



Creation Matters

Volume 8, Number 1

January / February 2003

A Family Affair: Close Encounters with the Camel Kind

by Glen W. Wolfrom, Ph.D.

Breeders have successfully produced, through induced ovulation and artificial insemination, two offspring from females of the *Lama* genus and male dromedary camels (Farag, 2002; see Figure 1). Dubbed a "cama," the first hybrid, a male named Rama, was born 14 January 1998. On 27 February 2002, a female hybrid named Kamilah was born. These "matings"

were accomplished at the Camel Reproduction Center in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, under the direction of British researcher J.A. (Lulu) Skidmore.

Taxonomically, the camel family is named Camelida, and its members are called camelids (see Table 1). New World (NW) camelids consist of guanacos, llamas, vicuñas, and alpacas, while Bactrian (two-humped) and dromedary (one-humped) camels comprise the Old World (OW) camelids. Crosses within the OW and NW camelids, respectively, produce fertile offspring. All camelid species have the same diploid chromosome number ($2n=74$). The cama is the result of the first successful cross between an OW and a NW species of camelid.

... continued on p. 4

Aspects of Deity Perceived from Natural Science, Part 2: God's Purpose

by George F. Howe, Ph.D.

It is in keeping with the Bible and with science at its best to look for aspects of God's nature that are revealed in His creation (Howe, 2002). The Bible encourages us to seek out God's characteristics by studying His handiwork:

Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. (Romans 1:20a, Revised Standard Version).

Certain of God's scientifically obvious attributes can be designated by words which

... continued on p. 2



Figure 1. **Top photo:** Rama, a male cross between female guanaco and a male dromedary camel, was born in January, 1998. **Bottom photo:** Kamilah, a female cross between a female llama and a male dromedary camel, was born in February, 2002. Photos courtesy of Dr. Lulu Skidmore.

Objective Origins Science vs. Evolution Only: Objectivity Scores Big Time in 2002

by John Calvert, J.D.

Twenty years from now, 2002 may appear as the turning point or "D-Day" in the war against an "Evolution Only" paradigm in public schools. The competitor to Evolution Only is objective origins science. Objectivity is the antithesis of Evolution Only.

Origins science is the science that studies the religiously charged question: "Where do we come from?" Objective origins science, in seeking to answer that question without bias, allows the weight of the relevant evidence to dictate explanation rather than prejudice, presupposition, or preconception. When we go to

the ball game we want the umpire behind the plate to just tell us whether the ball is in or out of the strike zone. We don't want him to favor one team or the other by ignoring relevant data or interpreting observed data so that it fits a "desired" explanation.

If current origins science were conducted and taught with the objectivity of a major league umpire, then we could fold our tents and go home. It isn't. According to John Rennie, the editor of *Scientific American*, his brand of science employs a bias when it addresses *the big question*.

... continued on p. 6

begin with the letter “p” for mnemonic reasons (Howe, 2002). His *presence*, for example, is overwhelmingly evident in astronomy, as David noted:

The heavens are telling the glory of GOD,
And the work of his hands the expanse
is declaring;... (Psalm 19:1; Rotherham, 1896).

Purpose is another divine characteristic which can be witnessed in science. God's purpose, intent, plan, or design can be discerned by questioning the animals:

But ask now the beasts and they shall teach you... (Job 12:7; King James Version)

The Hebrew word for “ask” here means to inquire intently of these creatures. Ironically, the very beasts we are supposed to consult are not able to speak! Nonetheless, they are said to “teach” us clearly or “...to point out (as if by aiming the finger)” (Strong, 1967; p. 53). Although inarticulate, animals teach like dynamic instructors who use the index finger to emphasize their points! And lucid learning occurs when someone performs a clearly designed experiment using animals, or records insightful field observations of wildlife, as we shall see.

Under scientific scrutiny, the winged creatures likewise tutor us by enumerating their own evidences for design in nature.

Or the birds of the heavens and let them tell you... (Job 12:7; New American Standard Bible).

Upon being properly addressed with investigative wisdom, the earth itself yields information about God's program.

Or, speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee (Job 12:8; King James Version).

And the fish contribute to our appreciation for divine purposes in creation as well.

Or let the fish of the sea inform you (Job 12:8; New International Version).

We can learn how science is securing knowledge about God's purposes from each of these sources (animals, birds, the earth, and fish) by turning to current journals.

But Ask Now the Beasts and They Shall Teach You

How can shrubs and trees continue to grow and survive even though their leaves and twigs are continually being eaten by moose and other browsers? Ask the animals and then listen, like Reeb (2002) has done. The saliva left by a moose on branch and leaf surfaces that have been bitten promotes growth in the wounded plant tissues. Bergman from Sweden (Reeb, 2002) discovered that cut willow twigs treated with moose saliva grew significantly better than the cut, untreated controls. Thus the saliva of a browsing animal stimulates the regrowth of the very plant it eats. Here is God's design *par excellence*!

Ostfeld (2002) reported that little field mice (voles) prevent reforestation of northern meadows in the United States and Canada. These voles are able to perpetuate their own choice grassland habitat by selectively eliminating tree seedlings that would otherwise soon change the landscape back into forests that are far less desirable as vole habitats. This is an amazing ecological feat, considering the small size of voles. It reminds us of Zechariah 4:10 where it is said that the Lord does not despise the day of small things.

King Solomon suggested that we “go to the ant” (Proverbs 6:6) and consider her ways if we wish to become wise. Scientists are now going to the ants to find solutions for complex networking problems (Bonabeau and Theraulaz, 2002). As a result of many interactions between individual ants, a kind of group knowledge emerges which they call a “swarm intelligence” (p. 74). As a result of studying foraging patterns, new methods for handling traffic in busy telecommunications networks have been deduced.

Bonabeau and Theraulaz (2002; p. 74) also reported that:

The cooperative interaction of ants working to transport a large food item may lead to more effective algorithms for robots. The way in which insects cluster their

colony's dead and sort their larvae can aid in analyzing banking data. And the division of labor among honeybees could help streamline assembly lines in factories.

Comparing all this recent research on practical applications of ant behavior to scripture passages written thousands of years ago shows that the God of the Bible is also the God of natural science (Job 12:2 and Proverbs 6:6).

