



KANSAS SCHOOLS IN THE NEWS

by John D. Morris

The Kansas State Board of Education earlier this year began an effort to increase openness in their science curriculum, including that portion related to the origins issue. Two versions of state science guidelines were considered in mid-May; the “majority” report, an evolution-only version used over the past few years, and the “minority” report, which encouraged the desired openness and the honing of critical thinking skills. Predictably, evolutionists responded with hysteria and refused to testify before the committee, declining to “dignify non-scientific theories” with their presence.

Dozens of witnesses discussed the weaknesses of evolution theory and the obvious design of living things. Their testimony was rather comprehensive and persuasive. They were each cross-examined by an ACLU attorney who refused to be questioned himself. Predictably, he attempted to shift the focus to extraneous issues and personalities, but since there was no serious scientific objection, the Board adopted the minority report.


Those testifying in favor came from a wide variety of perspectives. ICR was asked not to testify, for we hold a decidedly Christian/creationist viewpoint, and the curriculum was neither. Unofficially, numerous recommendations and much counsel was accepted from ICR.

Several years ago similar guidelines were proposed, but a worldwide media “dis-information” campaign fully confused the issue. Horror of horrors, evolution was being removed from the curriculum and Biblical creation was replacing it! Nothing could be further from the truth, but scare tactics diverted attention from the weaknesses of evolution and the benefits of more openness in education.

The same strategy is being employed now, it seems. On May 12th, one day after the adoption, I participated in a TV debate with leading evolutionary spokesman, Dr. Michael Ruse, and I.D. movement leader Dr. Jonathan Wells, a microbiologist from the Discovery Institute who gave testimony at the hearings. Dr. Ruse repeatedly bemoaned bringing the

Bible into the science classroom and even compared the certainty of evolution with $2+2=4$. Certainly he knows that combining two fingers with two fingers obviously yields four fingers, but the claim that man's hand came from a fish's fin cannot be scientifically verified. Look for more diversionary smoke screens in the days ahead.

It seems to me that the Kansas School Board is doing it right. Their goal is to improve science education by increasing openness and encouraging critical thinking skills. Who could be opposed to that? Evolutionists, that's who! Evolution has had a total monopoly on education for decades. They have everything to lose and nothing to gain. For some it's power (millions of young minds), for others it's money (billions of dollars in textbooks). A small minority, however, consider themselves evangelists for a naturalistic religion and the schools their pulpit. They dare not allow openness or scientific accountability, for if they do, they will lose.

By the time this report is in the mail, numerous things may have changed. What will not change, however, is ICR's deep concern for young people in our public school system, and its lasting desire to see scientific instruction improve. In today's schools, a "religion" of naturalism is being taught in the name of education. The inculcation of one religious view (i.e., naturalistic evolution) and the exclusion of all others is a violation of our Constitution and poor education as well. We will continue to provide what help we can, but we will not be diverted from our long-range vision of serious scientific research and education of professionals. Curriculum battles, church teaching, lay ministry, etc., are all critical, but none will maintain or attain lasting results without up-to-date information. Providing such information is ICR's primary mission, thereby fueling the creation movement at large. 



by John D. Morris

On Saturday, April 30, the ICR Museum of Creation and Earth History participated in National Museum Day proclaimed by the Smithsonian Institute. It called for museums all over the country to hold an open house, and sponsor programs for all ages. ICR was invited to join in.

The day was well-attended and everyone who came enjoyed the festivities. Individuals from throughout the American Southwest were here, along with some from greater distances. Hourly discussions were hosted by each of the ICR science staff, interspersed by Museum tours, live animal exhibits, and films.

Some visitors were glad to see ICR on the Smithsonian list of recommended museums, and delighted that ICR chose to participate. They wondered if the Smithsonian is supportive of creationist thinking. Since the Smithsonian is America's national museum, supported by tax money collected from creationists and evolutionists alike, shouldn't they be neutral on this worldview issue? Can't we work more closely with them?

