

the earth is only a few thousand years old (e. g., the Associated Press article in the Albuquerque Journal of January 6, 1982, p. A-1). Then, from that point onward there was an almost unbelievably large increase in the publication of journal articles and books devoted to exposing the errors and inconsistencies in what had become known as "creation science." Before 1981 hardly one scientist in 100 would stoop to even comment at any length on the writings of creationists. But, now that it had become obvious that many educators and legislators were seriously trying to listen to the creationists, a complete turn-about took place. Many of the leading book publishers, including a few of the large university presses, and a large number of leading scientific and educational journals, began to publish extensively against creationism. In most of these books and articles, the outstanding errors of "creation science" regarding the nature of the earth's crust and of the fossil record served as a springboard for the attack against creationism.

Many prominent journals, including Science, Physics Today, The Science Teacher, and the Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, devoted a surprising number of pages to articles and discussion concerning young-earth creationism and its efforts to secure legislation requiring "equal time" in school classrooms. As with the articles in the Journal of Geological Education, emphasis in these journals was placed upon the creationist practice of neglecting or rejecting the research data which indicate *great age*.

Several semi-popular science magazines also lent their efforts to the cause of notifying the public of the apparently obscurantist nature of "creation science." Among these were Geotimes and Science 81 (Science 82 in 1982, etc.). The latter, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and enjoying a very wide circulation in the United States, included 4 articles on the subject in its December 1981 issue--the month in which the Arkansas trial was convened. The creationist emphasis on a "6,000 to 10,000-year-old earth" is prominent in all 4 of the articles. The beginning paragraph, which introduces the section, ends with the summarizing sentence, "But it is not just biological evolution that is challenged by the creationists; their claims call into question nearly all of modern science, from astronomy to geophysics." (p. 53)

The article, "Creationism as Science" (p. 55-57), by Allen Hammond, the editor of the magazine, is written with reserve--not containing caustic or ridiculing statements. The following introductory parts of the article show the author's method and concern: