

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 13 Issue 7 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

April 2009

EVOLUTION SUPERSTITION

This is our annual special issue celebrating National Theory of Evolution Day (April 1), in which we give the theory of evolution all the respect that it deserves. This year we celebrate with a more highly evolved version of Stevie Wonder's 1972 hit song, Superstition.

When it comes to evolution
You believe it all.
Fish in shallow water
Somehow learned to crawl.

Chorus:

When you believe in things
You don't understand,
There's nothing dumber.
Evolution ain't the way.

Methane and ammonia
Fill the atmosphere.
Smells like dirty diapers
But soon life does appear.
Countless years of good luck
Changing DNA.
Scales turn into feathers
So birds can fly away.

(Repeat chorus)

Making spears and fire
To kill and roast a pig.
All that clever hunting
Makes ape-man brains grow big.
You aren't allowed to question
What scientists say.
But the "truth" that they are teaching
Changes every day.

(Repeat chorus)

It's just superstition
It's not true at all.
To force kids to believe it
Takes a lot of gall.
It isn't really science
They are teaching you.
It's just superstition
Too silly to be true.

When you believe in things
You don't understand,
You're going to suffer
Superstition ain't the way.

Download Death Valley Dave's recording ¹ of this song (for free, without restrictions) at <http://scienceagainstevolution.org/music/EvSuper.mp3>.

Foolish Email

FOOL OF THE MONTH

Our goal is to make fun of the theory of evolution, without making fun of the evolutionists themselves. But, in honor of April Fool's Day, we are printing a typical email from an evolutionist to let him make a fool of himself.

This particular email came from the United Kingdom. Apparently the British spend so much time teaching evolution, they don't have time to teach English. The only changes we made to his email were to delete his last name and email address, and mark his errors with "[sic]".

Subject: Your site

From: josh [sic]

Date: Mon, 23 Mar 2009

I've read some of the site's articles, and quite frankly im [sic] sickened by the bias, unscientific, non concistant [sic], illogical shit that you guys pour out.

The sad thing is, most idiots beleive [sic] you.

I guess the only good thing is, the people who actually matter; [sic] the intellects [sic], don't.

Good luck in indoctrinating more retards.
Yours, josh. [sic]

Josh apparently thought that his insightful, well-written email would convince us of the truth of the theory of evolution. It didn't.

¹ Lead guitar, rhythm guitar, bass guitar, and keyboard tracks played by R. David Pogge, recorded at Sidewinder City Studio, Ridgecrest, California.

MORMON EVOLUTIONISTS

We are glad to clarify some statements we made about the religions that accept and reject evolution.

Last month we were hoping to get at least one email like Ron's. We wanted someone else to make this point, and give us the opportunity to expand on it. Ron's email was the best. (Thanks, too, to the rest of you who sent us similar emails.)

Hi Dave.

Another great newsletter. Just a quick comment regarding "Darwin's Makeover," and particularly the statement "So, the theory of evolution is accepted by Mormons and Catholics."

I happen to be a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon), and will tell you that evolution is *not* accepted as a theory of the Church. We believe in the creation, and "no death before the fall."

The CES (Church Education System) is an official program of the Church (throughout the world). CES is also taught in religion classes at BYU. The professors at BYU do not speak for the Church. The Church actually has very clear, concise, doctrinal language regarding macroevolution.

[Ron included here some official church references rejecting evolution, which we have deleted.]

BYU is an accredited University, so it is only there (biology) do you find professors who propagate teaching evolution. They are not leaders of the Church nor represent the Church in any way. *Everything* I have seen officially published by the Church, does not concur with what they teach -- especially apes-to-man. I spent two years debating a [BYU] Ph.D. [professor] via email (which is actually how I first became familiar with your site from looking up information on biogenesis). In the end, he had nothing published by the Church to show me as evidence that he was even close to being aligned with Church doctrine. On the other hand, everything I presented to him was from Church published materials.

So, when I saw this, I just wanted to make it absolutely clear that Mormons do not believe in macroevolution or Darwin's theory. Thanks,
Ron

Now that that's clear, let's take this opportunity to repeat what we said last month.