Let the Birds of the Heavens Tell You

Domesticated cormorants have been used for centuries in the Orient to catch fish for human consumption (Hoh and Leachman, 1998). Several families in Wucheng, China, carry out a brisk fishing business by letting these highly skilled, winged fishers do their work for them. With a wood block on a long bamboo pole, the human fisherman brings back his cormorant from the water as it delivers a freshly caught fish in its beak. Such fishing at Wucheng was better years ago, but recently one of the fishermen reported catching anywhere between 10 pounds and 100 pounds in a day by using cormorants.

The lesson from birds in this specific case is that some of them can be used to catch our food supply. Perhaps contacts like these involving humans, birds, and fish are what the Creator intended by telling

Creation Matters

ISSN 1094-6632

Creation Matters — a CRS publication
Volume 8, Number 1
January / February 2003

Copyright © 2003, Creation Research Society

All rights reserved.

General Editor: Glen W. Wolf from

For membership / subscription information,
advertising rates,
and information for authors:

Glen W. Wolf from
P.O. Box 8263
St. Joseph, MO 64508-8263

Email: contact@creationresearch.org
Phone/fax: 816.279.2312

Creation Research Society Website:
<http://www.creationresearch.org>

Articles published in *Creation Matters* represent the opinions and beliefs of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Creation Research Society.

Advertisements appearing in this publication do not necessarily imply endorsement of the events, products, or services by the Creation Research Society.

Adam and Eve to subdue (Hebrew *kabas*) the earth (bring it under control) and to:

Rule over the fish of the sea
and the birds of the air and over
every living creature that
moves on the ground (Genesis,
1:28b; New International Ver-
sion).

“Rule” (Hebrew *rada*) probably here means to lead or direct. And this means that God intends for humans to harness the talents of birds to accomplish useful ends, something we would expect from a faithful Creator who made humans a little lower than the angels.

Speak to the Earth and It Shall Teach Thee

In recent years, the Lord has given Creation Research Society several gifted professional and amateur earth scientists. As a result of their dedicated research and writing, the *Creation Research Society Quarterly* has come to look as if it were the *Creation GEOLOGY Research Society Quarterly*! All of this makes old-timers like me rejoice because, long ago, it was difficult to find vocal geologists who would publish in the *CRSQ*. I will not even begin to name names or to list the many creation/flood/young earth geology papers published in the last 15 years. It will be sufficient to say that many false paradigms have been crumbling, paradigms defended by those wishing to remove God’s purposes from earth science.

One major example is that most geologists no longer account for vast depths of strata by calling for the slow rain of sediments across vast ages of time. They now assert, instead, that thousands of feet of regularly alternating sediments were deposited quite rapidly in deep-water, flood-related events. Some of these processes are called “turbidity currents” and the vast deposits they have produced are known as turbidites or sometimes as flysch (see Figure 1).

The catastrophic aspects of geology fit well with the overall idea that a loving Creator brought corrective judgment to earth in times past. Scientists have indeed brought their questions to the earth and it has given clear and often unexpected an-



Figure 1. Flysch beds in the Hamond formation. In this view, one is looking northward at a road cut along Highway 90, about 15 miles east of Marathon, Texas. Scientists now believe that repeating beds like these were formed rapidly by turbidity currents in deep water. This may have occurred during the depositional stage of the Flood, and the tilting might have taken place somewhat later in a tectonic stage. Photograph by G. W. Wolf from.

swers controverting uniformitarianism.

Or Let the Fish of the Sea Inform You

Marine biologists wonder why fish are so colorful. By means of personal dives in Australia’s reefs and laboratory studies of his own, Marshall (2002) has put this color question directly to the fish. The answers Marshall got showed that colors play various purposeful roles in the lives of different reef fish. Certain color patterns can camouflage whole schools of fish *en masse*. Zebras, on land, also have this “disruptive coloration” by which a whole herd is obscured from view.

Many fish are able to change their colors rapidly, like chameleons. In certain species, these changes occur with mood shifts, as during a fight confrontation. Sometimes bright colors like blue and yellow are aposematic, providing a protective warning to other fish that the highly pigmented fish is toxic, as in the case of the boxfish (Marshall, 2002).

A permanent dot on both sides at the rear of some fish resembles an eye. Such false eyes make it difficult for predators to tell the fish’s head from its tail. A bright color scheme of an individual fish, when seen in a shaft of sunlight, may serve as a “display” to attract potential mates or to drive off rivals.

All of these and many other functions of color in reef fish cry out for a creation-

design explanation. Marshall (2002) seems to be steeped in evolutionary speculations. He does admit quite perceptibly, however, that these fish did not evolve such colors as a result of their environmental setting, because the reefs themselves have a relatively monochromatic green or brown color. In another article in this series, I hope to discuss pulchritude and the strong possibility that God put colors like these into fish and other living forms not only for utilitarian purposes, but for His own enjoyment and ours as well.

Conclusion

The end result of all such scientific instruction from beasts, birds, the earth, and fish is a resounding answer to this question:

Who knoweth not among all these
that the hand of Yahweh hath
done this? (Job 12:9; Rotherham,
1896.)

The answer is that everyone ought to realize that the animals, the birds, the fish, and the earth give non-verbal affirmation that they each were made (Hebrew *asah*) by the Lord.

References

- Bonabeau, E. and G. Theraulaz. 2002. Swarm smarts. *Scientific American* 282(3): 72-79.
- Hoh, E. and J. Leachman. 1998. Flying fishers of Wucheng. *Natural History* 107(8): 66-71.
- Howe, G. 2002. Aspects of Deity perceived from natural science, part 1: God’s presence. *Creation Matters* 7(5):1.
- Marshall, J. 2002. Why are reef fish so colorful? *Scientific American: The Oceans Quarterly* 9(3): 54-57.
- Ostfeld, R. 2002. Little loggers make a big difference. *Natural History* 111(4):64-70.
- Reebs, S. 2002. Drooling is good. *Natural History* 111(6): 26.
- Rotherham, J. 1896. *The Emphasised Bible*. The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, OH.
- Strong, J. 1967. *Strong’s Dictionary of Hebrew Words*. Abington Press, New York, NY.

