

Origins Insights

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION OF THE
CREATION SCIENCE FELLOWSHIP



November 2003

A Review of the Basic Symposium at ICC #5

by Bob Harsh

The Fifth International Conference On Creationism was divided into two parts. In the technical track, which ran from Monday through Saturday, forty three original peer reviewed papers were presented. The Basic Track ran from Wednesday through Saturday and twelve presentations were made.

The major stated goal of the International Conference on Creationism is: the development and systemization of the Creation Model of Origins. The work towards that goal is done by the scientists and Biblical scholars who are continuing to do original research. The papers that survived the Editors and Reviewers were presented in the Technical Track sessions. I believe progress was made towards accomplishing our goals with the papers presented at ICC #5.

The purpose of the Basic Track was to present an overview of the progress that has been made in the development of Creation Model of Origins. Our target audience was laymen, who may have difficulty understanding the information as presented in the detail and language needed for the technical sessions.

It was expected that many people from the community as well as a few from the technical track would be interested in the basic track sessions. It soon became apparent that the audiences at the basic track sessions were mostly people who had been attending the technical sessions earlier in the week. I was happy to see some new faces and young people, but they were few in number. Why did this happen? Was it good or should we be discouraged with the poor turnout of "lay people"?

I think this can be discussed with the old illustration of, "Is your cup half empty or half full?" I also want to answer these questions by discussing Dr. John Morris' keynote address to the ICC on Monday night. John gave the

"Young Universe" creationist community a pat on the back and a challenge. He said that, "We are winning the scientific war and losing the propaganda war." I think we can agree that the deeper we study nature, the more the results confirm our conclusions that the universe was created thousands, not billions of years ago. Design by an intelligent designer is ever more evident. These confirmations come from the research of non-creationist as well as creationist scientists.

**CSF Meeting
Tuesday, Nov. 18
7:30 PM**

"Neo-Creationist Geology from 2003 ICC"

Chuck Danley will present an overview of recent geological evidences for creation from the 2003 ICC.

John's choice of the term "propaganda" is interesting. You see, propaganda does not have to be true. Where does the propaganda that so highly elevates evolution come from? The ultimate source is, of course from Satan, the father of lies. The most basic lie that many evolutionism scientists subscribe to is functional atheism.

[Psalm 14:1 The fool says in his heart, "There is no God."]

The human source of much of the propaganda about evolution is from people who do not want to believe in God. They are foolish and their understanding of nature is flawed. The propaganda war is being fought at many levels. At the university level it seems like evolution has almost complete control. Public education only provides the evolutionists' side of the "Origins" story. The press rarely raises any questions about evolutionist scientists' interpretations of nature. The authoritative source of the information in many of the stories they write is "science" or "according to scientists". In reality, it is often a small minority of scientists who have proposed an untested interpretation of nature. The most famous example of evolutionism propaganda is the way our educational system has distorted the facts of the Scopes trial that took place nearly eighty years ago. The "scientific facts" used in support of evolution in America in the 1920's are known to be disputed today. The public is unaware of the "facts", so the folk legend of evolution's superiority over creation is allowed to stand. Untruths and partial truths are hallmarks of propaganda. The popular scientific magazine *Scientific American* is probably the most affective "Evolutionism" propaganda outlet for many of our brightest young people. Public television provides the propaganda in very affective ways from preschool programs to Nova.

How do we make progress in the propaganda war? We can start with having a good understanding ourselves. Then we need to share our knowledge with our families and then with others who will listen to our message. We need to pass on the importance of the proper ways to interpret what God has told us in the Bible. We also need to be aware of what creationist scientists have discovered and pass on that information.

The basic track was a step in the right direction for making progress in the propaganda war. The basic track covered most of the topics in a way that should equip people to understand origins from the young universe creationist perspective. Our own Bob Walsh kicked off the Basic Track with a discussion of "Biblical Hermeneutics". We should try to interpret the Bible in the context of the people it was written to at the time it was written. David Fouts from Bryan College followed with a thorough discussion of the Hebrew word, *Yom* which means "day" in English. Todd Wood, also from Bryan College, discussed the limits of biological change. Our task is to discover the kinds that were created and the kinds that entered and exited the ark. Dr. Wood proposed that there was a rapid period of speciation of the kinds immediately following the flood. The biological sources of the new variations were contained in the genetic makeup of the "kinds" at the time of Noah's flood. That period of rapid speciation was followed by a period of stasis devoid of much morphological change. Brad Harrub concluded the Thursday basic lectures with an update on fossil man.

Brad Harrub continued on Friday with a thorough discussion of creationist understanding of Noah's flood. Bob Harsh from CSF presented the ten most basic evidences evolutionists use to prove biological evolution is true. He gave evidence that none of these ten "icons of evolution" are scientifically accurate evidence that favors evolution. Paul Ackerman from Kansas helped us understand Psychology from a creationist perspective. Danny Faulkner is one of young universe creationism's leading experts in the field of Astronomy. He concluded Friday's program with a detailed lesson on young universe creationists' understanding of Astronomy.

Using the Grand Canyon as a teaching tool, Steve Austin, from ICR, helped us understand how the geologic column came to be. He shared his major discovery of, what appears to be, a mass killing of billions of nautiloids. The most likely killing agent was Noah's flood. Kurt Wise from Bryan College presented an encouraging updating of the field of Baraminology, the search for an understanding of the "created kinds".