Therefore, we could argue that teaching evolution in public schools promotes the Mormon and Catholic faiths and discriminates against the Jewish and Islamic faiths. We could make that argument, but we won't because it is totally bogus. It is just as bogus as the argument that teaching Intelligent Design advances some vague religious notions.

That's what we said last month, with exactly that emphasis.

We wanted to emphasize this bogus argument because it was the basis of the lawsuit *Kitzmiller, et al. v. Dover School District, et al.*² and a major theme in the Nova program *Judgment Day: Intelligent Design on Trial*. In that trial, and in the TV program about that trial, it was claimed that mentioning the possibility of Intelligent Design is an unconstitutional attempt to get religion into the public school system because the people who support Intelligent Design secretly believe the Bible (even though Intelligent Design neither specifies God as the designer, nor uses any Biblical references).

The judge decided that one could infer religious intentions because some (but not all) of the people supporting Intelligent Design are Jews and Christians. We were trying to show that argument to be bogus because it is possible to name a Mormon who believes in evolution and teaches it at BYU. It does NOT logically follow that teaching evolution in the public schools is motivated by a desire to teach Mormonism in the public schools. That would be an absurd conclusion. But, a judge looking for a lame excuse to prohibit the teaching of evolution could use statements by professor Whiting as justification.

Ironically, the Nova program almost made the same point. Some of the teachers, parents, and members of the school board who wanted evolution taught without any criticism identified themselves as Christians. They claimed that evolution has nothing to do with religion.

Evolutionists like to have it both ways. When it suits their purposes, they say that religion and science deal with completely different subject areas and have nothing to do with each other. But whenever scientific arguments against the theory of evolution are raised, then evolutionists claim that those arguments are thinly disguised attempts to get religion into the science class.

The Catholic church has endorsed evolution for more than 50 years, and yet many Catholics believe in creation. The person who argued in favor of evolution most strenuously with me at the Community Dinner last fall was a retired Presbyterian minister, but many Presbyterians are creationists. You can find evolutionists and creationists in every major religion, no matter what the official church policy (if any) says about the subject. Therefore, honest critical analysis of the theory of evolution is not simply a religious dogma. Evolutionists simply use the religious argument because they can't win the scientific

² <http://www.pamd.uscourts.gov/kitzmiller/docket.htm>

argument.

ACCREDITATION CONSPIRACY

There is an important sentence in Ron's email that we can't overlook.

BYU is an accredited University, so it is only there (biology) do you find professors who propagate teaching evolution.

Some parents send their children to a private college or university run by their own denomination so that their children won't be taught secular theories and values that conflict with their religion. They are shocked when they discover that their children have been taught evolution at their own church-supported school. I personally know of people who have complained bitterly to the administrators of a particular Christian college about the teaching of evolution there. I have heard that this is a common complaint of parents who send their children to colleges and universities run by other denominations as well.

These colleges and universities (run by denominations that don't believe in evolution) teach evolution because they must to be accredited. We received the following email alert from the American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS].

Evolution News. As the Texas State Board of Education draws closer to finalizing the state's new science standards in late March, Texas legislators are pursuing legislation related to the evolution issue. HB 4224 would return controversial "strengths and weaknesses" language to the science standards. HB 2800 would exempt certain institutions from following state regulations on granting degrees; this is geared toward allowing the Institute for Creation Research to offer a master's degree in science education, a program rejected by a state board in 2008.³

Evolution must be taught to be accredited. Most colleges and universities buckle under and teach things they know to be false, just to get accredited. ICR is one of the very few organizations that is not willing to compromise to get accredited. **If they win this battle, perhaps other private colleges and universities can be free to teach the strengths and weaknesses of the theory of evolution.** That would be a good thing!

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

³ AAAS Policy Alert -- 18 March 2009

WHY EVOLUTION IS TRUE

Evolutionists have finally published an explanation of why evolution must be true.

We have often said that the creation/evolution controversy could easily be settled if an evolutionist would simply put forth a reasonable, scientific explanation for how the theory of evolution could possibly be true. That's why we were excited to read this:

It had to be done, and Jerry Coyne is unquestionably one of the most qualified people for the job. I am referring to a clear, engaging, accessible explanation of the evidence for evolution, an aspect of the so-called evolution-creation "controversy" that is too often neglected. There are, of course, plenty of books criticizing creationism and its cousin intelligent design as well as works aiming to explain the creationist phenomenon within the broader context of American anti-intellectualism. We can also easily find plenty of superb books for the public about various aspects of evolutionary biology even beyond the classical essays by Stephen Gould and Richard Dawkins. And yet, it is hard to get one's hands on a good non-college-level presentation of why evolution is, as they say, both a theory and a fact. Coyne's *Why Evolution Is True* begins to fill this obvious lacuna, even though--just like in other branches of science--additional popular writing by scientists and well-informed journalists on evolution will be welcome for many years to come.

The first eight chapters span pretty much everything one may want to know about evolution but, apparently, so few dare to explain.⁴

Notice that Pigliucci did not say, "Of the many excellent books explaining why the theory of evolution must be true, this is one of the best." No, he implicitly agrees with us when he says, "it is hard to get one's hands on a good non-college-level presentation of why evolution is, as they say, both a theory and a fact." So few dare to explain everything one may want to know about evolution because they can't do it. As it turns out, Coyne can't do it either, but we are getting ahead of ourselves.

⁴ Massimo Pigliucci, *Science*, 5 February 2009, "EVOLUTION: The Overwhelming Evidence", page 716

We hoped there might be some merit to Coyne's book, but were somewhat skeptical when Pigliucci made this comment about what he thought was the most compelling argument in the book.

But it takes a particularly obtuse mind to look at the figure [showing human, *Australopithecus afarensis*, and chimpanzee] and reject the notions that *A. afarensis* is a member of the human lineage and that we and chimps have evolved from a common ancestor. Then again, there is no dearth of obtuse minds when it comes to creationism.⁵

A creationist might well say, "But it takes a particularly obtuse mind to look at the complexity of living things and reject the notions that life is the product of conscious design. Then again, there is no dearth of obtuse minds when it comes to evolutionism." But a creationist probably would not say that, because creationists tend to be more polite.

We must question the judgment of anyone who thinks that the statement, "It looks like it must have evolved," is more valid than, "It looks like it must have been created." These are both simply subjective statements—just opinions that reveal bias more than anything else.

Pigliucci goes on to say,

The problem with the creation-evolution issue, however, is that it is not about the evidence. The clash is not a scientific debate, it is a social controversy. Coyne understands this, and he begins his last chapter by recounting the story of a public lecture he gave about evolution and intelligent design. ... Coyne admits that the issue goes far beyond science, into philosophy and questions of meaning and morality.⁶

We will have more to say about this later, but for now we just want to point out that both Pigliucci and Coyne recognize that the debate isn't really about science, and that they think the evidence doesn't really matter.

Nonetheless, we must present the evidence, and Jerry Coyne's book does an excellent job of it.⁷

We think the evidence is all that matters. They rather grudgingly present the evidence because they know the evidence isn't on their side. It is important to note, however, that Pigliucci thinks Coyne does a good job of presenting the evidence.

The editors of the peer-reviewed journal, *Nature*, said,

A GOOD BOOK Jerry Coyne, a staunch opponent of creationism, marshals the arguments in support of evolutionary theory in an accessible yet authoritative book, *Why Evolution is True*. Particularly strong, says reviewer Eugenie Scott, is the section contrasting transitional and ancestral fossils. A good choice for the teacher who wants to know more about evolutionary biology, says Scott.⁸

In particular, Scott said,

Jerry Coyne, an accomplished population geneticist at the University of Chicago in Illinois, has devoted much time recently to attacking creationism. His articles in popular publications neatly dissect the scientific claims of the creationists, clearly showing their logical and empirical failings. In *Why Evolution is True*, he shifts his concerns to demonstrate to an open-minded reader the strength of evolutionary biology. The book is one long argument for why the theory so often associated with Charles Darwin should — as much as any other well-founded scientific explanation — be recognized as true.⁹

That sounds nice and unbiased, doesn't it?

