevate T_b .¹⁸

At the risk of oversimplifying their argument, here's what they claim in plain English. Bones have growth rings sort of like tree rings. They claim to be able to determine the rate of growth of an animal by looking at these rings, and they believe they can accurately correlate body temperature with growth rate, assuming what the atmospheric temperature was at the time. Their conclusion was that dinosaurs were passive, cold-blooded creatures most of the time; but they could burn fats and sugars when necessary to become

¹⁸ John M. Grady, *Science*, 13 June 2014, "Evidence for mesothermy in dinosaurs", pp. 1268-1272, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/344/6189/1268.full>

active, warm-blooded creatures for short periods of time.

(In *Jurassic World*, the fictional dinosaur *Indominus rex* was just the opposite. Most of the time, she was warm-blooded; but she could intentionally become cold-blooded in order to hide from infrared cameras by assuming the same temperature as the environment.)

Grady's medium-temperature (neither warm-blooded nor cold-blooded) metabolic compromise prompted this reaction from D'Emic and Myhrvold:

ABSTRACT

Grady *et al.* (Reports, 13 June 2014, p. 1268) suggested that nonavian dinosaur [that is, dinosaurs that weren't actually birds] metabolism was neither endothermic nor ectothermic but an intermediate physiology termed "mesothermic." However, rates were improperly scaled and phylogenetic, physiological, and temporal categories of animals were conflated during analyses. Accounting for these issues suggests that nonavian dinosaurs were on average as endothermic as extant placental mammals.¹⁹

The body of the rebuttal goes on to say,

Improper conversion from annual to daily time scales leads to underestimation of the growth rates of extinct animals such as dinosaurs.

Estimating the duration of growth within a year from bone tissue is a complex topic for future skeletochronological research to address. Just as scaling down from annual to daily growth rates is not straightforward, scaling up of daily growth rates can be misleading.

In other words, the regression computed by Grady *et al.* [figure 1 in (1)] conflated clades with other categories of animals. A fairer comparison would be to compare clades only, which would mean including birds within Dinosauria, a category that would overlap the distribution of mammalian data (Fig. 1D).²⁰

D'Emic said that Grady's analysis is wrong. He used a mathematical argument only someone with a PhD in statistics could understand (which we mercifully did not inflict upon you). Grady responded with an equally obtuse mathematical argument, accusing Myhrvold of misapplying

¹⁹ M. D. D'Emic, *Science*, 29 May 2015, "Comment on 'Evidence for mesothermy in dinosaurs'", p. 982, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/348/6238/982.2.full?sid=940b2687-402e-4cd8-bdff-9cf5a5dac524>

²⁰ *ibid.*

statistical techniques, with a small concession at the end.

Subsequent analyses by Myhrvold to reassess the relationship between basal metabolic rate and growth are conceptually flawed.

Characterization of dinosaur growth offers a rare metric for assessing paleoenergetics because growth is a continuous, quantitative trait that can be directly linked to metabolism and body temperature. Our analyses suggest that dinosaurs were energetically intermediate and that mesothermy was likely widespread. Despite our disagreements, we concur with both that dinosaur growth studies have room for improvement.²¹

We did not report this earlier because although *Science* received the comment by D'Emic and Myhrvold for publication on 15 August 2014, and Grady responded on 5 September 2014, both letters weren't published until 29 May 2015. We don't know why, after holding these comments for so many months, *Science* finally decided to print them.

Although we don't know why *Science* waited so long to publish the rebuttal and re-rebuttal, we can tell you why we mention them now. Quite simply, the June newsletter was already finished on 29 May, and we knew the July newsletter would be all about dinosaurs. That explains our timing; but not the reason for publishing this column.

Here's the take-away from the whole discussion: Scientists still don't agree as to whether dinosaurs were warm-blooded, cold-blooded, or mesothermic—and they probably never will because there aren't any dinosaurs left (except birds ☺) whose temperatures can be measured. It is all unverifiable speculation—which isn't science. As long as somebody is willing to finance the research, there are people who will take the money and come up with a new conclusion.