John Baumgardner from New Mexico presented a very informative program on his theories of catastrophic plate tectonics and the geologic causes of Noah's flood. His theories help explain how the continents were flooded and the source of the water that covered the dry land. Andrew Snelling from Australia and ICR finished our basic track with an excellent update report of the findings of the RATE group on the rate of radioactive decay. It appears like the rate of radioactive decay has not been constant through the ages.

Many of the ICC attendees in the basic track are the ones who do presentations out in the "real world" in academic as well as nonacademic settings. Most of these people, like me, have not had the benefit of any formal training, from the perspective of young universe. Most of us were trained in public educational institutions from a totally evolutionist paradigm. We trained ourselves by reading a mixture of worthy, as well as less accurate books. It has been up to us to remove the bones from our creationism fishes. It is apparent to me that the major benefit of the basic track at the ICC was an attempt at systemization of the understanding of nature by the experts of young earth creationism. This was a very important for the benefit for the "ambassadors" of young universe creationism.

I am thankful for the experts who have taken the time and put their effort into finding out the truth about God's creation. Many of those busy people also travel the world presenting talks on their area of expertise and they can reach many people with information that may change their lives.

I am equally thankful for the many "ambassadors", who like the "experts", take the truth about young universe creationism out to people in communities around the world. Most of these "ambassadors", like the "experts," are highly trained in their area of science but have little or no training in other areas of science. The ambassadors would like to have enough grasp of the other areas of science, where they lack a lot of training, to be able to help their audiences to understand origins science.

The presenters at the basic track seemed to have the needs of the ambassadors in mind when they decided what to present in their basic track programs. CSF had a different thing in mind. We directed our advertising towards young people and home schooling parents who had not been exposed to any great extent to creationism science. I am convinced that we probably lost many in that target audience. I do not think many of them went home and urged their friends to attend the next day's basic track. Their idea of "basic" and the presenters' ideas of "basic" were not the same. I fear that we could rightly be accused of false advertising. I think they were very impressed that the presenters were experts. I doubt if they would be able to explain to their friends the facts of the presentation.

We need these people to help us make progress in the propaganda war. With that in mind, I have a couple of proposals for the next ICC's Basic Track. We need to recognize that many ICC attendees are not the scientists who are the "experts" but they are the "ambassadors" who desire to effectively present the message of young universe creationism to their audiences. In years past CSF videotaped the sessions. However, that video taping did not have a high demand. It is my hope that many will purchase the audio-tapes of the basic sessions. Most presenters did not provide written handouts to help the audience to be able to study the information presented after the conference.

The ambassadors spend most of their time working at their career job. Most have families they want to spend time with. Many feel called of God to be "Creation Evangelists". All of them struggle with devoting enough time to preparing their presentations. They need help!

Here are some my suggestions:

- 1- The basic track presenters need to be chosen at least one year before the ICC.
- 2- The presenters need be willing to share their information by agreeing to send their PowerPoint presentations to the organizers of the ICC prior to the conference so that the presentations. This will allow the organizers time to determine how the information can be more effectively shared with the attendees.

- 3- These presentations need to be in a form that the presenters will be willing to allow the “Ambassadors” to incorporate into their own presentations.
- 4- Written materials need to be available that are a “condensed” systemization of the various areas of young universe creation science. These materials need to be produced by the “experts” who are the presenters in the ICC Basic Track.
- 5- The local creation groups then need to present programs based on this information from the “experts” to their audiences throughout the world.

What are our obstacles?

- 1- It is a characteristic of scientist to insist that their angle on origins is correct and competing perspectives are in error. How do we find “real experts” who are willing to present competing interpretations fairly?
- 2- Many of the “experts” in ICC #5 were unwilling to “share” their PowerPoint presentations with the “ambassadors” who would have liked to use them as a resource.
- 3- The sponsor of ICC will incur a greater expense when written materials are to be provided. The presenters need to provide the soft copies off their materials but the sponsoring conference needs to provide the hard copies for the attendees.

CSF 2004 Program Agenda

Your Board of Directors have been working on next year’s agenda. We expect to have this available in the December Origin’s Insights. A highlight of our 2004 activities will be the AIG Seminar on Nov. 19-20 at the David L. Lawrence Convention Center.

So far, mark your calendars for Jan. 20 when Bob Ivey will present an introduction to dating. Radiometric dating and the age of the earth, that is.

Creation Science Fellowship , Inc.
Newsletter is published monthly.

Purpose: The aim of Creation Science Fellowship is to inform and educate people of the biblical, philosophical and scientific validity of creationism.

Circulation: 430

Officers

Robert Harsh..... Chmn, Newstr. Ed.
Reid Moon.....Secretary
Stu Chandler ..Vice Chmn., CSF Books
Gail Pinkney.....Treasurer
Robert Ivey.....Web Site Manager

Ex-officio

Robert Walsh.....Fmr. ICC Coordinator

Email: csficc@csfpittsburgh.org

Web Site: www.csfpittsburgh.org

Editor’s Address: Robert Harsh
439 Little Creek Road, Harmony,
Pennsylvania, USA 16037
Email: naturbob@juno.com

CREATION SCIENCE FELLOWSHIP, INC.
P.O. Box 99303
Pittsburgh PA USA 15233-4303
Phone: (412) 341-4908

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Pittsburgh, PA
Permit No. 2548

Address Service Requested