It remains a dismal truth that in the United States, almost half of the population does not accept the common ancestry of humans and chimpanzees; anti-evolution sentiments are also manifest in the rest of the developed world, albeit less virulently. Coyne's book will be a good choice to give to the neighbour or teacher who wants to know more about evolutionary biology. Lamentably, his book is still needed.¹⁰

There is a reason why we are reviewing book reviews. It certainly isn't to show how unbiased Coyne and his reviewers are! ☺ We need to establish the fact that evolutionists have published reviews in respected, peer-reviewed journals saying that Coyne's book is good. Otherwise, you might think we are just tearing apart a book that even evolutionists say is filled with nonsense. No, this is The Great White Hope that evolutionists wish will finally defeat creationism. It's their current champion. It's the best they've got. It is sort of pathetic, in a way.

This month, we are going to give you an overview of the book, intentionally ignoring the details. Next month we will examine the alleged

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *Nature*, 5 March 2009, "This Issue", page 4

⁹ Eugenie Scott, *Nature*, 5 March 2009, "Primed for evolution", page 34

¹⁰ *ibid.*

evidence in favor of evolution presented in the book. But, as has already been stipulated, evidence doesn't matter to evolutionists. They are more concerned with social ramifications, and that's primarily what Coyne's book is about.

THE REASON

The title of the book is, "Why Evolution is True," so one might legitimately wonder, "What is the reason evolution must be true?" Suppose you assigned every student in a high school biology class to read this book and, in just one sentence, tell why (according to Coyne) the theory of evolution must be true. That would be an interesting experiment. Here's how we predict nearly every student would answer: "Evolution is true because creationism is false." There might be some other answers, but we can't imagine what they would be.

The first chapter of the book is nothing more than an attack on creationism. The last chapter in the book is nothing more than an attack on creationism. Sprinkled throughout the rest of the book are attacks on the wisdom and capability of an unspecified intelligent designer.

MALICE IN THE FIRST DEGREE

Why is a book about evolution filled with so much about creationism? We would have to know Coyne's motives, and motives are hard to judge. We would normally hesitate to do that, except for the fact that Coyne himself makes such an issue about motives. The first chapter is devoted to *Kitzmiller, et al. v. Dover School District, et al.*¹¹, in which Judge Jones ruled that the motive for criticizing the theory of evolution is nothing more than an attempt to get Christian values into the public school system.

Judges routinely make decisions about motive. "Did the accused kill the victim?" is only part of the decision. It also matters whether the accused killed the victim by accident, or intentionally on the spur of the moment, or planned the crime for months in advance, to determine whether it is third, second, or first degree murder.

Presumably, students in law school learn how to establish motive. It would be an interesting exercise for a law school class to assign two students to argue whether or not Coyne intended his book to be an attack on religions that believe the Genesis account of creation. We pity the student assigned to argue that Coyne had no religious motivation. Coyne clearly wants to protect evolution from the "threat" of religion, and feels he needs to discredit religion to do it.

OTHER POSSIBILITIES

Apparently, in Coyne's mind, there are only two possible alternatives—Biblical creation and evolution. He never mentions Greek mythology, Norse mythology, Egyptian creation stories, Native American beliefs, or even the Multiverse theory. (There is a "scientific" belief based on quantum physics and superstring theory that there isn't just one universe—there are billions of them. Every time a decision is made, the universe splits into two, each one following a different decision path. So, there is another universe just like ours in which John McCain is president. We were created by whatever quantum physics force causes new universes to pop into existence.)

Coyne never makes the argument that evolution is true because Greek mythology is wrong. We think it is instructive to speculate upon two reasons why he didn't do that.

First, it should be clear to all that proving that Greek mythology is wrong doesn't prove that evolution is right. It is just as true that proving creation is wrong doesn't prove that evolution is right. Therefore, all his attacks on creationism and intelligent design have nothing to do with why evolution is true, and have no place in a book with that title.

We have received more emails than we can count saying, "Just because you prove evolution is wrong doesn't prove creation is right." Our answer is, "We agree. But we aren't trying to prove creation is right. We are simply examining the theory of evolution from a purely scientific basis, and find that the evidence is overwhelmingly against it. We don't present, or evaluate, any other competing theory of origins."

So, let's be perfectly clear: Proving evolution wrong does not prove creation is right; and proving creation is wrong doesn't prove evolution is right. This is significant because Coyne devotes a large portion of his book to disproving creationism/intelligent design. Therefore, a large portion of his book is logically irrelevant.

