

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 11 Issue 5 www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

February 2007

Evolution and the Social Scientist

What do the social sciences tell us about the theory of evolution?

Over the years we have examined the theory of evolution from a number of different scientific perspectives. We've looked at it from a biological point of view, a chemical point of view, a thermodynamic point of view, etc. But we've never looked at the theory of evolution from the point of view of a social scientist. That is, we've never looked at the theory of evolution from the point of view of a sociologist, psychologist, or anthropologist. It is about time that we did.

From a sociological point of view, it is clear that man is a social being. He lives in a society that depends, to some extent, on order and structure. Sociology examines how well the customs of various civilizations operate. One thing that brings order and structure to society is religion.

All Religions Are Wrong

Voltaire said, "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him."¹ From a sociological point of view, man needs something to give meaning and direction to his life, and that thing is a religion. Religions were invented as a way to keep order in society.

From a secular, sociological point of view, there are only two possibilities. Either (1) there is no such thing as "one true religion," in which case all religions are merely human inventions devised to keep order, or (2) there is one true religion, in which case all religions, except one, are merely human inventions devised to keep order. That's why **sociologists view all religions as if they aren't really true.** And, in every case (or every case but one), sociologists are correct.

Given the premise that all religions are false, the sociological approach is to examine the extent

to which each religion makes people feel good and behave well. Religion simply is "the opium of the people"², but different people choose different drugs. Some people find the notion of a god watching over them comforting. On the other hand, some people find the notion that there is NO god watching over them comforting. Social scientists want to know which drug works the best.

Social scientists aren't looking for the "true" religion—they are looking for the best religion. **Social sciences study the various world religions and evaluate how well they help society to function.**

Humanism

The primary atheistic religion in America is humanism. Atheists don't meet every Sunday morning, and aren't as formally organized as most religious groups; but the American Humanist Association does claim to be "The Voice of Humanism Since 1941."

In order that religious humanism may be better understood we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which we believe the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate.³

Although it is often claimed that atheism isn't a religion, **these atheists themselves claim humanism to be "religious."** The "certain affirmations" they make are, in effect, their creed. Since they are so opposed to traditional religions, they object to the word "creed" as a description of their beliefs. Instead they use the term, "manifesto." Their fundamental beliefs are stated

¹ <http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/343.html>

² Karl Marx, as translated in <http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/300700.html>

³ <http://www.americanhumanist.org/about/manifesto1.html>

in their fifteen-article Humanist Manifesto, in which they admit that they are inventing a new religion tailored to fit modern needs. We encourage you to read the whole manifesto. Here are a few pertinent excerpts.

While this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

FIRST: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

SECOND: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process.⁴

The “continuous process” by which man has emerged from nature can be nothing other than evolution. Clearly, the first two articles deny creation.

FIFTH: Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Obviously humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but it does insist that the way to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relations to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.⁵

This was written back in 1933, when science was still associated with the “scientific method.” Since the theory of evolution fails the scientific method so miserably, modern evolutionists don’t limit science to things learned using the scientific method. The new definition of science is, essentially, “anything a scientist thinks.”

SIXTH: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of “new thought”.⁶

Since “the time has passed for theism,” *et cetera*, they have a strategy for replacing them with something else. That “something else” is stated in article 11.

ELEVENTH: Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and

manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom. We assume that humanism will take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking.⁷

In other words, they plan to use the public education system to eradicate all those sentimental and unrealistic religions. Social peer pressure will cleanse America of the filth of wishful thinking. This has been their published strategy since 1933.

THIRTEENTH: Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.⁸

So, religious institutions must be replaced by some other institutions that will keep society in line. What could those institutions be, if not the schools, government, and the courts of law?

FOURTEENTH: The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.⁹

In their view, capitalism hasn’t worked. Therefore, “a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established ... Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.” Is this the Humanist Manifesto or the Communist Manifesto? The mere fact that they find the word “manifesto” less offensive than “creed” is significant.