(And, as an aside, the fact that one has to assume a radically different climate before humans started causing climate change, strongly suggests that climate change might not be the result of human activity—but nobody really wants to open that can of worms! ☺)

²¹ Grady, *et al.*, *Science*, 29 May 2015, "Response to Comments on 'Evidence for mesothermy in dinosaurs'", p. 982, <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/348/6238/982.4.full?sid=940b2687-402e-4cd8-bdff-9cf5a5dac524>

DINOSAUR EXTINCTION

Why did all the dinosaurs die?

The big question when I was growing up was, "What killed the dinosaurs?" Over the years, the question has remained—but the answer keeps changing.

The answer I was taught in 1953 was, "The mammals killed them all off."

Near the end of the Age of Reptiles, the warm-blooded mammals began to appear. These were tiny little furry fellows, no larger than a rat. At the Flaming Cliffs we found skulls and skeletons of eight of these little mammals. It is quite possible that they ate the dinosaur eggs. Thus many dinosaurs were never born. This must have happened in many parts of the world.²²

It was the politically correct answer at the time because it proved Darwin was right. It was proof that survival of the fittest caused mammals to drive dinosaurs to extinction.

Younger students have been taught this explanation:

The Cretaceous–Paleogene (K–Pg) extinction event, also known as the Cretaceous–Tertiary (K–T) extinction. ...

As originally proposed by a team of scientists led by Luis Alvarez, it is now generally believed that the K–Pg extinction was triggered by a massive comet/asteroid impact and its catastrophic effects on the global environment, including a lingering impact winter that made it impossible for plants and plankton to carry out photosynthesis. The impact hypothesis was bolstered by the discovery of the 180-kilometre-wide (112 mi) Chicxulub crater in the Gulf of Mexico in the early 1990s, which provided conclusive evidence that the K–Pg boundary clay represented debris from an asteroid impact. The fact that the extinctions occurred at the same time as the impact provides strong situational evidence that the K–Pg extinction was caused by the asteroid.²³

²² Roy Chapman Andrews, *All About Dinosaurs*, 1953, Random House, page 140

²³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cretaceous%E2%80%93Paleogene_extinction_event

This explanation was even more politically correct because it blames climate change, and helped to explain how so much evolution could have happened so quickly.

Yet the devastation caused by the extinction also provided evolutionary opportunities. In the wake of the extinction, many groups underwent remarkable adaptive radiations — a sudden and prolific divergence into new forms and species within the disrupted and emptied ecological niches resulting from the event.²⁴

But now the political need is for the American public to be even more frightened by the terrible danger of climate change. Therefore, the dinosaur demise must be blamed primarily upon the climate change before the asteroid impact! (The asteroid just finished the job.)

Well before an asteroid struck the planet some 66 million years ago, Earth was already in turmoil, a record from an ancient lakebed in northeastern China suggests. Investigators knew from ocean floor sediments that the climate was unstable at the end of the Cretaceous period, when the dinosaurs were making their last stand. But findings from deep drilling in the Songliao Basin, presented at a conference here this spring, show that the climate swings on land were far more drastic, with average annual temperatures going up or down by as much as 20°C [68°F] over tens of thousands of years—a geological eyeblink. “It certainly wasn’t a good time for the dinosaurs,” says Robert Spicer, a paleoclimatologist at the Open University in Milton Keynes, U.K.

...
The intense greenhouse effect drove average temperatures to about 22.3°C [72.14°F] — compared with 5°C [41°F] at Songliao today. Adding to the climate turmoil, the warming was interrupted just after the K-Pg boundary by a brief cooling episode, which the team attributes to dust, soot, and aerosols from the Yucatán impact.

...
Paleontologists suspect that dinosaurs were feeling the stress. In a review last August in *The Geological Society of America Special Papers*, paleontologist David Archibald of San Diego State University and colleagues noted that the number of nonavian dinosaur species shrank by half in the last 10 million years of the Cretaceous, with the biggest losses occurring in the Maastrichtian. The Chicxulub impact was, Wang says, “the straw that broke the camel’s back.” Put another way, Spicer says, “if the asteroid came in on a less stressed system, the

effects would not have been so severe.”²⁵

Not only did climate change cause the death of the dinosaurs—it almost prevented them from evolving in the first place!

