

[REDACTED]
Niles, Illinois 60714
[REDACTED]

9/11/93
Brian P. Lamb
C-SPAN
Suite 650
400 N. Capitol St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Lamb:

I am a regular listener of C-Span and though I cannot catch everything, I view more on C-Span than all other T.V. programs combined. More than that, I am benefited one hundred times more than all other programs combined. It is of incredibly great value to us in providing a showing of conflicting viewpoints as it also includes conservative viewpoints. Thank you so much.

Recently I heard Susan Swain interview Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition on a format entitled *An American Profile*. I was very impressed with this. Because I am a conservative Christian I greatly appreciated hearing Ralph Reed and what he had to say. I was also very impressed with the sincerity and objectivity of Susan Swain's interview. It was very good. And later that very day I believe I heard you interview Martin Gross regarding his book *Washington Waste from A to Z*. That was also very interesting and very good. I liked the format of *An American Profile*.

I would like to request that you or Susan Swain do the same with Dr. Henry Morris, President of Creation Research, El Cajon, California.

Here are several reasons that would justify bringing him into your programming:

1. Dr. Henry Morris is the moving force behind the Creation Science movement, and this movement continues to grow. It is a rapidly expanding phenomenon in the U.S. today.

Although the Supreme Court decided against Creation Science in public school curriculums in a couple of court cases, it continues to move forward. Recently, while vacationing in California, I noticed in the daily newspapers that a local school board had voted to install Creation Science in a way they felt would not conflict with the Court decision. I suspect that this sort of thing is happening in many parts of the country.

An ever increasing number of parents are opting for home schooling and Christian private schooling because of the Creation Science viewpoint. And with the expanding popularity of the voucher plan for school choice, Creation Science is bound to continue to accelerate in its outreach and influence.

2. The movement is gaining tremendous ground internationally. I do not have any figures at hand but I did receive information about Expo-93 in Korea in which the Korean Assoc. of Creation Research has an exhibition running until Nov. 7, 1993. The information states they have 1,000 member scientists, 250 with Ph.D. degrees, 150 being university professors, and with members holding over 1500 seminars this past year in Seoul alone. That's just the Korean branch; and I know they are strong in Russia, Australia, Canada, England and, of course, the U.S.

3. Dr. Morris, a former evolutionist himself, has spent a total of twenty-eight years on the faculties of five universities (Rice, Minnesota, Southwestern Louisiana, Southern Illinois and Virginia Polytechnic Institute); has written at least eight major books on the subject of Creation Science; is the President of Creation Research, and probably knows more about the subject than any other person on this earth.

This is a national phenomenon. It deserves a place in your programming.

4. Although I recognize that short and to the point letters probably stand a better chance of getting read and acted upon, I think I should go a step further and provide some more substance.

Have you personally, or any on your staff, seriously looked into the case for Creation Science? Let me expand with a little personal testimony about how I got seriously interested and thus feel all others should also.

Way back when I took Geology at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Il., we used the text *Historical Geology* by Carl O. Dunbar, Professor of Paleontology at Yale University. Dr. Dunbar states, "Fossils

provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms." Being a ministerial student, I raised the question in the class of the appearance of disparity between our geology text and the record in Genesis. The reply was to the effect that we must accept the facts, the scientifically documented evidence produced by the science of geology.

Since that time I have learned more about the actual and factual data available. I have discovered that there are over 150,000 actual and genuine fossils in our museums, represented by millions more catalogued fossils, not to mention billions more of documented fossils; **yet we do not have even one clear cut transitional fossil known to man today.** When you consider the fact that to go from the molecule to modern man there would have to be billions of transitional forms, it is astounding that actual data reveals no authentic transitional fossils.

S.M. Stanley of John Hopkins, the leading paleontologist of the day writes: "The known fossil record fails to document a single example of evolution accomplishing a major morphological transition."

Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London, says he has no knowledge of any examples of transitional forms.

The smoking gun is missing. Yet every science textbook from elementary, high school, college and university, through graduate schools are packed with illustrations of such transitional development. Every museum has elaborate models, pictures and illustrations of this. Yet there is not one in actual existence. Professor Dunbar's text however continues to teach "...Fossils provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms." No mention of the Creation Science model is allowed.

The justification for the censorship and book banning seems to be that Creation Science is religion and is held by only a small segment of extreme right wing conservatives, while the Darwinian Science is real science held by authentic scientists. But *U.S. News and World Report*, December, on Creation and Science says, "The three major Western religions- Christianity, Judaism and Islam- all teach that the universe is the handiwork of a divine creator who has given humanity a special place in that creation..."