The Christian Right

The term “Christian Right” has been used to

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

describe a political movement that has arisen in recent years. What is the Christian Right responding to? Clearly, it is responding to the Anti-Christian Left as defined by the Humanist Manifesto. It is the stated goal of American humanists to cleanse America of Christianity, and replace religious institutions with government institutions that will replace capitalism with communism.

So, we can step back and view the situation from the impartial position of a social scientist watching the battle play out. There are two groups who have competing ideas on how society should be governed. One believes religious ideals should motivate individuals to virtuous action in a free society. The other believes individuals need to be controlled by government institutions that are unhindered by superstition. What is the key to winning? Both groups agree it is winning the creation/evolution battle.

Creation Myths

From a secular, social science point of view, there clearly is a basic human need to have an explanation for where the human race came from. Every culture has a creation myth. Consider the Native Americans, for example.

In Southwestern tales, four or five worlds of different colors or elements are stacked one on top of the other, and people climb up a reed or stalk through a hole in the ceiling of one dying world into the next, newborn one. People in the Northwest tell of descending through a hole in the sky (associated with the smoke hole in a tipi) to emerge into the present world.¹⁰

The Greeks, on the other hand, believed that man was created by two Titans named Prometheus and Athena.

Prometheus shaped man out of mud, and Athena breathed life into his clay figure.¹¹

The Norse legend, not surprisingly, says that man came from ice.

Thawing frost then became a cow called Audhumla. ... The cow licked salty ice blocks. After one day of licking, she freed a man's hair from the ice. After two days, his head appeared. On the third day the whole man was there. His name was Buri, and he was tall, strong, and handsome.¹²

¹⁰ Erdoes and Ortiz, 1984, American Indian Myths and Legends, page 75

¹¹ http://www.desy.de/gna/interpedia/greek_myth/creationMan.html

¹² <http://www.pitt.edu/~dash/creation.html>

There are many more creation myths. We leave it to you to find more as the proverbial "exercise for the reader." You will find that there are differences, and similarities, but there is one thing that is common to all creation myths, except one. With just one exception, all creation myths are stories about something that happened in the past which cannot be proved or disproved.

As silly as it sounds, one cannot prove that the first man was not licked out of a block ice by a cow. In defense of the Norse legend, one could legitimately say, "We don't know any scientifically plausible method by which it could happen, but that doesn't prove it didn't happen. It must have been a miracle." That's not a terribly satisfying defense, but if one accepts the possibility of supernatural events, it could be true.

As we said before, there is one creation myth that is an exception. The creation myth of humanism is the theory of evolution; and it is based on 19th century science—not oral tradition.

None of the other creation myths claim to have a natural, scientific explanation. All the other creation myths involve special, supernatural events which cannot be reproduced in the laboratory. The theory of evolution is the only creation myth that claims no supernatural process was involved, and was the natural result of forces still in operation today.

Since the theory of evolution claims to be scientific, it must be scientifically plausible. Evolutionists cannot legitimately use the defense, "We don't know any scientifically plausible method by which it could happen, but that doesn't prove it didn't happen. It must have been a miracle." Faith in miracles is not allowed in a religion that denies the supernatural. Yet evolutionists use that excuse every time they get backed into a corner. Insufficient scientific knowledge isn't an acceptable defense of a myth that claims to be based on scientific knowledge.

Science Happens

The fundamental problem for evolutionists is that science happened. The space race began after World War II, and when the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, Americans really got serious about science. Science students wanted to learn how everything worked, and one of those things they wanted to learn about was evolution. When they started to look at evolution in the light of modern science, they started seeing insurmountable difficulties. They rejected evolution as the explanation for the existence of all the various kinds of life on Earth, and started looking for other explanations.

If known natural processes are unable to

explain the origin and diversity of life, the only other two options are (1) unknown natural processes, and (2) supernatural processes. It is easy to believe in unknown natural processes at first; but as time goes on, and the search for natural answers leads to an unending series of dead ends, faith in an unknown natural cause has to be abandoned.

After the alchemists had tried everything they could think of, they eventually gave up on the idea of turning lead into gold. Someone might still say, "How do you know lead can't be turned into gold? Gold had to come from somewhere; it could have come from lead. Sure, lots of alchemists tried to turn lead to gold, and failed, but that doesn't mean it can't be done!" Modern society recognizes that argument for what it really is—desperate wishful thinking.

