

## Preface

The Sixth International Conference on Creationism (ICC) continues the same theme as the past three ICCs (1994, 1998, and 2003), *Developing and Systematizing the Creation Model of Origins*. It is to this end that the sponsors of the ICC are dedicated and offer these *Proceedings* as the written record of the Sixth International Conference on Creationism.

The Sixth ICC held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the week of August 3–6, 2008 has been co-sponsored by two creationist organizations: The Creation Science Fellowship, Inc. (CSF) of Pittsburgh, and the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) of Dallas, Texas (formerly of San Diego, California).

The Sixth ICC was managed by an Executive Committee made up of members from both organizations, whereby ICR representatives specialized in administrating the “technical review” aspects of the conference, and CSF representatives administrated the “coordinating” aspects of the conference meetings. This “division of labor” helped in managing the complexities of such a forum and provided for a smooth working process.

The Sixth ICC was divided into two tracks.

(1) The Technical Symposium in which peer-reviewed papers were presented and published with the intention of furthering particular aspects of the creation model of origins.

(2) The Evening Track was devoted to presenting various geological aspects of the creation model that were developed at past ICCs. Some of these elements were:

1. A Creation Model for the Earth’s Magnetic Field
2. A Model of Catastrophic Plate Tectonics
3. The Unique Deposition of Nautiloids

Each of the above topics was either initially introduced or fundamental understanding was provided at past ICCs. While there are other original ideas presented at past ICCs (for example, Baraminology, etc.) these topics were chosen to be presented during the Evening Track because they may be important elements to further developing the creation model of the geo-science history of the earth. The Evening Track was open to the public for the purpose of introducing these key elements of the creation model to the man-on-the-street.

Since 1986 the ICCs have provided a forum for rigorously developing the “technical” aspects of the creation-flood model of earth and universal history, and have purposely not specialized in any one technical area (for example, bio-models or astro-models, etc.), but rather have kept a broad view for their purpose. The ICC Technical Review Committee first categorized creation research (ICC 1994) and later revised this classification as follows (ICC 2008):

### Theme 1—FOUNDATIONS OF SCIENCE

#### Areas:

- (1) Biblical Models and Hermeneutics
- (2) Mathematical and Logical Models
- (3) Philosophy of Science

### Theme 2—LIFE SCIENCES

#### Areas:

- (1) Cell and Molecular Biology
- (2) Organismal Biology
- (3) Biogeography
- (4) Systematics
- (5) Genetics
- (6) Ecology

### Theme 3—STELLAR AND PLANETARY SCIENCES

#### Areas:

- (1) Astro-chronometry
- (2) Cosmogony and Cosmology
- (3) Atmospheric Science
- (4) Hydrospheric Science
- (5) Cryospheric Science

### Theme 4—EARTH SCIENCES

#### Areas:

- (1) Geochemistry and Geochronology
- (2) Geophysics
- (3) Physical Geology
- (4) Sedimentary Geology
- (5) Paleontology

### Theme 5—SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE HUMANITIES

#### Areas:

- (1) Philosophy of History
- (2) Linguistics
- (3) Archeology
- (4) Psychology
- (5) Economics and Political Science
- (6) Education

Since the beginnings of the modern creation movement with the publication of *The Genesis Flood* (1961)<sup>1</sup> creationists have tended to focus on developing the technical creation model. The ICCs (since 1986) were the first successful attempt to bring together in a formal peer-reviewed manner creation researchers from all areas and provide a forum for developing the creation model of origins. In this way, a new era in creationism began, the *neo-creationist* era. Since the first ICC in 1986 a focus has been given to creation research that was missing prior to 1986. That focus has been to “formally” and “strategically” develop the model by bringing creation researchers together in a peer-reviewed manner to systematize, debate, discuss, and formalize the creation model of origins. While there are still a plethora of areas that have not even been touched upon, the ICCs have served to help develop many areas that had not been discussed before. In this regard, what distinguishes the modern-creationist period from the neo-creationist period is that the latter emphasized a systematic and strategic approach to developing the creation model.

As creation researchers grow in number, it will be strategic to begin holding similar conferences in the specific themes or areas. Indeed, several have already been taking place, such as the Biology Study Group (BSG), which is taking up the responsibility of furthering our understanding of systematics, particularly from a baraminic approach. The RATE group has performed some remarkable work in recent years and has published its findings. There are still many areas that require specific focus, and as those researchers in those areas grow in number additional conference forums ought to commence.