George F. Howe is Biology Editor of the Creation Research Society Quarterly. He receives mail at 24635 Apple Street, Newhall, CA 91321-2614.

Phenotype

In a scientific publication about the first offspring, Skidmore and her coworkers (Skidmore, et al., 1999) reported that, at 9 months of age, his fur and nose/nostrils were like those of the NW camelids, but his ears and tail were intermediate in length between those of camels and guanacos. The feet were described as intermediate between the single (conjoined, two-toed) footpad of camels and the cloven hooves of guanacos. There was no sign of a hump. Vocalizations were said to have “discernable elements” of both parents. Genotyping analyses were consistent with the offspring being a hybrid between the two species.

In more recent popular articles, the male hybrid, now more than four years old, is reported to have a mixture of characteristics (see Figure 1). His behavior is depicted as more llama-like, while his vocalizations are more camel-like (Frag, 2002). His fur is described as intermediate (furrer than a camel, not as luxurious as a llama) (Slackman, 2002). With a body size intermediate between the two species, his legs are noted to be longer and thicker than those of a camel (Slackman, 2002).

From descriptions in the popular reports, there is nothing to suggest that the recently-born female has physical characteristics which differ from those of the male (Frag, 2002) (see Figure 2).

Capable of reproduction?

It is not yet known if the male cama is capable of reproduction. Though he has shown an “interest” in female llamas, he is reportedly too big for them and too small for camels (Slackman, 2002). Perhaps the birth of the female hybrid will, in the future, provide an “opportunity” for further evaluation of reproductive success.

Skidmore, et al. (1999) have expressed skepticism about reproductive success for the male (Skidmore, et al., 1999). This pessimistic outlook was based, in part, on the fact that histopathological examination of ovaries from previously aborted female hybrids revealed a lack of complete oocyte meiosis. Although testicular development is evident in the surviving male, the authors

Table 1. The Camel Family (after Skidmore, et. al., 1999)

Family Camelidae	
Species Name	Common Name
<i>Camelus bactrianus</i>	Bactrian (two-humped) camel
<i>Camelus dromedarius</i>	dromedary (one-humped) camel
<i>Lama glama</i>	llama
<i>Lama guanicoe</i>	guanaco ^a
<i>Lama pacos</i>	alpaca
<i>Lama vicugna</i>	vicuña ^b

^a Probable wild ancestor of the domesticated llama

^b Possible wild ancestor of the domesticated alpaca

further speculate that spermatogenesis may be adversely affected by Y-linked genetic differences.

As alluded to above, there have been a number of successful conceptions, but only two live births (Skidmore, et al., 2001). One report suggests that part of the difficulty may be related to biochemical differences between tissues of the developing fetus and the mother (Jones, et al., 2002). Extraspecific embryo transfer techniques are being utilized in an attempt to improve the live birth success rate (Skidmore, et al., 2001).

The initial success of this venture has been heralded as “shedding new light on our understanding of evolution.” In fact, one popular account proclaimed that “the common ancestor of the camel and the llama has been reintroduced to the world” after having been extinct for over 30 million years (Stamford, 1998) — a veritable “30 million-year-old miracle.”

Evolutionary storyline

The evolutionary storyline, as recounted by Skidmore, et al. (1999), is that camelids split into the two genera (*Camelus* and *Lama*) some 11-30 million years ago in North America. They began to diversify when the cameloids (ancestors of the camels) migrated to Siberia, via the Bering Straits, then eventually to regions in southern Asia and the Middle East. The lamoids (ancestors of the guanaco and the vicuñas) migrated to the Andes in South America. Llamas and alpacas were domesticated a few thousand years ago.

The evolutionary “miracle,” of course, is that after millions of years of genetic isolation it is possible to produce a hybrid from these two species. Today there are a number of anatomical and physiological similarities and differences between OW and NW camelids. It is not the purpose of this review to detail these (see Skidmore, et al., 1999). In the words of Skidmore, et al. (1999), “Considering the many millions of years of reproductive isolation ... it is perhaps surprising that any male hybrids were produced at all.”

Baraminological perspective

In 1999, just after the first hybrid was born, members of the Baraminology Study Group evaluated the camels from the creationist perspective (Wood, et al., 1999). They concluded that modern camelids (OW and NW) belong to the same created kind and were represented by only two individuals on Noah’s Ark. This is especially exciting because modern camels are mentioned in Genesis 12:16, less than 500 years after the Flood. Several creationists have proposed a period of rapid speciation within kinds after the Flood (Wieland, 1997; Wise, 1994; Wood and Cavanaugh, 2001), and the camel kind confirms that prediction.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. Todd Wood for reviewing the article and providing a baraminological perspective. Special thanks to Dr. Lulu Skidmore for supplying photographs of the two hybrids.

References

- Farag, T.I. 2002. Emirates home to new hybrid species: Cama. *The Ambassadors Online Magazine* 5(2). <http://ambassadors.net/features.htm>
- Jones, C.J., M. Abd-Elnaeim, E. Bevilacqua, L.V. Oliveira, and R. Leiser. 2002. Comparison of uteroplacental glycosylation in the camel (*Camelus dromedarius*) and alpaca (*Lama pacos*). *Reproduction* 123(1):115-126.
- Skidmore, J.A., M. Billah, M. Binns, R.V. Short, and W.R. Allen. 1999. Hybridizing Old and New World camelids: *Camelus dromedarius* x *Lama guanicoe*. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 266:649-656.
- Skidmore, J.A., M. Billah, R.V. Short, W.R. Allen. 2001. Assisted reproductive techniques for hybridization of camelids. *Reprod. Fertil. Dev.* 13(7-8):647-652. [At the time this article was published there was only one successful birth.]
- Slackman, M. 2002. Kamilah's mission: cheer up a lonely cama. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 15 July 2002. <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/07/14/1026185141216.html>
- Stamford, F. 1998. Instant cama. *Al Shindagah Online*. March 1998. <http://www.alshindagah.com/march98/cama.htm>
- Wieland, C. 1997. Speciation conference brings good news for creationists. *CENTJ* 11(2):135-136.
- Wise, K.P. 1994. *Australopithecus ramidus* and the fossil record. *CENTJ* 8:160-165.
- Wood, T.C. and D.P. Cavanaugh. 2001. A baraminological analysis of subtribe Flaveriinae (Asteraceae: Helenieae) and the origin of biological complexity. *Origins* 52:7-27.
- Wood, T.C., P.J. Williams, K.P. Wise, D.A. Robinson. 1999. Summaries on camel baraminology. In Robinson, D.A. and P.J. Williams, eds. *Baraminology'99*, Baraminology Study Group, Liberty University, pp. 9-18. <http://www.bryancore.org/bsg/Bara99.pdf>

Glen Wolf from is editor of Creation Matters and Membership Secretary of the Creation Research Society. He is employed as a clinical research scientist in the animal health industry.

