

# Acts & Facts



Institute for Creation Research  
www.icr.org

Facts  
Facts

Vol. 34 No. 6 June 2005

## DARWIN AND THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND: ARE WE NEXT?

Back in 1972 Dr. Larry Vardiman traveled to London to attend a science conference at the Royal Society headquarters near Buckingham Palace. He had been selected to be one of some 50 presenters for a week-long cloud physics conference.

On the Sunday before the conference he attended worship services at the Metropolitan Tabernacle Church where Charles Spurgeon had preached in the 1800s. Only about 100 people were in attendance on that Sunday morning at this famous church which could easily hold 5,000 people in its sanctuary.

Attendance in churches all over England has remained extremely low since the late 1800s when Darwin's theory of evolution began to take effect. In England today, less than three percent of the population claims to attend church of any belief. An encouraging bit of revival has crept into England in recent years, and interestingly, it is paralleled by the emergence of several creation organizations.




*Big Ben in London, England.*

The wholesale disaffection with God and things religious which followed Darwin's publishing of *The Origin of Species* will be repeated in the United States unless something changes to reverse the trend. We have already seen a decline in church attendance and a growing antagonism toward Biblical morality in our culture.

ICR will once again be leading a trip to England in September of 2005 to witness this cultural phenomenon first hand. We will be visiting

numerous museums and historical sites claimed to harbor "proof" of evolution and millions of years.

We have yet to discover effective ways to stop the wholesale deterioration in reliance on God's Word which would reverse this process. Can we encourage or initiate such a movement? Why not join us on the ICR tour to England this fall and help search for a solution. To obtain details on the ICR England Tour call Cindy Gabay at 619/448-0900, ext. 6034. 



## President's Column

by John D. Morris

The recent discovery of dinosaur soft parts (see page 5) has spawned much interest among scientists. The deposit in which the *Tyrannosaurus rex* fossil was found is dated at 70 million years. Not only were blood cells found, but soft and pliable tissue as well, including flexible blood vessels. Paleontologist Mary Schweitzer, who made the discovery in Montana, exclaimed: "Finding these tissues in dinosaurs changes the way we think about fossilization, because our theories of how fossils are preserved don't allow for this."

The fossil was entombed in a porous sandstone, with the surity of penetration by groundwater. Since biological material is quickly broken down in the presence of water, it seems inconceivable that organic material could have avoided decomposition for so long, raising the possibility that the formation is misdated. While not "proving" the young age for the fossil, the discovery is obviously much more compatible with recent rapid burial and fossilization than with an age of millions of years. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how soft tissue could have lasted even 5,000 years or so since the Flood of Noah's day when creationists propose the dinosaur was buried. Such a thing could hardly happen today, for soft tissue decays rather quickly under any condition. Clearly, non-uniform processes must have been involved.

Faced with the implications of this discovery, secular evolutionists are scrambling to suggest a way soft tissue can be completely preserved in pristine condition, for they dismiss the possibility of young age. But unfortunately, Christian leaders who likewise hold to long ages are joining them in the search. Why must

*Photos of the discovery were made widely available to newspapers, magazines, and websites by Science magazine, but refused to ICR for use in this article. (See page 4.)*

Christians fight this evidence? Shouldn't they welcome the possibility that the Bible is correct as it appears on the surface? Yes they should, but so strong is the commitment to millions and billions of years among many Christians that contrary evidence must be explained away.

Consider another recent incident involving Christian leaders. On several occasions over the last two years ICR scientists have participated in conferences with Christian academics to discuss the various views on the age of the earth. In April, Drs. Russ Humphreys and Henry Morris III met for such a "closed" meeting in Dallas to "identify common ground." Present were several other young-earth creationists as well as numerous seminary theologians and scientists holding the old-earth view.

Recent creation advocates presented scientific evidence supporting the Biblical creation doctrine, including the new RATE research (Radioisotopes and the

## Acts & Facts

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.



Age of The Earth), and rehearsed the clear Scriptural teaching of the young earth. Recent creation was shown to be crucial in understanding the nature of God, of man, of sin, and salvation. Clearly this is not an optional doctrine. Recent creation is derived by well established rules of hermeneutics and shown to be necessary for a Biblical view of the character of God. To them, science and Scripture agree—the earth is young.

The other, old-earth view was held by most in the room. Some, including the scientists, held to Progressive Creation, in which God created over billions of years, others to Theistic Evolution, where God used long ages of evolution to create. The seminary theologians primarily held the Framework Hypothesis, in which Genesis is considered allegorical and contains no historical information. Most knew little scientific evidence in support of long ages, but insisted that mainstream “science” firmly hold to billions of years, and that Scripture “allowed” it, thus they have adopted it.

