

## Creation and ICR in Iraq




Military personnel serving at Sather Air Base located at Baghdad International Airport were offered the vital message of creation and redemption thanks to the invitation of the base Chaplains, Major Norman Ellis and Captain Cody Broussard. One of ICR's speakers, Lt.Col. Randy Guliuzza, M.D., was serving there at the Expeditionary Medical Squadron—a mobile trauma and surgical unit. In an area regularly exposed to mortar and rocket attacks, which suffered numerous combat casualties and held regular "Patriot" ceremonies for American service members killed in action, the truth of each person's accountability to the Creator was timely.

Dr. Guliuzza brought a series of messages every Sunday for eight weeks. The topics included: the importance of the doctrine of creation to the church's mission,

a critique of the evidence for evolution, the design features of the human visual and reproductive systems, and a session on geological time. Attendance was very good and increased every week. Many personnel were able to attend all of the lectures which were always followed by question and answer sessions and rich fellowship.

When stateside, Dr. Guliuzza speaks as often as possible for ICR, and has become an excellent debater when an opportunity can be found. A professional engineer in the Navy before commencing his medical training and joining the Air Force, he brings many insights and experiences to the discussion.

ICR joins Dr. Guliuzza and many Americans in prayer for a speedy victory and lasting peace in Iraq, and a healthy return for him and other personnel. 





by John D. Morris

## From Dayton to Dover

In a case reminiscent of the famous 1925 Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee, a federal judge ruled against efforts by the Dover, Pennsylvania, School Board to include mention of Intelligent Design (ID) in public school science classes. On December 20, 2005, U.S. District Judge John Jones issued a 139-page wide-ranging, detailed, sometimes angry, sometimes mistaken diatribe against creation thinking in any form.

Judge Jones book-length ruling included what pretended to be a lengthy history of science, although selective in its choice of events and rulings. Its conclusion is the most important issue in the debate, i.e., the modern definition of *science* used by the courts and some scientists. No longer is science the search for truth, it is the search for *naturalistic* explanations for all things. Any hint of *supernatural* causes or actions are therefore not science, and not allowable in the public schools under the separation of church and state. Students must be systematically shielded from mention of ideas which involve anything other than the materialistic.

In one place Judge Jones wrote, "We find that while ID arguments may be true, . . . ID is not science." (p.64.)

Throughout the ruling, ID is equated with creationism, an equivalence which both sides deny. True, all Christian creationists believe in intelligent design, and have done so for decades, but not all ID proponents are creationists.

Theirs is a big tent which includes eastern religions, agnostics, and evolutionists along with some creationists. The Judge erred in assuming religious motives to all ID advocates. Some may be so motivated, but in America, what is

wrong with that? In this country, the government serves the people, and in poll after poll it can be seen that the vast majority of Americans believe in some form of God-directed origins.

The Court failed to recognize the difference between operations science, dealing with the present nature of the universe and how it operates, and origins science, how the universe came to be. Everything science observes today mitigates against naturalistic origins. Macroevolution doesn't happen today, nor is there evidence it happened in the past, nor *could* it happen given natural law as we know it. Other processes must account for the origin of things. Every young earth creationist, every advocate of Intelligent Design as well as every advocate of evolution believes in natural law. None resort to supernatural processes to account for the present operation of things. But present natural processes are not evolutionary. To teach natural law properly necessitates teaching its limitations too. To claim that natural law accomplished everything likewise necessitates the censorship of many scientific observations. According to the Judge's ruling, we can only teach our young people that no other processes were involved.

Obviously, creation, evolution, and intelligent design are views of history, the unobserved past, when they deal with



**PUBLISHED BY**  
**INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH**  
P.O. Box 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021  
619/448-0900 WEBSITE: [www.icr.org](http://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**.

origins. Each can, however, point to the intricate design of things in the present, and speculate about their history.

The apparent design of living things is likewise not in question. All sides agree to that. Our differences lie in our views of history, and the stories we tell about the unobserved past are historical reconstructions. The leading evolutionist, Richard Dawkins, writes, "Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose." (*Blind Watchmaker*, 1987, p.1.) Evolution attributes the source of design to random mutation and *natural* selection, despite the lack of modern examples. Intelligent Design attributes the design to an unidentified designer. Creationists identify the designer as the God of the Bible.