An area that has yet to be rigorously addressed is the area of presenting and defending the creation model of origins to the man-on-the-street, to the theological community, to the academic arena, and to secular and religious man. Generally speaking when creationists have presented or defended creationism as a whole, the argumentation has been one of “evidence”—presenting the evidence for this and the evidence for that. While it is important to present evidence, the underlying methodology of most creationists today can be shown to be fundamentally flawed. It is often heard as follows: “the creation model is true because of the evidence” or something very similar in either grammar or logic. The problem with this presentation is that Biblical creation is true irrespective of the scientific evidence. A particular sub-model within the greater scientific creation model may be flawed, but the biblical model of Creation and the Flood remains intact as understood by the Grammatico-Historical Method [GHM] (sometimes referred to by the Normative Hermeneutic [NH]). Furthermore, presentation of evidence for biblical creationism as a whole clouds the issue of the biblical model, which is not derived scientifically, but rather hermeneutically and exegetically. The biblical model of origins provides the framework of our scientific modeling, and therefore our scientific creation models must be subservient to the biblical model, never the reverse. Any scientific model is always subservient to the biblical model when the two touch upon the same topic.

The biblical methodology for defending the creation model to any of the groups identified above is articulated for us in Proverbs 26:4–5:

Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.

These remarkable verses, which seem to be internally contradictory, indeed constitute together a mighty set. When properly understood by the Normative Hermeneutic, this verse set is not only non-contradictory, but provides the fundamental methodology for defending not only creationism, but the entire biblical worldview. Proverbs 26:4 & 5 provide the biblical methodology for apologetics.

Briefly, verse 4 provides the first half of the Biblical Apologetic Template (BAT). In order to “disprove” his/her antagonist’s worldview, the biblical protagonist is not to argue from within the worldview of his antagonist. In other words, do not argue within the evolutionist’s presuppositions to prove creation. Much of the creationist and the intelligent design movements are caught in this trap. As an example, let’s look at the area of probability and chance. How often have creationists argued as follows? “*Evolution can not be true, because the probability of the simplest protein is astronomical to the point of impossibility...*” The biblical creationist should never argue or present the creation model within the presuppositions of the evolutionist’s worldview. The materialist’s worldview of chance and probability is grossly different than the biblical view of chance and probability. This argument uncritically accepts the evolutionist’s presuppositional notion of probability as an ultimate and irreducible element of reality—so that the “universe” is “open” with a non-deterministic future—a future that is “ruled” by “chance.” This is a fundamental flaw within the ID movement and creationists have fallen into this trap long before the publishing of *Darwin’s Black Box*.<sup>2</sup> Once this is done the debate is over, even before it is started. Regrettably, however, it is beyond the scope of this preface to discuss this topic in detail.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Whitcomb, J.C. & Morris, H.M. (1961). *The Genesis Flood*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.

<sup>2</sup> Behe, M.J. (1996). *Darwin’s black box: The biochemical challenge to evolution*. New York, New York: The Free Press.

The second half of the Biblical Apologetic Template is seen in verse 5. “Answering a fool according to his folly” means to take the antagonist’s presuppositions and show how his/her worldview is fundamentally inconsistent, internally flawed, and ultimately devastated.

To summarize these wonderful verses, the first part is for the biblical protagonist to present his/her worldview within the confines of his/her own presuppositions, showing that the biblical worldview is self contained and consistent, not internally contradictory, and furthermore provides a coherent model and framework for understanding “the evidence”. In this way, the presuppositions and the biblical or scientific creation model logically come BEFORE the evidence. The second part then is to show the materialist antagonist that given his presuppositions, his/her worldview (or view of origins) is ultimately inconsistent, self contradictory, and can not ultimately explain “the evidence”.

Arguing in this manner is foreign to most modern creationists and will require a “paradigm change” in the mindset of creationists and to a greater degree the ID leaders.

To Israel, Moses did not pen a “preface of evidence” before he penned the immortal inspired words...

“In the beginning God created the heavens and earth...”

Rather he “presupposed” that the Triune Elohim created the cosmos and thus started writing from there. This does not mean that evidence is to be ignored or shunned; rather, it means that evidence is now precisely defined and understood within the context of a biblical worldview.

In the area of Apologetics, creationists need to challenge themselves on methodology and see that by arguing “evidentially” it has not had the success that would seem to be so obvious on the surface. There are no “brute facts”; there is no autonomous datum that can be understood within itself and by itself. Evidence is precisely as follows:

evidence = data + interpretation (or worldview)

Thus, as mentioned above, by arguing within the worldview of secular chance, creationists have given up the ghost and lost the argument from “jump street,” and this is only one such example.

Creationists need to begin showing the fundamentally religious nature of evolution, and this can only be done by attacking evolution at its roots—its worldview, its presuppositions, indeed its materialism. Thus, creationists are in a two front war: (1) Apologetics—defending the faith, and (2) Developing the biblical and scientific models of origins. Regrettably, by focusing primarily on number 2 for more than 4 decades creationists have fallen behind in defending their model and worldview.

It is time for a change, a change to fighting a two front war, the most difficult of challenges.

Robert E. Walsh

(Past Proceedings Editor, Technical Review Committee Chairman, and CSF Chairman)

Pittsburgh, PA

March 15, 2008

---

<sup>3</sup> For a remarkable discussion of this topic from a biblical/mathematical/theistic approach, see Dennis, P.W. (1998). Probability and quantum mechanics: A christian theistic interpretation. In R.E. Walsh (Ed.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on creationism* (pp. 167–200). Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Creation Science Fellowship.