Safaris to date in '96 have been a great success. Sixty people, toured the famous Karst Topography and Savannah at Ha Ha Tonka. Everyone had a great time and learned that the "Uniformitarian Geology principle" "The Present is the Key to the Past" as well as the typical strategy of studying present day processes to compute the time required to cause typical geologic features (like sediment layers, fossils, canyons and caves), are probably both backwards. In most cases, "The Past is the Key to the Present," and in many cases the present process (such as a river in a valley, or rainwater dripping into a cave) had little or nothing to do with causing the feature where the process is now observed. For example, most river valleys and canyons, are the causes of the rivers, not vice versa.

Rain and unseasonably cold weather dampened the bedrolls of many of the 42 folks on the Western Kansas/Chalk Bed Safari, but most of spirits soared when they descended into Wildcat Canyon and Castle Rock, sampled volcanic ashfalls, and filled their cars with fossils. In the brief seminar we again demonstrated that major geologic features tend to be relics of past events, not the result of continuous processes. For example, it was once thought to require millions of years to grow the calcium deposits from coccolithophores and flora-minifera which are found in Chalk, but is now known that, in rough, polluted waters, these creatures could have produced the world's chalk in as little as a few days! Other evidence indicates the chalk required a few decades, but much evidence refutes the notion that millions of years were involved.

Join CSA on a Creation Safari

June 14 - 7:00PM - Astronomy Outing
June 22 - Burr Oak Woods - "Hands and Knees Nature Outing"
July 3 - 7:00PM - Astronomy Outing
July 20 - KU Natural History Museum & Fossil Hunt
August 9 - Astronomy Outing (Comet, Meteors)
August 20 - KC Zoo
September 13 - Astronomy Outing (Comet)
September 21 - Katy Trail Bicycle Safari - MO River Bluffs
October 11 - Astronomy Outing (Comet)
October 19-21 - Ozark Cave Safari
November 8 - Astronomy Outing
November 23 - Squaw Creek Waterfowl, Deer, Eagle & Fossil Safari

To make reservations, call (816) 658-3610. To find out, information on Safari costs, meeting place, time of departure and return, what to bring, safari registration information, etc. request a copy of the booklet: "CSA 1996 Safari Details."

CSA speakers participate in many engagements at churches, schools, colleges, educational conferences, radio and TV shows, etc. Normally we do not take the time or space to try to list all these for you. Occasionally a particularly interesting one is worth sharing.

On May 19, 1996, I was a speaker at the dedication of the new "Center For Inquiry" of the Kansas City Eupraxophy Center and the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal. The "keynote speaker" was Dr. Paul Kurtz whose book, Eupraxophy: Living Without Religion, inspired the title of the Eupraxophy Center. The theme of the meeting was "Defending Science and Humanism in the Bible Belt." I was originally asked to speak on "The Case Against Scientific Humanism." Later I saw a flyer saying I was speaking on "Science and the Bible." So I chose to speak on both, titling my talk: "My Life as a Scientific Humanist." I do not have a tape of my talk, and I am not given to following a script, but the essence of what I think I said follows.

To discuss "Scientific Humanism" we must have proper definitions of science and humanism.

- **Science** comes from the Latin scientia which means knowledge. But it implies to most of us knowledge that has been certified true! Unfortunately, our five best certification methods never lead to absolute certainty (see "What Is Science" in my book Real Scientists Just Say NO! or the essay in CSA News Vol 12(5), 1995). Our best hope is to arrive at a reasonable faith.

- Most people think humanism = secular humanism = atheism. Others are like the author of a pamphlet I read from a table in the rear of the room who pretend humanists are "People who are interested in humans and/or humanity." But the name Humanist was originally applied to people who claimed to be Christians, but who viewed, one way or another, human intellect (science) is equal to God's Word. Thomas Aquinas was typical of the type of nonsense they would espouse. He taught that man's soul was fallen, but not his mind, thus, even pagan philosophers were a source of knowledge and wisdom.

- **Secular Humanists** are merely a group of folks who plagiarized the humanist title, dropped any pretense of religion, and claim evolution proves their religion.

- Both kinds of humanists have always been around and are certainly numerous today. Hugh Ross, the subject of an essay in the May/June, 1996 CSA News is a stereotypical Aquinas. An intelligent man and supposed great apologist for Christianity, Ross must virtually rewrite the origins narratives and several Christian doctrines, to accommodate this week's science.

Based on the proper definition of science and humanist, I spent over 40 years as a "Scientific Humanist." I have two degrees in...
the sciences, even went to school on a physics scholarship... and I was definitely a humanist.