The Smithsonian Institute is really a suite of museums and research programs, covering subjects from historical, to cultural, to

Acts & Facts



PUBLISHED BY

INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH

P.O. Box 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021

619/448-0900 WEBSITE: www.icr.org

To disseminate articles and information of current interest dealing with creation, evolution, and related topics. Sent free upon request.

Editor: John D. Morris

Co-Editor: Henry M. Morris

Managing Editor: Donald H. Rohrer

Assistant Editor: Kelly Griffin

No articles may be reprinted in whole or in part without obtaining permission from **ICR**.



Bruce Wood leads a tour on Museum Day.

science, to inventions, to music, etc. Each American should spend a vacation there. While national institutions seemingly should respect viewpoints from all serious citizens, reality points otherwise. Over the years, ICR has had numerous contacts with the Smithsonian. In most instances their conduct has been professional, others have been dismissive or confrontive.

An editorial in the May issue of *Smithsonian Magazine* by secretary Lawrence M. Small, sheds light on their perspective. He writes, “in accordance with a newly created strategic plan for science, [the Smithsonian] has decided to concentrate its resources over the next five years on addressing four questions . . . What is the nature and origin of the universe? How was the Earth formed and how has life on our planet evolved? How did early humans develop and how did they adapt . . . ? How can we best sustain the Earth’s fragile biological diversity for future generations?”

Obviously, the Smithsonian has “evolved.” No longer simply a suite of museums, documenting American life and history, it has become a worldwide science research conglomerate, enjoying an immense budget. At taxpayer expense, it has accomplished much of value, for which we all are thankful. But it is also evolutionary to its core, promoting a materialistic worldview of the past in the name of science. As long as ICR maintains a Christian view of nature, we can expect little affiliation with the Smithsonian.

On the other hand, as long as they insist on a naturalistic origin of all things,

eliminating the possibility of personal, supernatural input into the universe’s beginning, ultimate truth will elude them. Much money will be misspent. It could be better used in trying to more fully understand the record of origins given by the Creator. His written account doesn’t give all the details. There’s plenty of room for research, but the basics are present to answer the four questions identified by the Smithsonian.

1) “In the beginning God created the heaven[s] and the earth” (Genesis 1:1). He created even the heavenly bodies for man’s use, expects us to understand what we can about them, and I suspect has a grand destiny for us involving them.

2) The complexity of life on earth exceeds the potential of natural processes. Wherever life exists, it was created by an Intelligence far exceeding our own.

3) The earth, created for man, will ultimately melt with fervent heat (II Peter 3:12) and be replaced by the new earth. Humans were created directly from “the dust of the ground” (Genesis 2:7), and endowed with His “image” (Genesis 1:27). Man was intelligent from the start, but lost his standing when he chose to rebel against his Creator, only now regaining a shadow of what he could have become.

4) God’s image in man was given stewardship over the earth, to understand it and use it wisely (1:28). The modern environmental movement has taken a false turn into pantheism, but protecting the environment deeply concerns the Christian.

Much that the Smithsonian and other researchers discover has great value. Creationists and evolutionists completely agree in all issues relating to the nature of the universe and how it operates in the observable present, but we do disagree on how it originated in the unobserved past.

With all due respect for my scientific colleagues, you will not discover truth about origins if Truth is presuppositionally eliminated from your worldview, before your investigation begins. ☞



LATVIAN PUBLIC SCHOOL SCIENCE TEACHERS LEARN ABOUT CREATION SCIENCE

Dr. Patti Nason was key-note speaker at a Creation Science Teacher Conference in Riga, Latvia, April 16–17, 2005. About 400 teachers from rural and urban public schools attended the conference and, for the first time in their lives, learned about an alternative to evolutionary science.

Latvia, a small Baltic state that was formerly part of the Soviet Union, became a free nation in 1991. Before that time the people were taught evolution in order to support the communistic worldview—the theory of evolution supports communism’s denial that there is a God. Similar to US citizens, they are inundated with evolution in their culture. Although many people now attend church and are familiar with the Bible, they accept evolution as a fact.

Dr. Nason presented four 1½ hour lectures with PowerPoint presentations to the teachers and had a long question-answer session. The following sessions were presented as an overview of creation science:

(1) Scientific Worldviews—contrasting the basis for creation science and evolutionary science; explaining that creation scientists evaluate scientific conclusions by their congruence with the Bible.