When evolutionists say, "How do you know life isn't the result of evolution? Sure, lots of scientists have tried to explain it, and failed; but that doesn't mean it didn't happen," we recognize it for what it really is—desperate wishful thinking.

The problem with the 19th century theory of evolution is 21st century science. We don't know any scientifically plausible method by which chemicals could form the first living cell, and there isn't any scientifically plausible way a single-celled organism could evolve into multi-cellular organisms, and isn't any scientific plausible mechanism by which those multi-cellular organisms could evolve into all the plants and animals alive today. To believe in the theory of evolution, one must believe in a whole series of steps for which there is no plausible scientific explanation. That is a fatal flaw for a creation myth that claims to be based on science.

The Alternatives

If someone believes one creation myth, he cannot believe any other. If one believes the first man thawed out of ice, then he cannot believe the first man climbed up a reed from a dying world. On the other hand, if it were possible to prove that the first man did not thaw out of ice, it would not prove that the first people crawled up a reed from a dying world. Disproving one myth does not prove another. It merely leaves an unanswered question.

There are some people, like Marshall¹³, who claim to be comfortable with unanswered questions. But social science has pretty well established that the origin of man is a question that most human beings aren't comfortable

leaving unanswered. Disproving the Norse legend would not, all by itself, prove the Southwestern Native American legend is true. Disproving evolution does not prove the Genesis story. If man is not the natural result of evolution, where did he come from? Did he come from ice, mud, a hole in the ground, or down from the sky? Inquiring minds want to know!

There is a whole spectrum of religious groups that would be more than happy to answer that question for you. Since there are so many suppliers of information in that area, Science Against Evolution sees no need to duplicate their effort. We focus on the truth about evolution, and let you search for whatever other truth you want to find elsewhere.

Why Do Scientists Believe in Evolution?

The question that is legitimately in our charter is, "If science is against evolution, why do so many scientists continue to believe it?" The answer has to do with social science (which broadly includes history and political science) rather than the so-called "hard sciences" (such as biology, chemistry, and physics). The answer can be found in American history and politics.

The Humanist Manifesto was published in 1933. Since that time, rather than wage open war against believers, humanists chose to sabotage traditional religions secretly. They did this by saying that there was no real conflict between science and religion. One deals with the physical realm, and the other deals with the spiritual realm. There can be no conflict because there is no overlap. It sounded logical, so most people believed it. Only a few people recognized that if the theory of evolution is true, then man's sin did not cause death, so death could not atone for sin. The few who recognized that there really is a conflict between the theory of evolution and traditional American beliefs were disregarded as religious fanatics.

The humanist strategy worked for a while. The theory of evolution was "fostered by education and supported by custom." American children in the public schools were taught that "evolution is a fact." Anyone who didn't believe in evolution was accused of believing the earth is flat, too.

Children were taught all the principles of the humanist manifesto in public schools. They were taught that the universe self-exists and was not created. Man is a part of nature that has emerged as the result of a continuous process. The nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic

¹³ Disclosure, January 2007, "Marshall's Big Question"

guarantees of human values. The time has passed for theism. Government will ensure equitable distribution of goods and services, and will take care of them. Naturally, the children rejected traditional religion and turned to the political left.

When conservative Americans saw what was happening to their children, they fought back. They home-schooled their children. They elected creationists to public school boards to get evolution out of textbooks. The fight was on.

Beginning in 1985, national samples of U.S. adults have been asked whether the statement, "Human beings, as we know them, developed from earlier species of animals," is true or false, ... Over the past 20 years, the percentage of U.S. adults accepting the idea of evolution has declined ... [In 2003,] About a third of American adults firmly rejected evolution, and only 14% of adults thought that evolution is "definitely true."¹⁴

Since the humanists' covert attack on other religions is becoming less effective, they have launched a full frontal assault. Richard Dawkins is leading the charge, with his book The God Delusion. He also managed to make the cover of the November 13, 2006, *Time* magazine with his "God vs. Science" debate. You no doubt have noticed in recent years that humanists are becoming openly anti-Christian. They want to prohibit children from saying the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools because it includes the phrase "under God." They have gone to court to keep prayer out of schools. They have tried to prohibit religious clubs from meeting on school property. They have argued in court that any criticism of evolution is an effort to get Christianity into public schools as the basis for removing warning stickers from biology textbooks.