In addition, the thrust of Creation Science is simply to look at exactly the same data and the same established laws of science the Darwinian evolutionists have access to; and then show how it cannot fit the evolutionary model but how it does fit the creation model. Neither is religion, or both are religion but not as seems to be commonly assumed. It is a scientific argument.

The censorship of the establishment has been rather complete in dealing with the scientific evidence against the evolutionary model and for the creation model. C-Span should provide an opportunity for the other side.

In our local high school, Maine East, Park Ridge, Illinois, my oldest son took biology with the text, *Biological Science--An Inquiry into Life*. Beginning at page 633, we find only three possibilities listed for the origin of life, the very starting block for the entire Darwinian evolutionary theory:

1. Life on earth is eternal. This is rejected.
2. Life came from another planet. This is rejected.
3. The final alternative presented is that life originated on this earth by spontaneous generation.

Now despite the scientific fact that Louis Pasteur and others eliminated this myth by the scientific method, it is preferred over the Creation belief. The scientifically proved impossibility is preferred to Creation. In fact, Creation doesn't even merit mention. It isn't even one of the possibilities to be rejected. It is unworthy of mention. A myth is preferred in our school text on science.

The only other evolutionary theory for the origin of life that I am aware anyone holds today is number two above. Francis Crick who shared a Nobel prize for the discovery of DNA is convinced that life could not and did not evolve on earth. So he argues for "directed panspermia"...life reached earth in a rocket fired by intelligent life on some other planet. But after decades of scientific searching for life on other planets, and the desperate search of material brought back from the moon, they have zero evidence of life from outer space, and yet this the only alternate view.

This is science? This is the best that the evolutionary scientists of 1993 can do? To protect these theories there is a complete blackout of the scientific evidence for Creation Science in the full range of public education, the established book publishers of scientific and educational materials, our public museums and T.V.

C-Span should provide one exception to this ban.

How about one other example? Creation Science argues for a young earth. This seems to be analogous to the establishment like arguing for a flat earth. Why is there no outlet, besides the Christian network, for the commonly recognized facts of science that favor the young earth theory? Here's but one...

Hans Pettersson of the Swedish Oceanographic Institute estimated scientifically that meteoritic dust is falling upon the earth at the rate of 14,300,000 tons of new dust each year. This is scientifically

measurable. He did his tests up on a mountain to avoid some local dust. Since meteorites that have survived and impacted the earth contain an average of 2.5 percent nickel, the sample dust can be distinguished from local terrestrial sources.

Isaac Asimov is undoubtedly the best known scientific write of the age. He accepted that figure and concluded that with the commonly accepted age of the earth at five billion years old, the dust would come to fifty-four feet of meteorite dust over the entire earth surface if undisturbed; yet no one can see a trace of it when you go out for a hike. This is explained as due to the wind and the rain and that it eventually gets into the rivers and then into the oceans. It hasn't been found there either but then the ocean is quite large.

When the Apollo moon landing was being planned there was great concern among the scientists that *since there was no wind or rain on the moon*, the Apollo lunar module would sink into the fifty-four feet of cosmetic dust. And this concern was openly expressed. It was such a serious consideration that the lunar module was equipped with large pad feet to prevent it sinking out of sight before our very eyes.

When it landed on what appeared to be a hard surface, before 600 million eye witnesses on T.V., CBS interviewer Walter Cronkite asked about that very thing. Here is the exact text of Neil Armstrong's reply to Walter Cronkite: "The surface is fine and powdery...I only go in a small fraction of an inch, maybe an eighth of an inch."

Did this bring any scientific comment about the implications of this as to the age of the moon and the earth and the universe? None at all. The evolutionary scientific field was as silent as a tomb. There were no T.V. commentaries on this nor any newspaper articles, yet it surely was striking news.

Here is genuine scientific evidence that favors either a young or an old age for the universe. Why should there be a black out of the case for Creation Science when it comes up with genuine scientific data favoring its model? There were 600 million eye witnesses to the event. It was not staged by the fundamentalists.

As I see it, this is the inestimable value of C-Span. It gives the opposing view a fair hearing. Naturally it can't get into minuscule differences in the public debate, but here is a national phenomena and at the foundation are thousands upon thousands of the most credible scientists, in nearly every field of science, with the highest of credentials, pointing to factual data as the above in their respective fields.

How about contacting Dr. Henry Morris to see if he would agree to a segment on *An American Profile*? I see they list a phone number as 1-619-448-0900 and an address as P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, Ca. 92021.

Sincerely yours,

C.C. --- Dr. Henry Morris

[REDACTED]
Niles, Il. 60714



Brian Lamb
C-SPAN
Suite 650
400 N. Capitol St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