The Angler Fish

by Mark Stewart

The scientific classification of anglers makes up the order Lophiiformes. Those known as goosefishes make up the family Lophidae in the suborder Lophioidei, including the common angler fish, or European goosefish, classified as *Lophius piscatorius*. Sexual dimorphism is characteristic of anglers belonging to the suborder Ceratiodei, often referred to as deep-sea anglers. Other groups of anglers include the batfish family, Ogcocephalidae, the frogfish family, Antennariidae, and the sea toad family, Chaunacidae.

Angler is a common name for some 225 different species of the angler fish and of about 265 related saltwater fishes having appendages resembling fishing rods or lures with which they entice prey. Many species change colors in only months. The common angler fish is found along the coasts of Europe and North America from the British Isles and Nova Scotia to Barbados. Up to 1.5 meters (approximately 5 feet) long, they live on the ocean floor, creeping along on pectoral fins in search of food. The angler's cavernous mouth and head are all out of proportion to the rest of its body — the mouth of one species can be 10 inches wide on a three-foot-long fish. With its large mouth and distensible stomach, the angler can swallow other fish as large as itself.

One of the most unusual aspects of anglers is their reproductive behavior. In many species of deep-sea anglers, the male is less than one-tenth the size of the female and lacks her characteristic lure. The parasitic male attaches himself to the body of his mate by biting through the skin of the female host. The circulatory systems of the two fish then

join, with nutrients from the blood of the female thereafter providing the male angler with his only source of nourishment. Anglers are the only fish that exhibit this type of extreme sexual dimorphism. Try figuring how many billions upon billions of males died trying to perfect that routine. Obviously,



Deep sea angler fish, *Melanocetus johnsonii*.
Photo Copyright (2001) .MailsBroadcast dotcom.
Reprinted with permission from
www.mailsbroadcast.com/b22.deepsea.fish.htm

since the males of some species are “surviving” by hooking onto the blood supply of the females - they have always been “surviving” in this fashion.

Evolution also fails to explain, in its own rules, principles, and scientific methodology, how a ludicrous “fishing pole,” hanging out of a fish’s head, can arise through a process of random mutation and natural selection. The evolutionary “idea” is that changing environments have weeded out those that were not genetically equipped to alter themselves to fit in with new conditions. This “survival of the fittest” scenario, though badly battered in its original Darwinian form, is still a fundamental basis for evolutionary reasoning. In effect, it is “progress or perish” in the evolutionary scheme of things.

One additional problem is that anglers are terrible swimmers and, as such, have a difficult time chasing other fish to “catch” them. But did they develop that way? If so,

from what original state did they develop? Did they formerly swim about on the surface, at medium depths, or on the bottom? Think about this. If an anglerfish evolved, it had to have evolved from some original state — a “pre-angler” of some type. According to one author (Cromie, 1966), “Through the trial and error of evolution anglers have selected a variety of exotic lures from nature’s tackle-box.”

Not only do anglers have the instinct to attract other fish to their fleshy baits, but they also have the instinct not to grab it themselves. Furthermore, they know better than to grab each other’s lures! This evidence indicates an intelligent creator rather than blind, degenerative forces working together.

Some anglers have forked light organs on their foreheads. Others have a type of “flashing light” on the bait at the tips of their rods, which can be turned off or on at the fish’s will. The light, produced by colonies of luminescent bacteria, “shines” through skin which lacks the skin pigment present in the rest of the organism. Such bioluminescence is not rare in the ocean depths, where some organisms have this ability within their own biochemistry, and others like the angler fish utilize symbiotic bacteria. Leaving aside the origins of bioluminescence, per se, how do such symbiotic relationships arise via naturalistic, random evolutionary processes?

Apparently no formal treatise has been advanced to explain how all the varieties of fishing apparatus (i.e., the rod and bait) evolved. What evolution does suggest is that the pole just “gradually” grew from an ex-

... continued on p. 7

In a recent issue he reluctantly acknowledged that “a central tenet of modern science is *methodological naturalism*...” (Rennie, 2002; emphasis added). Methodological naturalism is an assumption that natural laws and chance are adequate to account for all phenomena. Although a naturalistic assumption may have some utility in experimental sciences, it destroys objectivity in an historical science like origins science.

Scientists like Mr. Rennie really don’t ask the question: *Where do we come from?* That is because methodological naturalism provides the answer before the question is asked. We come solely from unguided and purposeless natural process called evolution. Methodological naturalism assumes that intelligent causes have not operated to produce natural phenomena, even in the face of an enormous volume of contradictory evidence.

“*Evolution Only*” is just another name for methodological naturalism. The key word is “*only*.” With an Evolution Only assumption, the umpire will always call strikes when Evolution is the pitching team and balls when it takes the bat. There really is no need to even play the game. We know the outcome before it starts. Evolution always wins. If a game is played at all, it can only be an intramural sport between two competing concepts of evolution, but not between evolution and an alternative theory of origins like intelligent design — that would not be “Evolution Only.”

The year 2002 was a watershed for scientific objectivity in origins science. Evolution Only / methodological naturalism was rejected in two jurisdictions: Ohio and Cobb County Georgia. It was replaced with movements toward more objective origins science curricula. As expected, these victories are serving as beacons for renewed activity around the country.