Evolutionists aren't really pro-science; they are anti-God. They view religion as a mental illness that needs to be eradicated. Recognizing the obvious conflict between the Bible and the theory of evolution, they are endeavoring to establish the theory of evolution as a way of discrediting the Bible (and the Koran, too) and stamp out the delusion that there is a God.

A social science examination of the theory of evolution, and the humanist reasoning behind it, helps us to understand the influence of the theory of evolution on politics and customs. It explains why non-scientific arguments are used as proof of a supposedly scientific theory.

The scientists who believe in the theory

¹⁴ *Science*, Vol. 313, 11 August 2006, "Public Acceptance of Evolution", page 765

evolution believe it because it is the creation myth of their religion. They attack Genesis because they know that if they can discredit Genesis it will leave a void which most people would naturally fill with something else—and that "something else" is most likely to be the theory of evolution, which is the foundation of their religion.

In the past we have largely ignored the religious, cultural, and political implications of the theory of evolution. In the future, we will continue to try to ignore them. We prefer to examine the theory of evolution from the point of view of the hard, experimental sciences. Richard Dawkins, however, makes that hard to do sometimes.

Evolution in the News

A Tale of Two Museums

We hope you will compare Discover's review of the Answers in Genesis Creation Museum with our review of the Field Museum of Natural History.

Answers in Genesis is about to open their Creation Museum. Bruno Maddox, a writer for *Discover* magazine, was given a pre-opening tour and wrote a two-page review of his experience in the February, 2007, issue of the magazine.

The first two paragraphs set the tone for the article.

Pondering from the vile comfort of the Marriot in Hebron, Kentucky, ... A creationist group called Answers in Genesis ... has decided to spend \$27 million building a creation museum only minutes away from this unlovely spot. ... Yet the museum's founders have chosen to set it in one of the few places on Earth that could plausibly have been designed by chimpanzees. ... Exiting the Marriott into a hall of filthy light, I make a mental note to bring this up with someone.¹⁵

Granted, *ad hominin* attacks are hallmarks of evolutionary arguments, but this is the first time an evolutionist has stooped so low as to attack a city and hotel.

[The museum is] a rather groovy modernist structure that looks from the outside like a topflight NBA arena as imagined by the makers of *The Flintstones*. The exterior is rendered in an oddly tasteful, faux-prehistoric faux stone, as is most of the interior—though the cave effect is somewhat compromised by a dizzying profusion of top-of-the-line plasma TV screens.

¹⁵ Bruno Maddox, *Discover*, February 2007, "Blinded by Science", page 28

...

I eventually get to meet with Ken Ham, a fearsome, chin-bearded Australian whose brainchild this whole project is.¹⁶

When we reviewed the Field Museum of Natural History,¹⁷ we did not attack Chicago, or the place where we stayed, or the colors of the banners outside the museum, or the personal appearance of the museum director. We discussed the exhibits!

Yes, we make fun of the silly things evolutionists believe, but we don't make fun of the evolutionists themselves. Perhaps the closest we have ever come to a personal attack was in our "Chimps Are Like Us" essay¹⁸ in which we discussed the claim that there is only 4% difference between chimps and humans. That essay began with side-by-side pictures of a chimp and a famous (but unidentified) evolutionist with the caption, "Four percent difference!" We never made fun of her or even mentioned her name. We simply made fun of the silly notion that there is only a 4% difference between a chimp and a human. We examined all the different ways evolutionists calculated the difference, and the absurd conclusions they made based on those calculations.