Two days of presenting viewpoints was followed by a summary session in which each participant was asked to state his or her perspective and identify what they would require to change that perspective. Each creationist felt the scientific evidence for the young earth was persuasive, but they would change if convinced that Scripture clearly taught long ages. To them, Scripture provides the framework in which scientific data is interpreted, not the other way around.

Conversely, old-earth proponents admitted mainstream scientific opinion was of paramount importance to them. None of them, including the scientists present, is involved in primary research, but all lean on the research of others. They would change their view of Scripture only if the majority of secular scientists shifted to young-earth thinking.

Secular interpretations of scientific information hold more credence than Scripture. Scholarly Bible-supporting discoveries such as those reported by the RATE scientists, Bible-believing scientists all, do not compare to secular “consensus” opinion. Even the discovery of unfossilized dinosaur flesh, which so strongly denies long ages, would be unconvincing. While pronouncements of some scientists have led them to abandon a high view of Scripture, scientific discoveries which support Scripture are ignored.

Think of the implications for Christianity. Human reasoning is the authority for many church leaders, not Scripture. Opinions of unregenerate scientists are of more consequence than those of qualified creationist scientists. Evangelical seminaries are teaching future pastors how to “get around” clear teachings of Scripture the world considers unpopular. Theologians and Bible scholars rely on secular scientists to interpret Scripture for them. No wonder the church at large is in trouble. Its leaders are leading it in a false path. For the creationist remnant, there’s a lot of work to do. 🌟



### From South Africa

Dr. Gish . . . is indeed a true servant of God. He has fought the good fight and no one can doubt that. Although he needs a well deserved rest after 65 years of incredible ministry both in the USA and many parts of the world, he still has much that he can share with all of us. I am glad that he will still be active in the creation ministry and will continue with writing and speaking engagements even if it is at a reduced pace. I guess the only people who will be happy that he is retiring are the evolutionists and compromising Christians. 🌟



## PEER REVIEW OF CREATIONIST RESEARCH

by Larry Vardiman, Ph.D.

As new creationist research is completed at ICR and elsewhere, major findings need to be reported in journals, magazines, and newsletters. However, before the results are released to the general public, they need to be reviewed for accuracy by fellow scientists who are knowledgeable in that field. Scientific research is normally published first in technical journals. It goes through a full peer review process whereby several scientists are asked to read and comment on its quality. Suggested revisions are submitted to an editor who functions as a referee. The names of the reviewers are typically held in confidence by the editor to encourage greater candor.

This process is used by both conventional and creationist journals. When creationist research is submitted to journals like *Science* and *Nature*, however, the manuscripts are almost always rejected, most often by the editor without peer review. The reason given is typically based on some arbitrary or minor issue unrelated to the quality or thrust of the results. Although rarely admitted, the reason is most often due to bias against the concept of creation. The simple association of an article with a known creationist or creationist organization is sufficient grounds for rejection. Even if a reviewer agrees with the quality of the research by a creationist, he will often turn down a paper for publication because he personally disagrees with the creationist perspective. Or he may be reluctant to recommend acceptance for fear of recrimination from his peers. Not only are the majority of reviewers and conventional scientific

journal editors antagonistic to creationists and their research, many journals have adopted formal statements which discriminate against creation-science. It is almost impossible for creationists to receive a fair review in conventional journals.

Consequently, most creationist research must be published in creationist journals and conferences like the *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, the *TJ*, or the *International Conference on Creationism* which have been established as alternatives to the conventional scientific societies. These creationist journals and conferences arrange for expert reviewers from a wide number of different technical fields to peer review prospective articles. Typically, the reviewers have degrees from the same universities as those for conventional journals. Since they have identified themselves as creationists, however, reviews of papers submitted to a creationist journal are often still criticized by the conventional scientific community because they believe only non-creationists can evaluate scientific quality. Critics will often state that creationists cannot function as scientists.

The RATE project faced this dilemma when it began to report the results of its research. Although a few of the findings were reported in the *American Geophysical Union*, some still criticized RATE for informing its supporters of the conclusions before they were published in conventional journals. Yet, without informing its supporters, the necessary funding would not have continued. So, the policy of RATE was to publish in creationist journals and conferences, informing its supporters of the results, with or without secular outlets. The battle Dr. Henry Morris spoke of in his book, *The Long War Against God*, continues behind the scenes in creationist research. Please continue to pray for the creation scientists who wage this battle for the mind every day. ☞



## THE DEVASTATING ISSUE OF DINOSAUR TISSUE

A recent discovery in the field of paleontology has sent shockwaves through the scientific community. Evolutionist Mary H. Schweitzer of North Carolina State University has discovered flexible blood vessels inside the fossilized thighbone of a “68–70 million year old” *Tyrannosaurus rex*<sup>1</sup> from the Hell Creek formation in eastern Montana. Further investigation revealed round microscopic structures that look to be cells inside the hollow vessels. Even to the untrained eye, the tissue samples look as if the animal died recently. Fibrous protein material was dissolved with an enzyme called collagenase, indicating that amino acid sequencing could probably be done (amino acids are the building blocks of protein).