Progress with Science Standards

In Ohio, Evolution Only/methodological naturalism was defeated by a unanimous decision of the Ohio State Board of Education. The Board specifically rejected a naturalistic definition of scientific knowl-

edge in favor of one grounded in logic and objectivity. The rejected naturalistic definition stated that “**scientific knowledge is limited to natural explanations for natural phenomena based on evidence from our senses or technological extensions.**”

Under the tenets of methodological naturalism, intervention by an intelligent cause is not a “natural explanation.” Intelligence can only be detected by other intelligence and not by only the five physical senses. Thus, by word-smithing the proponents of Evolution Only sought, *but failed*, to exclude any consideration of intelligent design when seeking to explain our origins to children.

Hand in hand with this fundamentally important decision, the Ohio Board also adopted science standards that require students to understand “*how scientists continue to investigate and critically analyze aspects of evolutionary theory...*”

Evolution Only proponents cannot live with criticisms of evolution, because principle criticisms deal with subjects that Darwinists must avoid, such as: lack of explanation for the origin of life and biological complexity, the use of a naturalistic bias in violation of the scientific method, and the dismal track record of Darwinian predictions.

The action of the Ohio Board gave heartburn to the major science institutions. However, it was congruent with the wishes of the public. In June, 2002, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* reported the results of a poll conducted by a highly regarded polling organization. A stunning 91% of Ohioans voted against “Teach Only Evolution,” while 82% favored teaching some form of intelligent design as well as evidence for and against evolution.

Progress with Textbooks and Curricula

The Ohio actions about state science standards are fundamental to objective science education. However, the real problem inheres in biology textbooks and curricula. The only options available to local school boards are textbooks which teach a very subtle Evolution Only “historical narrative” about where we come from. These books don’t mention criticisms of evolution or the competing design hypothesis. The books simply “*teach*” that we are the

product of an unguided natural process — that is the message.

Although methodological naturalism is a “central tenet of modern science” and the explanations found in the textbooks, that fundamental assumption is not even mentioned in the books. Instead, the textbooks lead students to believe that the Evolution Only explanations are evidentiary-based conclusions derived strictly by the scientific method. In fact, they are explanations dictated by a preconceived naturalistic assumption.

In 2002 a school board in Cobb County, Georgia decided to open the eyes and minds of students and scrap Evolution Only in both the textbooks and curricula. This was accomplished in a March, 2002, meeting where the Board directed that stickers be affixed to science textbooks which state:

“This textbook contains material on evolution. Evolution is a theory, not a fact, regarding the origin of living things. This material should be approached with an open mind, studied carefully, and critically considered.”

If there was ever any doubt about the bias of science institutions, it was eliminated with the announcement of this action. According to the AAAS and other science organizations, it is heresy to even suggest that evolution should be considered with an “open mind.” Of course, the ACLU, the public defender of biased origins science, promptly filed suit against the sticker. We are pleased to see the suit, for it is one we should win.

The Cobb County action to use stickers to warn students about bias in textbooks was generated by a petition signed by over two thousand parents. The petition also urged the Board to adopt other measures to identify and correct bias and misleading statements in textbooks and origins science curriculum. The Board further responded in September, 2002, by adopting an objective origins science policy that encourages the discussion of “disputed views” about “the origin of the species.” The new policy is posted on the web site of the Intelligent Design network (Anonymous, 2003).

In January, 2003, the Superintendent of Schools for the Cobb County district issued implementing guidelines. These would appear to require teachers to address

the issue of methodological naturalism as teachers “moderate” discussions “that will distinguish between scientific and philosophical or religious issues.” The guidelines also require teachers to “maintain a posture of neutrality toward religion.” An Evolution Only curriculum that promotes a naturalistic world view is not religiously neutral. Finally, teachers are to be supported in their efforts “to provide objective” instruction. With these guidelines, teachers should feel free to vary from the non-objective Evolution Only agenda presently utilized in biology classrooms.

The Cobb County policy reflects concepts expressed in two pieces of legislation. A Congressional Report that accompanies the “No Child Left Behind Act” urges educators to teach children to “distinguish the data and testable theories of science from religious or philosophical claims that are made in the name of science.” Concepts of objectivity and religious neutrality are also expressed in legislation introduced in the Ohio legislature. The language of Ohio HB 481 encourages objectivity, the disclosure of assumptions, and a discussion of the full range of scientific views that exist about our origins. These resources may be found at Intelligent Design network’s web site (Anonymous, 2002).

Beyond Ohio and Georgia

The wedge that is splitting the Evolution Only paradigm has been science itself. The more we learn about the cosmos and life itself, the more we are driven to the conclusion that both are remarkably “fine

tuned.” Evolutionary “historical narratives” are nothing more than just-so stories that appear increasingly inadequate to explain the awesome complexity of cellular information processing systems. Gene Myers, a lead scientist on the Human Genome project was quoted as remarking (Abate, 2001; emphasis added):

“What really astounds me is the architecture of life. ... The system is extremely complex. It’s like it was designed. ... There is a huge intelligence there.”

Two new educational videos are explaining these scientific points to the public and school educators very effectively: *Unlocking the Mystery of Life* and *Icons of Evolution*. Not only do they unlock the mystery of life, they also are unlocking minds previously closed to anything but evolution. [Editor’s note: Both videos are available from CRS Books. See www.creationresearch.org.]

The actions in Ohio and Georgia, and new science and new educational materials are generating growing interest around the country in moving from Evolution Only to Objective Origins Science. Intelligent Design network, inc., an organization that arose out of the debate in Kansas three years ago, is now working with groups in fourteen states. Although, the wall of Naturalism seems as formidable as the Aswan Dam, we are beginning to see cracks in the edifice. To bring the wall to the ground we need very good supplements to current biology textbooks. None are

presently available, but they will be produced. It is just a matter of time.

Thomas Huxley said: “*Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.*” Our science institutions are urging science to adopt the creed that we result only from natural processes and not by design. Creed adoption works in a closed society like that which prevailed in Nazi Germany. However, it can not replace the truth in an open society like ours. We have an insatiable thirst for the truth, and it will prevail. What we are seeing is truth pushing aside a worldview that some would like everyone to embrace. It just will not happen in the USA. The wall of naturalism will come down!