On the other hand, evolutionists have to talk about architecture and personal appearance because science isn't on their side. It is significant that nowhere in the two-page *Discover* article is there any criticism of any of the exhibits in the museum. That's because they can't mount any logical, scientific argument against the exhibits.

Two hours into my tour of the Creation Museum, I am visited by the startling realization that I, so hard-core an atheist as to make Richard Dawkins look like the Virgin Mary, have yet to actually, um, disagree with anything I'm seeing.¹⁹

It must have hurt him to make that admission because he begins to backpedal in the next sentence.

Now, don't get me wrong. Patrick Marsh and his creationists have some decidedly wacky—I would go so far as to say demonstrably false—ideas. They believe the universe is only 6,000 years old. They believe

that dinosaurs and humans lived not only contemporaneously but in blissful harmony.²⁰

If that is so, then why doesn't he demonstrate the universe is more than 6,000 years old? If you want to read about decidedly wacky ideas, just read the latest evolutionary conjecture about how the universe (or perhaps multiverses) began. Why doesn't he make a side-by-side comparison of scientific and historic evidence that dinosaurs and humans did/didn't live contemporaneously? It is because there is good evidence that they did live together.²¹

Presumably he tried to argue with Ken Ham, because he says,

After losing several arguments to Ham, I head to the next-door office and start losing them to one Dr. Jason Lisle, a fresh-faced 32-year-old astrophysicist.²²

Why are evolutionists so obsessed with personal appearance? Maybe it is a way to avoid issues.

If he truly wanted to understand the creationist position, how could he have made the following statements?

The disarming and unexpected thing about the Answers in Genesis folks, however, is this: *They don't pretend to be right.* ... the message being, as it will be explained to me many times before I leave, that everyone's view of reality is inescapably colored and distorted by that person's "starting assumptions." In other words, truth is an illusion and no one can ever really know anything.²³ [italics his]

They don't pretend to be right? No one can ever really know anything? The usual accusation is that creationists are so dogmatic that they always think they are right. Ken Ham's whole philosophy can be summed up this way: If you have questions about life, you can find the answers in Genesis.

Yes, conclusions can be distorted by assumptions. It is a message preached by Answers in Genesis, which can be traced back to the Institute for Creation Research, where Ken Ham once worked. But that doesn't mean no one

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ For examples, see *Disclosure*, October 1998, "Unicorns, etc."; *Disclosure*, September 1999, "We Dug Dinos"; *Disclosure*, June 2000, "Paluxy Tracks"; *Disclosure*, May 2002, "Dinotopia"; *Disclosure*, June 2004, "The Age of Dinosaurs"; *Disclosure*, April 2005, "Surprising Dinosaurs";

²² Bruno Maddox, *Discover*, February 2007, "Blinded by Science", page 29

²³ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *ibid.* pages 28-29

¹⁷ *Disclosure*, December 2001, "A Field Trip to the Field Museum" and *Disclosure*, January 2002, "Darwin's Scorecard"

¹⁸ *Disclosure*, October 2005, "Chimps Are Like Us"

¹⁹ Bruno Maddox, *Discover*, February 2007, "Blinded by Science", page 29

can ever really know anything. It means that one needs to examine assumptions carefully before coming to a conclusion.

People often project their own ideas and motives upon others. Evolutionists are the ones who believe one can't really know anything for sure. Their mantra is that "science is self-correcting." They use this argument every time one of their cherished beliefs is shown to be wrong. Evolutionists won't be upset when the current theory about dark energy, dark matter, or anything pertaining to the origin of the universe is rejected because we will never know the truth. To them, truth is just the currently accepted majority belief, which is subject to change at any time.

Ken Ham, on the other hand, believes that truth is unchangeable, and knowable. Ken Ham thinks he is right. How anyone could spend any amount of time with Ken Ham and think that Ken is unsure of his beliefs is baffling.

Maddox must be projecting his own ideas on creationists when he says,

Every day brings fresh claims from the world of mainstream science, claims that must be weighed, then tortured to fit the framework of creationist belief or discounted with some sort of scientific-sounding explanation.²⁴

That's exactly what evolutionists do! But, rather than just make the claim, as he does, we back up our claim with examples.