The Court also erred in presenting a false dichotomy between faith and science,

placing one in the realm of unsupported belief and the other in the realm of observational truth. Yet creationists claim their beliefs are factual, based on observations. We didn't observe the creation event, (neither did evolutionists observe the origin of life or any form of life), but the observations science makes agrees completely with creation, and not with evolution. Censoring out an observation-based point of view cannot be good education.

The key to resolving the court's dilemma is to recognize that all views of origins are religious. We observe what is here, not how it originated. We see its unimaginable complexity and intricate processes operating in the present. Any speculation of past origins is fraught with philosophical overtones, and no one view should dominate public education. ☪

To Schedule an ICR Sponsored

## Creation • Education Vacation in Florida



February 19–24, April 9–14, 16–21,  
or April 30–May 5, 2006

**Fossil hunting, canoeing,  
beach shelling, hands-on workshops**

Contact Dr. & Mrs. Parker  
863/494-9558 • [Creation@strato.net](mailto:Creation@strato.net)  
or [CreationAdventuresMuseum.org](http://CreationAdventuresMuseum.org)





## Un-Bee-lievable Vision

Next to the fruit fly, the most popular insect (arthropod) of the creation scientist could very well be the common honey bee. Much has been written and filmed of this insect's incredible ability to make perfectly-formed combs containing hexagonal cells for maximum utilization of space and heat transfer. The bee's ability to convey the location of a food source to fellow workers via a sophisticated "dance" is legendary.



Twenty-first century research has now revealed that bee vision is more complex than anyone thought. According to science, arthropods have always been complex—and they have always been arthropods. One of the first arthropods found in the fossil record is the amazing trilobite, common in Cambrian and Ordovician sediments. Many of these creatures are so well preserved that a detailed analysis of their eyes has been possible:

The elegant physical design of trilobite eyes employ Fermat's principle, Abbe's sine law, Snell's laws of refraction, and compensates for the optics of birefringent crystals. Thus, trilobites could see an undistorted image under water. Imagine being able to see with undistorted vision in all directions, being able to determine distance in part of that range, while, at the same time, having the optimum sensor for motion detection.<sup>1</sup>

So, from the beginning, arthropod vision has been extremely complicated, a fact not clarified by Darwinism. Indeed, even explaining how the arthropod *head* supposedly evolved is an "acrimonious field."<sup>2</sup>

The composition of the arthropod head is one of the bitterest and longest-running problems in animal evolution. Unresolved after more than a century of debate, this sorry tale is (in)famously known as the "endless dispute."<sup>3</sup>

The arthropod head never evolved in the first place—it was created.

The brain of the bee is composed of a mere one million neurons (nerve cells), 0.01% of the neurons of a three-pound human brain. Using this tiny bee brain and associated vision, bees have been able to solve complicated color puzzles<sup>4</sup> and even recognize human faces.<sup>5</sup> They do this by using their 6,300 ommatidia that comprise the eye. Bees have also been created with the ability to distinguish up to 300 separate flashes of light *per second*, an attribute they use as they rapidly fly over the changing landscape.

The next time a busy bee buzzes by you on its way to a field, remember that it is designed to do and find things that our most sophisticated machines and computers cannot do, using vision and a brain that flies in the face (so to speak) of undirected evolution.

1. Austin, S., *Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe*, ICR, 1994, p. 145.
2. Budd, Graham E., Telford, Maximilian J., "Evolution: Along came a sea spider," *Nature*, vol. 437, Oct. 20, 2005, p.1099.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Astrobiology Magazine*, Nov. 6, 2005. <http://www.astrobio.net/news/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=1765>.
5. Unger, K., *ScienceNOW Daily News*, Dec. 2, 2005, citing *Journal of Experimental Biology* 5

# ICR Graduate School

10946 Woodside Avenue North, Santee, CA 92071  
P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021  
619/448-0900, ext. 6017 or 6016

## 2006 SUMMER SCHEDULE

The schedule below gives the first tentative list of courses to be offered by the ICR Graduate School this summer. Interested students should write or call as soon as possible for further information and application forms. Details can also be found at [<http://www.icr.edu>].