(2) The Beginning of Life—scientific evidence with examples refuting chemical and biological evolution; micro- and

macro-evolution; genetic variation; mutations; etc.

(3) A Young Earth—general geologic processes; interpretation of the geologic column; Catastrophism vs. Uniformitarianism; pre-flood, flood and post-flood conditions of the earth; scientific evidence for a young earth and a worldwide flood.

(4) Those Amazing Dinosaurs—fossils and how they form; dinosaurs and man; dinosaurs’ existence and theories of their extinction; the Ice Age; recent discoveries of living tissue in fossilized dinosaur bones.

During the question-answer session the teachers asked for further explanations of some of the theories that were presented. Some questions related to a superstitious mindset that is prevalent in Latvia due to medieval religious practices. They expressed interest in receiving creation science materials for their classrooms.



Latvian teachers have the freedom to teach creation science in their classrooms. Dr. Nason challenged with the following: “I have heard it said that God only gives us as much freedom as we can handle. In the United States teachers do not have the freedom to teach creation science in the public school arena—it is against the law. Could it be that we have not handled our freedoms with responsibility toward God? I admonish you to use your freedom to teach the truth of creation so that God can continue to bless your newly found freedom.” ☩



WORSHIPPING THE CREATOR OR THE CREATION?

Although the accusation of mixing Christianity with science is regularly leveled at the creation scientist, one finds plenty of emotion—and yes, religion in the secular scientific community.

Ornithologists—and biologists in general—were overjoyed recently to discover a woodpecker that was thought to be extinct but has been found alive in the Big Woods region of Arkansas.¹ For six decades the ivory-billed woodpecker was reported as probably extinct by bird scientists until eight sightings and even a videotape of the creature were compiled over the years 2004–05. Even though this bird is merely a variety of woodpecker, it has caused quite a stir.

Some biologists and their reports of the rediscovery of the bird were quite emotional. In regard to trekking in the Arkansas woods, audio archivist Martha Fischer said, “The place really is like being in a cathedral.”² One report said many who searched the woods for the creature were “changed by their experience.”³ Indeed, an associate professor of biology “put his face in his hands and began to sob” and another “was too choked with emotion” after sighting the elusive bird, saying it rose “Lazarus-like from the grave.”⁴


Rediscovered plants receive the same reverent accolades. Denis Kevans and Sonia Bennett wrote a poem about a conifer thought to be extinct since Jurassic times, but was found to be alive in Australia in 1994:

*There's a tree that's so rare,
Grows deep in the gorges out there,
Deep in my heart I will sing of the Wollemi Pine,
No preaching words, no angry tones,
The Wollemi stands all alone,
One hundred million years of passing time.*⁵

Man is inherently religious and must worship something during his sojourn on earth. If he rejects the Creator, he or she will very likely worship the creation and those creatures that inhabit it. The apostle Paul warned in Romans 1:25 that there would be those,

Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature [literally, creation] more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

Creation scientists certainly share in the joy of finding a creature or plant alive that was thought to be gone forever. But all living things are from “the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein” (Acts 14:15). We are commanded not to worship the creature, but to bow down and worship the One who created them. Christians have been given a mandate to be wise stewards of what God has given us, “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it . . .” (Genesis 1:28). We are to care and be responsible for our world, but not worship it, call it Mother, or treat it as though it was a living organism to be revered.

1. <http://www.cnn.com/2005/TECH/science/04/28/woodpecker/>
2. <http://birds.cornell.edu/ivory/story6.htm>
3. Ibid.
4. <http://birds.cornell.edu/ivory/story1.htm>
5. <http://www.pnc.com.au/~lizzi/wollemi.html> 

Meeting Highlights

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Nine different lectures in seven locations over four days, occupied Dr. John Morris from May 6–9. He had been invited by heartbroken parents whose churches and formerly creationist Christian schools had announced they would be teaching old earth, progressive creation, and an allegorical view of Genesis. They did what they could to make a difference.