Ever since Darwin's day, evolutionists have struggled with the fossil record, trying to torture it into the framework of evolution. Darwin recognized that the fossil record was not consistent with his theory, but tried to explain it away with "gaps." When further exploration failed to fill those gaps, modern evolutionists came up with a scientific-sounding explanation called "punctuated equilibrium."

Ken Ham, on the other hand, has said on numerous occasions, "If there was a world-wide flood, what would you expect to find in the fossil record? Millions of death things in rocks laid down by water all over the world. What do you find in the fossil record? Millions of death things in rocks laid down by water all over the world." The fossil record fits perfectly in the creationist framework, but doesn't fit the evolutionary model at all.

That's a general example, but there are specific ones, too. *Nature* recently published the description of a juvenile *Australopithecus afarensis* fossil designated DIK-1-1 discovered in Ethiopia. The *Nature* article contained strong

²⁴ *ibid.*

evidence that *A. afarensis* lived in trees. But the popular news media tortured the evidence to make it appear that more proof had been discovered showing that this creature walked upright, trying to make it fit their evolutionary framework. Since we didn't have to fit the evidence into an evolutionary framework, we had no trouble reporting the facts.²⁵

Currently evolutionists are trying to figure out how to get *Homo floresiensis* (the "Hobbit") to fit with their ideas of human evolution. Since they struggle trying to get the facts to fit their beliefs, they assume creationists must, too.

Maddox admits he had some preconceived notions.

I thought I was going to meet people who love God and therefore hate science. What I found instead were people who love God but who have a pretty serious crush on science as well, and thus find themselves in the Fitzgeraldian nightmare of waking up every day and trying to believe in both.²⁶

He thought people who love God hate science because that's what he has been brainwashed to believe. There is no conflict between Christianity and science. There is a conflict between Christianity and evolution because there is a conflict between science and the theory of evolution. Creationists don't suffer from the inner turmoil he imagines. But, because he imagines that creationists have this problem, he comes to this erroneous conclusion:

They will—they must—spend their lives, and brains, trying to think of ways that patently false ideas can be made to seem, if not actually true, at least not *quite* so patently false.²⁷

No, that's what evolutionists do. Evolutionists have to think of ways that patently false ideas, such as the natural origin of life, can be made to seem not so patently false. How can someone who loves science believe that chemicals randomly formed all the necessary organic molecules, and came to life by chance? That's the real Fitzgeraldian nightmare!

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter. If you received this newsletter indirectly and would like to receive a copy every month, write to us and ask to be placed on our mailing list.

²⁵ *Disclosure*, October 2006, "Little Lucy"

²⁶ Bruno Maddox, *Discover*, February 2007, "Blinded by Science", page 29

²⁷ *ibid.*

by Lothar Janetzko

Welcome to the Creation Science Movement

<http://www.csm.org.uk/index.php>

“Restoring Faith in the Bible and Science”

This month’s web site review looks at the site of the Creation Science Movement. On the home page of the site you learn that “The Creation Science Movement is the oldest creationist movement in the world; founded in 1932 as the Evolution Protest Movement by prominent members of the Victoria Institute who were concerned at the scientific, ethical and theological consequences that belief in Evolution brings to society.” CSM is located in Portsmouth, United Kingdom.

The home page provides links to 1) Home, 2) Who we are, 3) News, 4) Events, 5) Genesis Expo, 6) Journals, 7) FAQs, 8) Shop, 9) Donations and 10) Membership. The page also contains Creation News – News Archive and web log that can be accessed as an RSS Newsfeed. By reading the various news articles you can gain insight into how the Creation versus Evolution debate is progressing in the United Kingdom.

From the Journals link, you learn that members of CSM receive quarterly copies of “CREATION The Journal of the CREATION SCIENCE MOVEMENT” as well as copies of their latest pamphlets. As a web reader you can view PDF files for the last four years of the Journal.

The FAQs link leads to some interesting questions regarding creation and evolution. Answers to the questions are often linked to pamphlets that CSM has published in the past and made available for purchase from the Shop link.

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