Department	Course #	Course Name
<b>MODULE A</b>		
<b>6/12/2006–6/30/2006</b>		
Biology	505 (3)	Biological Concepts
Biology	504 (3)	Advanced Comparative Anatomy
Biology	509 (1)	Laboratory Studies in Biology
Geology	501 (3)	Advanced Physical Geology
Physics	501 (3)	Classical Mechanics
Physics	502 (3)	Statistical Mechanics & Thermodynamics
Sci. Ed.	501 (3)	Applied Statistics for Scientists
Sci. Ed.	502 (3)	Advanced Educational Psychology/Lab
<b>MODULE B</b>		
<b>7/3/2006–7/21/2006</b>		
Biology	502 (3)	Population Genetics & Speciation
Biology	520 (3)	Advanced Cell and Molecular Biology
Biology	509 (1)	Laboratory Studies in Biology
Geology	502 (3)	Advanced Sedimentary Geology
Geology	504 (3)	Earth Structures and Tectonics
Physics	506 (3)	Introduction to Theoretical Meteorology
Physics	509 (3)	Introduction to Astronomy
Sci. Ed.	503 (3)	Instructional Design/Production
Sci. Ed.	504 (3)	Applied Science Education Research
<b>MODULE C</b>		
<b>7/24/2006–8/11/2006</b>		
Biology	507 (3)	Advanced Paleontology
Biology	510 (1)	Field Studies in Biology
Biology	508 (3)	Molecular Genetics
Biology	509 (1)	Laboratory Studies in Biology
Geology	503 (3)	Stratigraphic Analysis
Sci. Ed.	505 (3)	Curriculum Design and Analysis in Science
Sci. Ed.	506 (3)	Curriculum Implementation in Science
<b>MODULE D</b>		
<b>6/12/2006–8/11/2006</b>		
Geology	506 (1)	Geological Field Studies
Suppl. Crs.	502 (3)	Advanced Studies in Creationism—Distance



*“My soul, wait thou only upon God; for my expectation is from Him”  
(Psalm 62:5).*

ICR has recently completed an intensive evaluation of its strategic focus for the next few years and has just released an “Expectation” of the Lord’s supply to meet those goals. In the secular world such thinking and formal requests are called a “Prospectus.” Here are the main elements of “expectation” that will enable ICR to implement the work.

### **Scientific Research Projects: \$2,003,000**

**Life Sciences:** Studying the human genome to demonstrate obvious design characteristics and the uniqueness of mankind.

**Physical Sciences:** Various projects studying geologic evidence for a global Flood and cosmological evidence for a recent creation.

### **Disseminate the Findings: \$1,028,000**

**To Christian Leaders:** A network of Christian schools and colleges; a mentorship program—all to train a new generation of creation scientists.

**To the Christian Public:** A program of comprehensive public relations and communication with easily understandable media products, enabling “non-technical” use of ICR’s research results.

**To the Academic Community:** Reinforce work generated by Intelligent Design (ID) advocates with foundational scientific research done by ICR, demonstrating that the intelligence implicit in the design of life is best understood by an omnipotent and omniscient Creator.

### **New Dallas Center and Web-based Education: \$1,164,000**

**New Creation Science Conference Center in Dallas:** Train Christian leadership more intensively in the Biblical and creationist worldview, enhance the professional expertise of many disciplines, and broader dissemination of ICR research results.

**Web-Based, Distance-Learning:** A Master of Science degree in science education; an online certification program in Biblical worldview apologetics to assist pastors, teachers, and other Christian leaders in responding to the error of naturalistic and evolutionary humanism. Modules would be available as independent studies and applicable for Continuing Education Units.

If you would consider investing with ICR in these “expectations,” please ask us for a copy of the detailed “prospectus.”



Dr. Henry Morris III, ICR Executive Vice President for Strategic Ministries.  
P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021; Phone 619/448-0900; E-mail: hmorrisiii@icr.org  
donations can be made online at [www.icr.org/contribute.html](http://www.icr.org/contribute.html)