

## PREFACE

The Third International Conference on Creationism (ICC) represents a departure from previous ICCs. Whereas the first two Conferences ('86 & '90) were devoted to the theme *The Age of the Earth*, the Third ICC was devoted to the *Developing and Systematizing of the Creation Model of Origins*. The ICC is the only gathering in Creationism today for the sole purpose of rigorously developing a Biblical/rational view of earth and universal history. It provides an arena for creation researchers to gather with the expressed purpose of furthering our understanding of the Creator's work. Because the ICCs present a rare opportunity for creation researchers to formally and informally discuss ideas, a wealth of excitement has been generated about this forum.

The peer review process for the Third ICC was distinct from past ICCs. As outlined in the ICC Call for Papers, the prospective authors were required to submit to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) a 500 word summary, detailing the intended paper and its topic. The responsibility of the TRC was to rigorously evaluate each summary and determine if that topic was appropriate for submission into the ICC peer review process. The preliminary evaluation was based on the specific category of the summary and the following criteria:

- (1) Is this topic important to the development of the creation model?
- (2) Does this topic provide an original contribution to the creation model?
- (3) Is this topic formulated within a young-earth, young-universe framework?
- (4) If #3 is not satisfied, does this topic offer a (positive and constructive)[1] criticism, with a possible young-earth, young-universe alternative?
- (5) If this topic is polemical in nature, does it deal with a new topic rarely discussed within the origins debate?
- (6) Does this summary provide evidence of faithfulness to the grammatico-historical/normative interpretation of Scripture?

Upon completion of this initial screening, each participant was notified as to the standing of their submission(s). Upon acceptance each summary was categorized into a specific area(s) of concern. The TRC designed these areas to provide a listing of categories most needing research within the creation model and offered prospective authors a mechanism for focus. Each area had a specific ICC Editor responsible for working with the prospective author to improve his/her paper for final approval into the ICC. These areas and their associated ICC Editors were:

- |  |   |                          |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| (1) Philosophy of Science              | - | Paul A. Nelson, M.S.     |
| (2) Life Sciences                      | - | Wayne Frair, Ph.D.       |
| (3) Astro-Sciences                     | - | Donald B. DeYoung, Ph.D. |
| (4) Social Sciences and The Humanities | - | Paul D. Ackerman, Ph.D.  |
| (5) Earth Sciences                     | - | Steven A. Austin, Ph.D.  |
|  | - | Kurt P. Wise, Ph.D.      |

These editors are to be congratulated for their untiring efforts in helping the prospective authors improve upon their initial submissions and provide the best possible development of the paper's theme. The Board of Directors of CSF and the ICC Technical Review Committee wish to thank these men for their hard work and burning of the midnight oil in bringing about the best in each author's work and the most productive ICC to date.

The Technical Review Committee provided the ICC Editors criteria by which to evaluate each paper. These criteria were:

- (1) Does this paper make an original contribution to the creation model?
- (2) Is this paper well-documented with respect to the relevant literature?
- (3) Does this paper consider alternative explanations?
- (4) Does this paper demonstrate an awareness of its own limitations?
- (5) Does this paper provide a basis for further research in its area?
- (6) Does this paper exhibit sound methodology?
- (7) Does this paper demonstrate proper use of materials and equipment?
- (8) Does this paper properly present sufficient data to address its stated aims?
- (9) Does this paper properly interpret its data?
- (10) Does this paper properly develop its mathematical models (if applicable)?
- (11) Does this paper appropriately apply mathematical models to its important examples?
- (12) Is this paper tightly and coherently reasoned?
- (13) Is this paper faithful to the grammatico-historical/normative interpretation of Scripture?

Upon the reception of the paper's first draft its ICC Editor and author worked together to formulate a coherent articulation of the paper's topic. If after this "working" period the paper was not finally accepted, the author was provided with additional positive criticism and encouraged to continue working on the paper, either to be submitted elsewhere, or continue working until the Fourth ICC to be held in 1998.

The ICC Technical Review Committee would like to thank everyone who submitted papers to the Third ICC, whether finally accepted or not; your work is crucial to the furtherance of the creation model and we encourage all to continue and strive for excellence in this endeavor!