The second reason we suspect that Coyne doesn't try to prove Greek mythology is wrong is because he doesn't consider Greek mythology to be a credible explanation for how life began. We are reasonably certain that he doesn't believe that the Norse or Egyptian creation stories are credible explanations, either. He never mentions those creation stories, but he always comes back to intelligent design, which he considers to be creationism in disguise. Would he do that if he didn't (at least subconsciously) think intelligent design is a credible alternative?

¹¹<http://www.pamd.uscourts.gov/kitzmiller/docket.htm>

SCIENCE VERSES RELIGION

Depending upon what suits their immediate purpose, evolutionists sometimes argue that there is no conflict between religion and science, and other times argue that religion is anti-science. Which is it?

We aren't aware of any ancient Greek scientists (Hippocrates, Euclid, Archimedes, Pythagoras, etc) who wrote so vehemently against the Greek pantheon of gods. When it comes right down to it, what you think about Zeus has nothing to do with whether or not the sum of the squares of two sides of a right triangle equals the square of its hypotenuse. Belief in Osiris didn't prevent the Egyptians from building remarkable pyramids. Newton's theological works don't negate his laws of motion. In countless cases there is no conflict between science and religion.

There is, however, a fundamental conflict between the theory of evolution and religions that accept the Genesis account of creation. But that isn't really a conflict between science and religion—it is a conflict between the theory of evolution and science, and some religions. Despite what evolutionists would like you to believe, evolution isn't science. The theory of evolution is the creation myth of secular humanism, so the creation/evolution debate is a purely religious debate.

FOOLISH EGYPTOLOGY

Since this is April, and we are in an even more light-hearted mood than usual, let us put tongue firmly in cheek and apply Coyne's foolish logic to Egyptology, just to show how foolish it is. Coyne's book is filled with statements like these:

It doesn't seem so intelligent to design millions of species that are destined to go extinct, and then replace them with other, similar species, most of which will also vanish.¹²

Wouldn't it be odd if a creator helped an ostrich balance itself by giving it appendages that just happened to look exactly like reduced wings, and which are constructed in exactly the same way as wings used for flying?¹³

Why would a creator put a pathway for making vitamin C in all these species, and then deactivate it?¹⁴

We won't bore you with more such statements. It is clear from these examples that one general

theme is that an intelligent designer would not have designed something so badly. Let's apply that same logic to Hatshepsut's obelisk.



Please look at the picture. You can see that it isn't perfect. An intelligent designer would have made the sides perfectly straight, without all those broken edges. Furthermore, why would an intelligent designer go to all the trouble to carve it out of granite near Aswan and float it all the way down the Nile to Luxor? Not only that, it is nothing short of miraculous that Egyptians could have stood that obelisk up on end without modern equipment without breaking

it. Since it doesn't make sense that Hatshepsut would (or could) have done these things, it must be the result of a natural process, probably erosion.

The second common theme in Coyne's book is that living things that look similar have similar genes.

Only evolution and common ancestry can explain these facts.¹⁵

Genetic information, he believes, arises by chance over countless generations. He believes the fact that information appears to be the result of intelligent action is just an illusion. And so it is in the more than fifty caves (erroneously called, "tombs") in the Valley of the Kings. These caves are decorated with similar hieroglyphs, many of which are excerpts from the Egyptian Book of the Dead. If these hieroglyphs had been intentionally painted on the walls of these caves, they would all contain all of the chapters of the Book of the Dead. Furthermore, some of them would not be so faint and incomplete. (But they are not so faint and incomplete that we can't see their common ancestry.) The same hieroglyphs appear in all the caves. Clearly there must be some unknown natural force that causes hieroglyphs to appear on stone surfaces such as these so-called "tombs" and obelisks. Understanding this unknown natural force is essential to all scientific knowledge.

Although Coyne recognizes the difference between evolution and devolution, he apparently doesn't think the difference matters. If a bird loses the ability to fly because of some random mutation, he considers it to be proof that the ability to fly can arise by accident.

¹² Coyne, *Why Evolution is True*, 2009, page 12

¹³ *ibid.*, page 58

¹⁴ *ibid.*, page 69

¹⁵ *ibid.*, page 68

Consider these ram-headed sphinxes which were built in the early 1990's outside the Luxor Hotel and Casino in Las Vegas, Nevada.