Although it is too early to make definite statements regarding this stunning and wholly unexpected find, the evidence seems to indicate the *T. rex* fossil is—well, *young*. Young as in just centuries-old, certainly not an age of millions of years. Indeed, Dr. Schweitzer said, “I am quite aware that according to conventional wisdom and models of fossilization, these structures aren’t supposed to be there, but there they are. I was pretty shocked.”<sup>2</sup>

Would evolutionary theory have predicted such an amazing discovery? Absolutely not, soft tissue would have degraded completely many millions of years ago no matter how fortuitous the preservation process. Will evolutionary theory now state—due to this clear physical evidence—that it is possible dinosaurs roamed the earth until relatively recent times? No, for evolutionary theory will not allow dinosaurs to exist beyond a certain philosophical/evolutionary period.

This is not the first time that puzzling soft tissue has been unearthed. Nucleic acid (DNA) taken from wet “fossil” magnolia leaves allegedly 17–20 million years old have been discovered.<sup>3</sup> Fragments of genetic material up to 800 base pairs long were recovered—amazing considering it does not take long for water to degrade DNA. A microbiologist in California dissected a 25-to-40-million-year-old Dominican stingless bee from amber.<sup>4</sup> Spores of bacteria were found inside the insect and actually grew when placed in the proper medium. Dr. Cano, the discoverer, took careful measures to avoid contamination. Analysis of the DNA extracted showed it was very much like the DNA found in bacteria growing in bees today. Just as the creation model predicts, bees have always been bees and bacteria have always been bacteria.

If this is in fact what these various scientific evidences indicate—soft tissue, bacteria, and DNA ensconced in fossils and amber allegedly millions of years old—then there needs to be a complete re-evaluation of these evolutionary time spans, especially in light of the advances of the ICR RATE project.

As the great English author Charles Dickens said over a century ago, “these are the best of times”—for creation science!

1. Schweitzer, M. H., et al., *Science*, vol. 307, no. 5717, pp. 1952–1955, 25 March 2005.
2. Boswell, E., *Montana State University News Service*, 24 March 2005.
3. Golenberg, E., et al., *Nature* **344**:656–8.
4. Cano, S., *Science*, vol. 268, no. 5213, p. 977, *Research News*, 19 May 1995. 





## “The Bible Says . . .”

It has long been ICR’s position that God’s revealed and written Word cannot (and must not) be changed. *Sola Scriptura* was the battle cry of the Reformation revival that led to both the great missionary movement and the modern scientific age.

**God has exalted His written Word by decree and majesty.**

Psalm 138:2; Isaiah 55:11; Revelation 1:3

**God demands accurate and precise reading of His written Word.**

II Samuel 22:31; Psalm 19:7–8; Proverbs 30:5–6; Nehemiah 8:8

**God’s written Word must not be altered or deconstructed in any way.**

Matthew 5:18–19; John 10:35; II Peter 1:20–21; Revelation 22:18–19

**God’s written Word is eternally valid and supernaturally protected.**

Matthew 24:35; Psalm 119:89; Psalm 119:160; Isaiah 40:8; I Peter 1:23

**God’s written Word is the standard of both righteousness and judgment.**

John 12:44–50; II Timothy 3:16–17

**God’s pleasure and will (truth) is revealed through the Scriptures.**

II Peter 1:21; John 17:17

It is obvious, therefore, that the text of Scripture presents a very high view of itself. All that follows in our deliberations regarding the Creation will flow from how we view Scripture. The higher regard we have for the words of the text, the more careful we will be with the interpretation of the text. The more we use other words and passages of Scripture to define and clarify a given text of Scripture, the less we will be inclined to allow extra-Biblical information to alter the obvious rendering of a word or a passage. The further away from the clear reading and face-value of a passage an interpretation becomes, the more likely such an interpretation will be subject to human error and come into conflict with other axioms of God’s Word.

ICR’s public and academic insistence on this position is being resisted strongly by some, even in the evangelical world. Pray with us and share with us as we challenge those who question the true facts of history as revealed in God’s Word.



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)