A specific event in my life caused me to seek and question more seriously the meaning and purpose of life. A specific prayer (a first for me) led to amazing results.

Along the way, I reexamined all I had learned in science.

- The 1st Law of Thermodynamics told me matter cannot be created (by natural causes within the universe). Thus it seemed to require matter to have been here forever. But the 2nd Law told me matter could not possibly have been here forever. Therefore, my physics taught me matter must have a beginning and must have been caused by something outside the material universe.

- Universal human experience (empirical science) taught me that all complex systems owe their existence to acts of creation by intelligent living beings, and that these beings are always outside of, essentially different than, and transcendent-to, their creations. Conversely, all human experience (science) teaches that random processes never produce anything remotely resembling a complex system, not even something as simple as a pocket comb.

- My biology classes taught me The Law of Biogenesis, "Life comes only from life, and after its kind." Four hundred years of life experiments and 6000 years of plant and animal husbandry confirm this Law. From the laws of thermodynamics (above) we also know that life as we know it (based on matter) cannot have been here forever. Since life is the most complex system we know, and since all other complex systems were created, it is reasonable to conclude that life too was created.

I can note here that, in all of the above, I found all of my science training in direct conflict with what I had to believe to believe in evolution. But, if I took the Bible seriously, I could believe all it's historical narratives in harmony with my science training. That didn't mean the Bible was proven, but it did mean that it was certainly a more reasonable faith than "scientific humanism."

The writings of evolutionist scientists like Darwin and Gould convinced me evolution reasoning strategy was so irrational and so foreign to all I learned in science and in over 20 years in a technical profession, that evolutionist writings themselves further convinced me of the silliness of evolution.

Even this is predicted in the Bible many times, but typified by Romans 1: Men "suppress the truth," that the evidence of God is obvious, that "they are without excuse... Professing themselves wise, they became fools." Romans 1:18-22.

Social consequences which logically follow belief in evolution have been devastating to individuals and nations. This should prompt an examination of the belief. In this century alone, "scientific humanists" executed over 100 million people in their silly pursuit of "improving the human race via accelerated evolution."

Now, I am quite aware that some criminal acts have been committed by folks who claimed they were acting for God. However, rather than being evidence against Christ, they are evidence for Him, for He told us there would be "wolves in sheep's clothing." Thus, these acts were performed by Humanists, not Christians.

In fact, God's people have always been the primary ones who were being persecuted. Humanist Jews killed the prophets before Jesus, Jesus and his apostles. Humanist Romans killed thousands of Christians. Humanist "Catholics" killed about 60 million people (almost all Christians), Humanist "Protestants" based on the traditions of men, not Biblically defensible doctrines, persecuted thousands of Christians. I suspect the main reason Humanist Protestants did not kill as many Christians as Humanist Catholics is that the political power to do so no longer existed when Humanism went Protestant. Some will object, that Humanist Protestantism was governed far more by Biblical Christianity than its Humanist Catholic forebears. True, but the Christians who fled to America and those who fled America because they wouldn't shot reccoa, probably wouldn't be impressed. Nevertheless, even by the most extreme claims of those who would hold "Christianity" responsible for these immoral acts, "scientific humanists" have outperformed even these "wolves in sheep's clothing" in the heinous crime department by a factor of at least 20 to 1, in the previous 70 years of this century alone!!

Thus, it seems irrational, certainly not scientific, and can hardly be considered socially desirable, to believe in evolution - a complete faith in the power of random processes to build a complex brain in a conscious living system capable of figuring out the World's problems and solving them. Since evolution is the so-called scientific proof of "scientific humanism, I concluded that "Scientific Humanism" is an oxymoron... a completely incongruous phrase.

Furthermore, my search for meaning led me to examine the validity of the claims of Jesus, which, while beyond the scope of this discussion, I concluded to be substantially demonstrated by the legal method of proof. Therefore I committed to devote my life to him rather than the meaningless garbage to which I been previously devoted. The results were just as He promised in many places, but two will suffice to illustrate:

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." -Matt 6:33

"... for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." Matt 6:32

All the things I thought I was seeking as a scientific humanist were added unto me! I have a beautiful family, a good income, a satisfying career and ministry. I have no debts, personal or business. In fact, in only 15 years, my net worth is higher than I ever dreamed, and some 20 times what it was after 40 years as a "scientific humanist" Therefore, my
testimony to you is that, exactly as He promised... "Jesus Christ set me free from scientific humanism!!! He can do the same for you. There is life after scientific humanism! I am living proof of it. There is hope for everyone in this room!"