Compare them to these ram-headed sphinxes built about 3500 years ago in Luxor, Egypt.



3500 years ago the Egyptian sphinxes might have looked just like the Las Vegas sphinxes do today. 3500 years from now, it is entirely possible that the Las Vegas sphinxes will be in as bad shape as the Egyptian sphinxes are today. No reasonable scientist would predict that the natural forces that have caused the Egyptian sphinxes to devolve will cause them to evolve back to pristine condition in another 3500 years.

Natural forces do cause things to fall apart, and information to be lost. But that doesn't prove that natural forces cause things to fall together in useful ways, and for information to spontaneously appear.

BACK TO REALITY

Coyne tries to prove evolution is true by proving that creation is false. He does this primarily by misrepresenting the creationist position.

Creationists don't believe that species never change. Creationists believe that species do devolve. Chickens might very well have been able to fly at some time in the past. Mutations might have taken that ability away from them, and natural selection might not have been a sufficiently conservative force to cause all the mutant flightless chickens to die off. Despite what Coyne would have you believe, creationists

do believe that birds can lose the ability to fly, fish can lose the ability to see, and species may change in other ways.

What creationists don't believe is that species can turn into entirely different species. Creationists don't believe that the ability to fly or see can arise by accident.

Creationists also believe that the human appendix might have once served a more useful purpose than it does now. It is fundamental to their position that life on Earth now is not nearly as perfect as when it was first created. So, pointing out imperfections in existing species has nothing to do with the perfection of originally created species.

But don't take our word for it. Go to the library and check out Why Evolution is True by Jerry Coyne (don't waste your money buying it ☺) and buy a copy of By Design by Dr. Jonathan Sarfati. In particular, read chapters 12 ("What about 'poorly designed' things") and 13 ("Why are there 'bad things' in nature") in Sarfati's book, and compare what he says to what Coyne says in chapter 3 ("Remnants: Vestiges, Embryos, and Bad Design") of his book. If you do, you will see why evolutionists are so desperate to keep people from reading anything written by creationists or intelligent design advocates. If people know what creationists really say, then they won't believe the evolutionists' lies about creationism.

We've written more than we like about creationism, but that's because that's what most of Coyne's book is about. We feel somewhat uncomfortable trying to present the creationists' position for them. If you are interested in what creationists believe, there are plenty of creationists who would be glad to tell you.

Our only point is that Coyne's book contains very little science, and a lot of lies about creationism. Since so much of the book is an attack on creationism, we can't really review it without addressing the subject.

We wouldn't waste our time (or yours) on this book if evolutionists didn't consider it to be "a clear, engaging, accessible explanation of the evidence for evolution." Next month we will have a good laugh at Coyne's pathetic "scientific" evidence for evolution, even though April Fool's Day is over.

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. ☺

by Lothar Janetzko

TEACH CREATIONISM IN HUMAN EVOLUTION

<http://www.studlife.com/2.3499/teach-creationism-in-human-evolution-1.97677>

Student Life

This month's web site review looks at an article that was published in *Student Life*, The Independent Newspaper of Washington University in St. Louis since 1878. The article was first published on Monday, April 2, 2007.

The article is a discussion about Professor Richard Smith's "Introduction to Human Evolution" course in the anthropology department. "Professor Smith's class is notoriously under-enrolled and unpopular with students. You can hear crickets chirping when Smith takes the stage in Brown 100."

To enhance the course, the newspaper editors believe Smith's course should explore the more respected theory of Creationism. "Rather than sticking to the antiquated notions that humans evolved from lesser organisms, University professors ought to move towards the future by endorsing the more scientifically-sound view that the universe, humanity, life on earth and this very campus were created by a supernatural deity..."

By now it should be clear that this article in the student newspaper was just a non-factual story published in an April Fool's Day edition of their paper. What is important to understand however is that you can learn much about people's attitudes about creation and evolution by reading even their April Fool tongue-in-cheek articles.

Be on the lookout for similar articles appearing on the Internet this month. With the coming of spring, April is the month when many publications enjoy trying to fool readers into believing all kinds of crazy things. The BBC is presenting a spoof on flying penguins that have just recently been discovered.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of



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