



# CREATION <sup>In</sup> THE CROSSFIRE

Published by The South Bay Creation Science Association

And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day. Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts...And the water prevailed more and more upon the earth, so that all the high mountains everywhere under the heavens were covered. Gen 1:31-2:1; 7:19

---

## The Next Meeting:

**May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

at 7:00 p.m. Everyone is welcome. We usually meet the fourth Saturday of each month except December. The map on the last page gives the location of our meeting place.

---

## Speaker for May:

**Chuck Marler**

The title of his talk is "Understanding the Legal Parameters of Teaching Alternative Theories of Origins." Using Francis Beckwith's book, "Law, Darwinism, and Public Education," a review of the major court cases used as a precedent in teaching alternative theories besides evolution will be made. The impact of Intelligent Design along with strategies for breaking the "evolution only" monopoly will also be discussed.

Chuck Marler is a retired Human Resources Manager from the County of San Bernardino and has spent a career of presenting evidence in administrative hearings. He has been an officer of the Inland Empire Creation Science Association for the past 12 years. He has taught the evidence against macroevolution and other creation topics to audiences in churches and private schools. He last spoke at the South Bay Creation Science Association in July 2006.

---

## Aftertalk.com by Ron Haddad

Dr. George Howe's topic was "Intelligent Design in Plants." His talk could best be summarized in this way: "In biology there are numerous systems, the origin of which cannot be scientifically explained by the limited action of evolutionism. Many features of plants and animals are 'irreducibly complex' so that small changes governed by chance and natural selection cannot account for their origin. The saying 'design demands a designer' is more credible throughout biology than the unsupported adage that gene mutations can do it all if only enough time is available."

Dr. Howe has a B.S. in Botany, Wheaton College (Illinois); M.S. in Botany, Ohio State University; and a Ph.D. in Botany, OSU.

---

## Future Speakers:

**June 2007: Dr. Fred Field.** He is a professional linguist and will speak on "Two Views on Origin of Language." Those two views are Darwinian and Biblical. Christians believe that language was a one-time gift to humankind by God.

**August 2007: Dr. Joseph Mastropaolo.**

In 2006, Dr. Mastropaolo lectured to the parliament of the European Union on the subject: "Life is a Devolving, Dynamically Engineered Invention of Vast Originality." He will present to us the technical paper that he gave to that body last year. A brief summary follows.

"From objective scientific evidence that anyone may verify all life devolves and is dynamically engineered. In American public schools, teaching evolution has depressed science achievement by 50% and mathematics achievement by 50%. Teaching evolution also is associated with the extermination of the entire biosphere. Before it is too late, evolution must be expunged from every culture on this planet and devolution must be taught in its place."

---

## Videos at Six:

**May:** "In Search of a Living Dinosaur." In this video, Milt Marcy shows why the discovery of a living dinosaur is a distinct possibility. Milt's group, "Creation Generation," is at the forefront of the search for a saur-opod dinosaur in the Congo drainage basin of West Africa. Since 1985, Creation Generation has fielded nine expeditions. The net result of this field research has been the building of a database that hopefully will lead to the filming of a living dinosaur. In the video, Milt presents compelling evidence (including casts of possible claw marks) that these beasts and other dinosaurs are still alive. Come to our May meeting at 6:00 pm to see this exciting video.

---

**June:** "Starlight and Time" by Dr. Russell Humphreys.  
**July:** "Marty's Grand Adventure" by Marty Fishbein.

---

## Our Home Planet

By Clifford L. Lillo

Scientists agree that Earth is a unique planet that seems to have been made for man to inhabit. Many articles and books have been written that reflect this fact. However, evolutionists do protest the portion of the above statement about Earth being made for man. They say instead that man was able to evolve because of the Earth's unique conditions as to temperature, air pressure, gravity, availability of food, etc. Nevertheless, there is no disagreement that were our distance from the sun to change by even a short distance all vegetation would be baked or frozen out of existence. The viability of life also depends upon Earth's speed of rotation, the moon's position, the availability of water, and many other factors. But, a recent Associated Press article in the South Bay Daily Breeze, titled "Like Home ...to a Degree" by Seth Borenstein, would have us believe that an Earth-like planet recently discovered has excited astronomers because life might be possible there. The temperature is Earth like, being between 32 and 104 degrees Fahrenheit, but NASA astrobiology expert Chris McKay said, "It doesn't mean it's an Earth-like planet in terms of potential habitability."

Borenstein says, "Besides having the right temperature, the new planet is probably full of liquid water, hypothesizes Stephane Udry, the discovery team's lead author and another Geneva astronomer. But that is based on theory about how planets form, not on any evidence, he said." If that is true then why is it that Earth is the only planet in our solar system that scientists say is full of liquid water? Borenstein states, "Other astronomers cautioned it's too early to tell whether there is water."

Other possible negative factors on whether life could survive are: the planet is 14 times closer to the star that it orbits, it is still not known whether the planet rotates, it circles its sun every 13 days, and gravity there is about 1.6 times as strong as that on Earth.

Not discussed in the article are: what is the mechanism for origin of life, since that question has never been answered on Earth, and how could evolution happen there when no one has yet demonstrated how evolution could occur on Earth?