No doubt the reader, like others who have heard about the occasion, is dying to know what the response was. A few Christians who heard about the event and attended, were delighted. Of the others, I will say only that Paul got a mixed response on Mars Hill, and that I have come to love these folks as Jesus taught me to do. I have been working with them for years, and hope to continue to do so. The key to their response took place in their heart, which is too complex for even a former scientific humanist to analyze.

However it would be appropriate to comment on some of the other talks. Larry Martin, a paleontologist at KU Natural History Museum gave a "What Is Science" talk. He agreed with me that science cannot arrive at absolute certainty, but added that "Science is not about truth, it is not a system of truth, but a method of argumentation." Like most folks he feels it is OK to ignore the dictionary. He concluded that "Science and religion will not meet. Science says truth cannot be known. Religion says truth is known by a higher being and shared by someone who has had it revealed to him." He got part of it right, but ignored the test of a prophet and the fact that science and religion can meet when scientists fear God... with the caveat, "Now we know in part."

Martin drew heavy fire from a philosopher who said (roughly) "Science does deal with facts which leads to truth. I'm very comfortable with evolution." This man, revealed his religion, not his understanding of science. Even if evolution were true, it would probably be one of the most difficult things to prove to a sensible man because it all happened in the past.

Richard Deleware, Mathematics, UMKC rambled on about abuses of mathematics not saying very much except he expressed interest in the 1988 "Proof of Fermats Last Theorem." This was a highlight of Deleware's talk, but he didn't even state the theorem, nor explain the proof, nor apparently grasp the philosophical implications. Published in 1670, the theorem states: "In \( C^N = A^N + B^N \), for all integer values of \( N \geq 2 \), there are no integer solutions for \( A,B,C \)." The fascinating thing to me when I read about the proof in 1988 was that the theorem has been proven thousands times empirically (experiments using the scientific method of proof [inductive]) but mathematicians ignored these efforts, seeking a deductive proof. Lost on everybody seems to have been that deductive proofs are cute, but any connection between a deductive proof and the real world must be made inductively, yielding a result no better than the so-called scientific method can deliver.
"The Heavens Declare The Glory of God"
by: Larry Rink

The Psalmist tells us that "The Heavens Declare The Glory of God." But what does it mean? How do they "declare it." Larry will take us on a tour of the Heavens, particularly the Solar System to help us see more deeply in the "things that were made... the evidence of His eternal power and deity..."

The Advanced Institute in Creation Science
A Determination and Analysis of Appropriate Values of the Speed of Light to Test the Setterfield Hypothesis
A Video from the International Conference on Creation by: Alan Montgomery

In 1983 (actually before) Barry Setterfield published an extensive paper claiming the Velocity of Light \((c)\) has not been constant throughout history, nor have all the \(\text{constants}\) of physics. If true, it provided a simple response to the oft repeated "light from distant stars" argument against a young universe. By and large the physicist community rejected the proposal. All their arguments (that I read) were based on \(\text{theory}\). Practically none addressed the data even semi-competently (See next month's tape by Chaffin for an exception). The only noted physicist I have read who (actually independently) supports the \(c\)-decay theory is the Russian, Troitsky who argues that the data seems to support it, and the phenomena we see in the heavens demand it. Meanwhile, all the folks who knew how to analyse data (the statisticians) concluded Setterfield was right. Montgomery is one of the latter.

Science, Evolution and the New Age
by: Willy Peterson

Willie has just published his book "A New Age Primer." Those of us who have reviewed pre-publication copies feel it has high merit. Topics he will touch on include: \text{Evolution}, the foundation to the New Age Movement; History of \text{New Age occultism}, influence on the modern world - \text{religion, economic, philosophy, politics}; Relation to other totalitarian experiments; \text{Theosophy and Darwin} - Historical views in the occult community; \text{Punctualism} - synthesis of evolution and quantum theory; \text{Gaia} - pantheistic mandate for a new religion and a New World Order; \text{Futurism} - False hopes for the New World Order. It is unlikely anyone will be bored!

The Advanced Institute in Creation Science
Are Fundamental Constants of Physics Really Variables?
A Video from the International Conference on Creation
by: Eugene F. Chaffin, Ph.D.

All the physicists I read who attacked Setterfield's \(c\)-decay hypothesis did so on the basis of hopelessly incompetent "statistical analyses" or on the basis that it messed up all their pet theories and, unless Setterfield could rewrite all of physics to fit his concept, they were going to despise him and his \(\text{theory}\). The attacks of course were nonsense. A theory can be quite true and the author know nothing about any other branch of physics. Futhermore, many sane folks reject the other theories. A key exception to the \text{theory approach} has been Chaffin. His objections to Setterfield should be weighed by those seeking the truth.

CSA meetings are free, entertaining, educational.
If you haven't been coming, you should be.