Dinosaurs once dominated the world — but they spent their first 30 million years stranded on its geographic fringes. Large dinosaurs flourished near the poles, but only a few small ones, no larger than ostriches, managed to gain a foothold in the hotter low latitudes.

The latest research suggests that an unstable climate in these regions kept big dinosaurs at bay for millions of years, as conditions at lower latitudes swung violently between wet and dry periods.

The finding is based on a detailed climate history reconstructed from sedimentary rock in New Mexico that dates from about 215–205 million years ago, during the late Triassic period. Back then, the area sat just north of the equator, roughly where Costa Rica is today. The region was dominated by archaic reptiles (some related to crocodiles), with only a few small dinosaur species present.²⁶

Dinosaurs lived near the poles because the world was much hotter before man-made global warming.

NO CLIMATE CHANGE POSITION

Science Against Evolution takes no official position on climate change (even though I have privately²⁷).

We only mention climate change as an example, showing that politics drives “science.” Scientists have produced contradictory analyses that “prove” that human activity causes climate change, and “prove” the climate change was even greater before man existed. Human responsibility depends entirely upon political need.

We don’t claim that money causes honest scientists to change their minds—but funding is given to scientists who already believe what the sponsor wants to hear, and not to scientists who will produce evidence that contradicts the sponsor’s belief.

²⁵ Jane Qiu, *Science*, 12 June 2015, “Dinosaur climate probed”, p. 1185, [http://www.sciencemag.org/content/348/6240/1185.full?sid=940b2687-402e-4cd8-bdff-9cf5a5dac524Vol.348 no. 6240](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/348/6240/1185.full?sid=940b2687-402e-4cd8-bdff-9cf5a5dac524Vol.348%20no.%206240)

²⁶ Douglas Fox, *Nature*, 15 June 2015, “Extreme climate change slowed dinosaurs’ rise”, <http://www.nature.com/news/extreme-climate-change-slowed-dinosaurs-rise-1.17728>

²⁷ Do-While Jones, “Belief in Global Warming”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/dwj/warming.htm>

²⁴ *ibid.*

COMPARING CREATION AND EVOLUTION

<http://michael.oards.net/CreationVsEvolution.htm>

Flood/Ice Age Research

This month's web site review looks at a site that provides an interesting comparison of creation and evolution. The main page of the site provides tabs with the titles: 1) Home; 2) Models; 3) Response to Critics; 4) Resources; 5) Discussion; 6) About; and 7) Links. The "Comparing Creation and Evolution" article is found on the Discussion tab with the title "Creation vs Evolution."

The introduction to the article states that, "We often hear that the evidence for evolution is 'overwhelming,' and that no serious scientist actually questions evolution as a historical and scientific fact. This teaching pervades our society, saturating the media and public education." The article seeks to provide some arguments that should "challenge the thinking and assumptions of both scientists and informed laypersons."

After the introduction the website reader will find a discussion on Evolutionism and Theistic evolution. Here you will find some interesting insights into the problems evolutionists face when they try to answer basic questions such as "Where do we get our ideas of right and wrong, good or evil? and, "Where does our very consciousness come from?" How the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) seeks to address these problems is discussed.

What follows in the article is a brief overview of sixteen points which cover certain topics and concepts. The points include: 1) Evolution and Creation Defined; 2) Fossil Record; 3) Simple vs. Complex; 4) Four Basics; 5) Variation is Not Evolution; 6) Carbon-14 Indicates Fossils are Young; 7) Massive Fossil Graveyard Indicates Extensive Flood; 8) Dinosaur Remains Not So Old? 9) Aftermath of Mt. Saint Helens' Eruptions; 10) The Dating Game; 11) The Laetoli Footprints; 12) Evolutionary Development (Evo Devo); 13) Antibiotic Resistance; 14) Peppered Moths; 15) Complex Relationships; and 16) Genesis is Ancient Hebrew Narrative.

There is much to explore on this web site. On the Models tab you will find descriptions of a Flood Model and an Ice Age Model to explain these events. On the Resources tab you will find links to many articles that provide insight into many different topics related to the creation versus evolution controversy. On the About tab you can learn why the author of the web site became a creationist. As always, just explore the site to find topics of interest.



**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.info.