*(The following article is reprinted from  
FOXNews.com, March 15, 2007)*



## Must-See Global Warming TV

By Steven Milloy

As Al Gore's movie "An Inconvenient Truth" becomes mandatory viewing for many U.S. school children and nears becoming the "official truth" about global warming, it comes as most welcome news that an abso-lutely gripping film rebuttal has made its international debut, much to the chagrin of true believers in man-made climate change.

Last week, the UK's Channel 4 premiered a 75-minute film entitled, "The Great Global Warming Swindle." Through interviews with prize-winning climate experts and others, this masterful documentary explains the origins of global warming alarmism; debunks claims of man-made global climate change; exposes the motivations of organizations, scientists and activists sounding the alarm; and explains why it's been extremely difficult, if not downright dangerous, for climate scientists to question global warming orthodoxy publicly.

The entire film, which is creating quite a stir among tens of thousands of web viewers, can be seen online at <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4520665474899458831>.

According to the film, the origins of global warming alarmism had its roots in the 1970s-era fears of global cooling and an impending ice age, resulting from the 1940-1970 global temperature decline. Swedish meteorologist Bert Bolin suggested at the time that man-made greenhouse gas emissions might offset the cooling by warming the atmosphere.

When Margaret Thatcher became UK Prime Minister in 1979, her mandate was to reduce Britain's economic decline. Thatcher wanted to make the UK energy-independent through nuclear power—she didn't like her country's reliance on coal, which politically empowered the coal miner unions, or oil, which empowered Middle Eastern states.

So Thatcher latched onto Bolin's notion that man-made emissions of carbon dioxide warmed the planet in a harmful way, thereby providing the perfect political cover for advancing her nuclear power agenda without having to fight the miners or Arab oil states.

She empowered the U.K. Meteorological Office to begin global climate change research, a move that eventually led to the 1988 creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the United Nations' group that has come to be the "official" international agency for global warming alarmism.

At about the same time, as Greenpeace co-founder Patrick Moore explains on-camera, environmentalism became more extreme. By the mid-1980s, environmental goals – e.g., clean air and clean water – had become so mainstream that activists had to adopt more extreme positions to remain anti-establishment.

Then when the Berlin Wall fell and the Cold War ended, many "peace-niks" and political activists moved over to environmental activism, bringing their "neo-Marxist" political philosophy with them. As Moore puts it, environmentalism became the "new guise for anti-capitalism."

Global warming alarmism was thus borne from this combination of official British policy, environmentalism's rejection of its own success and political opportunism by "unemployed" left-wing political activists.

With such an inglorious heritage, it's no wonder the scientists in "The Great Global Warming Swindle" have little trouble dismantling climate myths.

Perhaps the most important bit of scientific knowledge presented is the actual relationship between temperature and atmospheric carbon dioxide.

In "An Inconvenient Truth," Al Gore disingenuously describes the relationship as "complex" while implying that higher atmospheric carbon dioxide levels cause higher global temperatures.

But according to the geological record and data from ice cores, higher temperatures actually precede higher carbon dioxide levels by about 800 years. Twentieth century data support this idea in at least two ways. First, most of the 20th century's warming occurred before 1940, while most of the century's greenhouse gas emissions occurred after 1940.

Next, when manmade greenhouse gas emissions soared in the post World War II industrial boom, global temperatures declined until the mid-1970s, leading to the aforementioned global cooling concerns.

The Channel 4 program notes that ongoing temperature measurements contradict global warming theory. According to the theory, lower atmosphere temperatures should be warming at a much faster rate than those at the Earth's surface. In reality, however, just the opposite is occurring.

Then there's the sun – the gigantic yellow ball in the sky that climate alarmists want all of us to ignore in favor of minute emissions of an invisible gas that makes up less than one-half of one percent of the Earth's atmosphere. As it turns out, solar activity – unlike atmospheric carbon dioxide levels – correlates quite well with historic temperature changes, including through its effects on cosmic rays and clouds, as the film demonstrates quite effectively.

So why does the world seem to be caught up in the vise-like grip of a controversy that is contradicted by available scientific data and its own dubious heritage?

According to the scientists in the movie, there is an intolerance of dissent on global warming. Official government sanction of global warming opened the floodgates of funding to climate researchers, who previously worked in obscurity.

NASA scientist Roy Spencer says in the program that climate scientists need for there to be problems to get more funding. IPCC contributor John Christy says of climate scientists, "We have a vested interest in creating panic because money with then flow to climate scientists." University of London biogeographer Philip Stott says that "If the global warming virago collapses, there will be an awful lot of people out of jobs."

The film also debunks the IPCC claim that the 2,500 scientists contributing to its reports also support its alarmist conclusions. One key IPCC contributor for example, the Pasteur Institute's Paul Reiter, threatened to sue the IPCC if the group didn't remove his name from a chapter with which he disagreed.

When I met Al Gore in January 2006 after a presentation of his climate slideshow, I asked him if he'd be interested in setting up a public debate between climate scientists. He declined – twice. At this point, I'd settle for a movie face-off – "An Inconvenient Truth" vs. "The Great Global Warming Swindle."

Let the public see both sides of the story and then we'll see who's believable and who's not.