He spoke on a variety of topics, from Biblical creation, to geologic evidences, to biologic discoveries, to current creation research. Even though the locations were widely dispersed, many came to numerous lectures, hungry for creation information and help in countering the compromising trends so prevalent in today's church. ☞

SHERWIN BOOK HONORED BY WRITER'S GUILD

ICR scientist, Frank Sherwin, recently was notified by the San Diego Christian Writer's Guild that he is the 2004 recipient of its annual Award for *Excellence in Educational Writing*. The basis of this distinct honor was his beautifully illustrated publication, *The Ocean Book*, (Master Books, 2004), Hardback, 80 pp.

Full-color illustrations in abundance were provided by Bryan Miller, while Debbie Brooks and Beth Wiles served as contributing editors. Listed by the publisher at \$15.95, it can be purchased currently from ICR for \$12.00 (plus tax, shipping, and handling) by calling customer service at 800/628-7640. It is recommended for home schools and general reading, middle-school age and upward. ☞



Radio Log

This month on “Science, Scripture, & Salvation”:

Weekend of: Title/Topic:

- July 2 Creation and the Constitution**
As America celebrates her birthday, many claim she was founded as a secular—not Christian—nation. Did her Founding Fathers base the government on Biblical principles? Don't miss this interesting program!
- July 9 Time**
Time can't be seen or felt, just experienced. It is something we can't escape from, but what is it, and when did it begin? Join us as we address these questions!
- July 16 Recent Space Discoveries**
From Mars explorations to Saturn's moon Titan, God's glory continues to be revealed. Listen in and learn about new findings and how they point to the Creator!
- July 23 Great Apes**
Gorillas, chimpanzees, and orangutans are magnificent creatures. According to Scripture, they were made by God during creation week. Evolutionists believe these primates share a common ancestor with man. Tune in for this discussion!
- July 30 Memory and the Human Brain**
Human memory is fascinating. Its workings are mysterious. Why do we retain some things, yet discard others? Is this an accident or the result of design? For answers, tune in!

To find out where you can hear ICR radio programs, please e-mail radio@icr.org with your name and address; we will send you a radio station listing for your state. If our programs aren't aired in your area, we would be happy to send you a free demo packet for you to take to your local Christian station! ☞

POLAR PROMISES AND PROBLEMS

Walking among the seven golden lamp stands and speaking with the voice of the glorified and resurrected King of Kings, the Lord Jesus dictated seven poignant letters. All are to be read. All contain insight to the response of God's people to His message. Two letters contain praise and commendation. Two give grave warnings. Three are mixed.

Smyrna (Revelation 2:8–11) is faithful in the middle of terrible persecution and is promised a “crown of life” for their steadfast testimony. Philadelphia (Revelation 3:7–13), because of its attention to the Word has an “open door” from the Lord and will see even their enemies acknowledge their success through Christ. They are serving in the Kingdom with favor and with promise for victory.

Ephesus (Revelation 2:1–7), although doctrinally sound, has a love that has grown cold and are in danger of losing the “lamp stand”—the very church relationship that keeps them tied to service in the Kingdom. Laodicea (Revelation 3:14–22) is oblivious to their danger of expulsion. They are neither “cold nor hot” (neutral) and assume that being successful and well thought of by the world is the goal of the church.

The “Polar Opposites” reflect the reaction among today's evangelicals to the foundational issues of Biblical creationism and the pervasive impact of the approach to inerrancy. Some, like Smyrna are standing firm in spite of denominational disdain, social ostracism, or limited resources. Larger “Philadelphian” churches are boldly ministering within their spheres of influence, heedless of the pressure to yield to the majority. May their fruit increase!

Sadly, many are similar to Ephesus and Laodicea. Some like Ephesus are so concerned over technical nuances in doctrine that they have lost their love for the Word, the Lost, and the Kingdom. More, however, are caught up in the “neutrality” of “acceptance” like Laodicea, and are more concerned with “the praise of men” (John 12:43) than “sound doctrine” (II Timothy 4:3).

Help us, please. ICR is on the front lines of this critical battle for truth.