References

- Rennie, J. 2002. 15 answers to creationist nonsense. *Scientific American* (July, 2002). www.sciam.com/issue.cfm?issuedate=Jul-02
- Anonymous, 2002. Teaching resources for parents, teachers, and school boards. Intelligent Design network. www.IntelligentDesignNetwork.org/teachingresources.htm.
- Anonymous. 2003. Recent Actions Taken by School Boards and Districts To Foster Objective Origins Science. Intelligent Design network. www.IntelligentDesignNetwork.org/ccacts.pdf.
- Abate, T. 2001. Human genome map has scientists talking about the Divine. Surprisingly low number of genes raises big questions. *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 19, 2001).

John Calvert is a lawyer with training and experience in geology. He is a managing director of Intelligent Design network, inc., a non profit organization that seeks scientific objectivity and religious neutrality in origins science.

Angler Fish

...continued from page 5

tended dorsal spine, and that the lure gradually developed via trial and error through assorted random mutations. Why would this occur only in some females, and why in only some species? And how long did it take? How were the “pre” anglers able to survive? If they survived by swimming faster and grabbing other fish in some pre-angler “state,” then they were surviving and had no need and no pressure to change. And if they were surviving quite well, why change? Why change so elaborately and make life more difficult? These questions are asked to demonstrate how ludicrous evolution becomes when attempting to explain all these factors.

If the angler fish were happily surviving in shallow water (which it does), it had no need to go deeper to search for food. And if it did not need to go deeper to search for food, then it would not need to develop its variety of fishing lures. The fact is that these marvelous creatures were created by a Master Designer and did not gradually evolve!

Bibliography

- Anonymous. 1999. Anglerfish. *Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia 99 Version A*.
- Cromie, W.J. 1966. *The Living World of the Sea*. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey, pg. 216
- Hildebrand, M. 1974. *Analysis of Vertebrate Structure*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, pp. 636-637.
- Idyll, C.P. 2000. Anglerfish. *The Year 2001 Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia (1-Disc Edition)*, Grolier, Inc., Danbury, CT.

- Shute, E. 1969. *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution*, Fourth Printing. Craig Press, Nutley, NJ, pp. 122-123.
- Pycraft, W.P. 1925. *Camouflage in Nature*, Second Revised Edition, Hutchinson and Co., London.
- Mr. Stewart, with an associate degree in accounting and business administration, has worked in the automobile industry for 18 years. He has had 50 letters-to-the-editor published in various newspapers, in addition to having articles in several creationist publications. Email: creation@bright.net*

What Intelligent Design Is Not ...

by Ashby L. Camp, J.D., M.Div.

Intelligent design (ID) is really not a theory of origins; rather, it is a theory of design detection. The claim of ID is simply that nature, particularly the biological realm, bears marks (i.e., detectable indications) of intelligent involvement. IDers believe one can infer this intelligent involvement from observation, and thus believe the enterprise qualifies as science.

Most of the participants in the movement believe personally that the intelligent designer was the God of the Bible, but they accept that all one can demonstrate via observation of nature is that some kind of intelligence was involved. In other words, the move from an intelligent designer to the God of the Bible must be made through theology or philosophy rather than through inference from observation.

Since ID proper makes no claim about how the world we observe (and from which we infer intelligent involvement) came to

be, it is consistent with many different origins scenarios. The sine qua non is that one believe the hand of the intelligence is in some way detectable.

Many theistic evolutionists reject the notion that the divine involvement they accept on faith is detectable. That is, they deny that this reality is empirically distinguishable from a reality that arose by purely unintelligent processes. That is why they are at home with philosophical naturalists. They agree with everything the naturalists say about origins, with the addendum that God was invisibly at work in the process.

It is interesting that some of the staunchest critics of ID are theistic evolutionists. Kenneth Miller, who claims to be Catholic, is one example that comes to mind. Another is Howard J. Van Till. You might read William A. Dembski's response to Howard Van Till's review of Dembski's

book entitled *No Free Lunch* to better understand this detectability issue and how significant it is.

If the ID movement succeeds in demonstrating scientifically that an intelligence was somehow involved in the origin of living things, the question will be the identity of that intelligence. My opinion is that this will make society more open to the truth of biblical creation. Others think it won't really help.

Reference

Dembski, W.A. 2002. *Naturalism's Argument from Invincible Ignorance: A Response to Howard Van Till*. Discovery Institute, Seattle, WA. <http://www.discovery.org/viewDB/index.php3?program=CRSC%20Responses&command=view&id=1256>

Ashby L. Camp has a J.D. degree from Duke University School of Law and a M.Div. degree from Harding University Graduate School of Religion. Email: Ashby@cs.com

What Are Creationists Thinking about ...?

As new scientific discoveries make the headlines, have you ever wondered how your fellow creationists are reacting? Have you ever thought of a "crazy" new idea about origins and wanted to bounce it off another creationist?

Now you can keep in contact daily with creationists from all around the world. The Creation Research Society sponsors **CRSnet**, an online community of CRS members who have e-mail access to the Internet. Not only do participants discuss the latest scientific findings related to origins, but they also receive news about the CRS — its research, publications, and activities — and other creation-related news.

For more information, send an e-mail message to Glen Wolfrom at contact@creationresearch.org.

Participation is limited to CRS members in good standing.



CRSQ on CD

George Hunter (editor). Creation Research Society. Members, \$149.00; nonmembers and subscribers, \$169.00. (Prices on this item include postage and handling.)

This two-CD set contains Volumes 1-38 (through March, 2002) of the *Creation Research Society Quarterly* (CRSQ) and Volumes 1-6 (through December, 2001) of *Creation Matters* in the popular Adobe® Acrobat® portable document format (PDF). The articles are searchable using the included Acrobat Reader® (v. 5.0) for the Windows® operating system. Special instructions are provided for those who wish to use the CDs on a Macintosh® operating system. [Note: Current plans are to offer updated CDs to registered owners at reduced rates every three years.]

Order from:

CRS Books, P.O. Box 8263, St. Joseph, MO 64508-8263
or see www.creationresearch.org





Enter the

Sixth Annual Midwest Creation Fellowship

Writing Contest

For Junior High and Senior High Students

Prizes:

Senior High Level (Ages 14-18*)

- **\$250 First Place †**
- **\$100 Second Place**
- **\$75 Third Place**
- **\$20 Book certificates for 4th and 5th Places**

Junior High Level (Ages 11-14*)

- **\$100 First Place †**
- **\$50 Second Place**
- **\$25 Third Place**
- **\$20 Book certificates for 4th and 5th Places**

*Age on April 30, 2003 — Those who are 14 have the option of competing on either level.

†Each first-place winner will receive a 1-year student membership in the Creation Research Society.

Rules:

1. Entries will be accepted beginning January 1, 2003 and must be received by April 30, 2003. Mail entries to:
MCF Contest, P.O. Box 952, Wheaton, IL 60189
2. Paper should be typewritten and double-spaced, not to exceed 1500 words for the Junior High level or 2500 words for the High School level. Give references to sources used.
3. Entries will include the Author's name, age, home address, phone number, email address, school. Specify Junior High or Senior High Level.
4. Essays will be judged on:
 - Biblical and Scientific merit of the paper
 - Ability to communicate ideas
 - Creativity shown in the presentation
 - Technical ability (writing skills, grammar, etc.)
 - Meeting all stated rules of the contest
5. Entries become the property of MCF and will not be returned. Prize winning entries may be reproduced and distributed by MCF. Winners may be invited to present their papers at an MCF meeting.

Purpose:

To encourage the development of skills in research, analysis, and logical reasoning through preparing an effective presentation of a thesis in a creation-oriented paper.

Theme:

The author may select any topic that fits one of the following two themes. *Sample topics are listed for each theme, but the author is not limited to those shown.* It is recommended, but not required, that the author examine both sides of the chosen theme.

A. Scientific Challenges to Creation / Macroevolution.

Sample topics inspired by this theme:

- Thermodynamics and the Origin of Life
- Origin of Mind and Morals
- K40/Ar40 Dating of Historical Lava Flows

B. Creation / Macroevolution in Primary and Secondary Education

Sample topics inspired by this theme:

- A Student's View of macroevolution in (Public, Christian, Home) Education (write from your own educational context, how things are, how things should be)
- Science Education — Its Methods and Purpose
- Recognizing Bias and Circular Reasoning in the Science Classroom

Midwest Creation Fellowship



**Through Him all things
were made;
without Him nothing
was made that
has been made.
— John 1:3**

Speaking of Science

Commentaries on recent news from science

Which Emperor Has No Clothes?

In the Jan. 31 issue of *Science*, Kenneth R. Miller of Brown University reviews a new book, *Where Darwin Meets the Bible: Creationists and Evolutionists in America* (1). Miller is a prominent anti-creationist spokesman, who appeared in the PBS *Evolution* TV series (2) and has debated leaders of creation and intelligent design for years. With a few strong reservations, he likes this new book by Larry Witham, a writer for the *Washington Times*. Witham tries to present a balance of leading characters on both sides of the aisle. What Miller doesn't like is the author's willingness to make it seem the creationist side is on a level playing field:

"Eager to build a case for equivalence, Witham overlooks the most essential element of the process of science: the manner in which it tests competing ideas with respect to their explanatory power and their concordance with data. This is the test that design creationism has failed time and time again. Alas, such failures are reported nowhere in this book. Witham, it seems, is unwilling to tell his readers that the emperor has no clothes."

Miller cautions his fellow evolutionists not to treat the opposition as a minor peasant uprising that will soon quiet down. He views the Intelligent Design movement as "poised to make plenty of trouble for science education in the years ahead":

"In an age of genomics, how can this possibly be the case? 'Who are these guys?' is a question I have heard from more than one of my colleagues, who are **incredulous** at the **continuing opposition to Darwin**. The answer can be found in *Where Darwin Meets the Bible* His book is a virtual



playbill that describes the principal actors in this modern **passion play**" (emphasis added).

In his review, entitled *The emperor's new design*, Miller concludes:

"Those who would prefer to work quietly in their laboratories and field stations while waiting for the **recent unpleasantness to blow over** are fooling no one but themselves – a point this book makes with **disturbing** clarity" (emphasis added).

It's ironic that Miller alludes to the *Emperor's New Clothes* [a fairy tale by Hans Christian Anderson (3)], since that is exactly the metaphor creationists have used against Darwinism for a long time: evolutionists parade their theory around like a proud king without a thread of evidence. Since we're not intimidated by bluffing here, we'll march right past the hot air regarding scientists being "incredulous" about the opposition to Darwinism, and look for at least a loincloth in Miller's tailor shop as he attempts to clothe Emperor Darwin (parents may need to shield their children's eyes).

Toss out the empty rhetoric, ridicule, assumption, and other vapor, and what remains? What is the warp and woof of his argument? It is this line:

"...the **most essential element** of the **process of science**: the manner in which it **tests competing ideas** with respect to their **explanatory power** and their **concordance with data**" (emphasis added).

Dr. Miller, please put *Creation-Evolution Headlines* (4) on your daily reading list, where you will find damaging admissions out of the pro-evolution scientific literature, on a weekly basis, admitting that evolutionary claims are totally devoid of this "essential element." This is *especially* true in this "age of genomics" – robed in the richest fabric of intelligent design the world has ever seen, replete with molecular machines, coded languages, automated factories, and quality control. No fair stealing

cloth from the creationists. Get your own "explanatory power" out of the thin air of naturalism. Get your own "concordance with the data" of the fossil record and genomics and comparative anatomy and biochemistry. Get something from nothing, distill information out of mindlessness, and produce the world's most powerful software without programmers. Who's calling whose emperor naked?

At *Science* magazine's happy hour, it's Miller on the house. Outside, eminently qualified philosophers and scientists who do not offer obeisance to the politically correct emperor are systematically bounced at the door, while lampooned by bawdy drinking songs inside. Will a day come when *Science* lets William Dembski review Miller's books, or lets Dean Kenyon review Gerald Joyce's latest chemical evolution tricks? If so, there may be "plenty of trouble" ahead – for hoodwinking tailors.

Some day, when evolutionists can no longer rely on arrogance (as exemplified by Miller's comments) and establishment intimidation – when, instead, they are held accountable by knowledgeable students and informed observers to produce the *evidence* to justify their nature stories and demands for exclusivity, things will get very interesting. The plot thickens, but the "passion play" still has more acts to go.

- (1) Miller, K.R. 2003. The emperor's new design (review of *Where Darwin Meets the Bible: Creationists and Evolutionists in America* by L.A. Witham). *Science* 299(5607):664.
- (2) see Discovery Institute. 2001. *Getting the Facts Straight: A Viewer's Guide to PBS's Evolution*. Discovery Institute Press, Seattle.
- (3) Anderson, H.C. n.d. *The Emperor's New Clothes*. <http://deoxy.org/emperors.htm>
- (4) <http://www.creationsafaris.com/crevnews.htm>

Believe in Evolution, Or Else

As reported by the Associated Press/Fox News (1), Dr. Michael Dini, a professor at Texas Tech, refuses to write a



letter of recommendation for any of his students who will not answer the following question with a “scientific” (read, evolutionary) answer: “How do you think the human species originated?”

The Liberty Legal Institute has filed a complaint against the university, calling this “open religious bigotry.” But Dini justifies his stance by saying, “If you cannot truthfully and forthrightly affirm a scientific answer to this question, then you should not seek my recommendation for admittance to further education in the biomedical sciences.” The university, it is reported, is standing behind the professor.

This is probably not an isolated practice. Notice that this professor does not care if you *know* all about the theory of evolution, or whether you got straight A’s, or whether you are the valedictorian and the best biology student he ever had, but whether you *believe* in the theory of evolution. Just admit honestly that you think God created man, rather than that man arose from an ape-like ancestor, and nothing else matters.

To Dini, it’s not enough to just *know* about what he calls “the most important theory in biology,” you have to *believe* it. But as aspiring medical student Micah Spradling responded, “I really don’t see how believing in the evolution of humanity has anything to do with patient care or studying science.”

Dr. Dini, if you are reading this, are you prepared to abide by your own standard, to “never throw out data that do not conform to your expectations or beliefs”? We do not deny your right to send recommendation letters according to your own conscience; we’d just like to lay before you some facts for your conscience to examine.

(1) Associated Press. *Biology Professor Refuses to Recommend Students Who*

Don’t Believe in Evolution. 30 January 2003. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,77075,00.html>

500 Vertebrate Fish Found in Early Cambrian

Where only one incomplete fossil had been known before, now 500 specimens of early Cambrian agnathan fish of the genus *Haikouichthys* have been reported in the Jan. 30 issue of *Nature* (1). This wealth of new fossils “reveals a series of new and unexpected features that imply a major reconsideration of several features of early agnathan evolution,” says the team of Chinese and European paleontologists. The fish appear to have had eyes, gills, and olfactory organs, and were swimmers. The authors explain the implications (emphasis added):

“The possession of eyes (and probably nasal sacs) is consistent with *Haikouichthys* being a craniate, **indicating that vertebrate evolution was well advanced by the Early Cambrian.** Although evidently a jawless fish, its **precise phylogenetic position is still speculative because this fish shows a puzzling mixture of characters contrary to some previous expectations.**”

How did this assemblage of fish die? “The specimens may have been buried alive, possibly as a result of storm-induced burial.”

This can’t be good news for evolution-



ists, even though they try to put a happy face on it, saying the discovery may “extend further our knowledge of their earliest evolution.” But what evolution? They used to claim no fish were found till the Devonian, as if that somehow muffled the Cambrian explosion a little bit. But now, here you have advanced features in vertebrate fish right in the early Cambrian, and evidence that supports flood burial. Don’t tell the creationists.

(1) Shu, D.G., et al. 2003. Head and backbone of the Early Cambrian vertebrate *Haikouichthys*. *Nature* 421:526.

Editor’s note: All S.O.S. (Speaking of Science) items in this issue are kindly provided by David Coppedge. Additional commentaries and reviews of news items by David can be seen at: www.creationsafaris.com/crevnews.htm.

Creation Calendar

Note: Items in “Creation Calendar” are for information only; the listing of an event does not necessarily imply endorsement by the Creation Research Society.

May 29 - 31

Annual Meeting, CRS Board of Directors
Concordia Univ. of Wisconsin, Mequon, Wisconsin

August 4 - 9

International Conference on Creationism
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA
Creation Science Fellowship, P.O. Box 99303, Pittsburgh, PA 15233-4303
Contact: 412-341-4908, www.icc03.org

August 15-20

European Creationist Congress
Gullbrannagården, Sweden
Hosted by The GENESIS Society of Sweden
Contact: Föreningen Genesis, c/o S. Halldorf, Algatan 8, S-388 41, Trekanten, SWEDEN www.8thecc.com

Contents

A Family Affair: Close Encounters with the Camel Kind	1
Aspects of Deity ... Part 2: God's Purpose	1
Objective Origins Science vs. Evolution Only ...	1
The Angler Fish	5
What Intelligent Design Is Not	8
Sixth Annual Writing Contest	9
Speaking of Science	
Which Emperor Has No Clothes?	10
Believe in Evolution, Or Else	10
500 Vertebrate Fish Found in Early Cambrian	11
Creation Calendar	11

Creation Research Society
P.O. Box 8263
St. Joseph, MO 64508-8263
USA

Return Service Requested



Creation Matters

January / February 2003
Vol. 8 No. 1

Nonprofit Org.
US Postage
PAID
Creation Research Society

Design & Origins in Astronomy, Volume 2

Edited by Don B. DeYoung and Emmett L. Williams. 2002.
Creation Research Society Books. 161 pages.

\$11.00 plus \$4 shipping

This is a sequel to our earlier volume of the same title. Key articles from the *CRS Quarterly* have been gathered together into one volume. This book is not meant to be an exhaustive treatment of creationist astronomy, but is rather a sampling of important subjects. Topics covered include:

- pioneer creationist astronomers
- the sun's age
- craters in Arizona and on the moon
- lunar and solar eclipses
- planets and magnetism
- speed of light studies
- stellar evolution
- the destiny of comets
- mysterious dark matter

order from:

CRS Books
P.O. Box 8263
St. Joseph, MO 64508-8263
or see www.creationresearch.org

