

A False Dichotomy

In a recent local university lecture, evolutionist Kenneth Miller presented his “Darwin, God and Design: American’s Continuing Problem with Evolution” routine. Miller, a professed “believer” and “practicing Catholic,” is a vehement opponent of Biblical creation, seeing no conflict between “faith” and “science.” But Miller is disingenuous, deceiving individuals into abandoning, what he believes, are their ignorant outdated beliefs. Let me summarize his lecture and explain why.

The first 15-20 minutes we got “acquainted,” a technique speakers use to acquiesce their audience to be perceived as “one of us,” reducing any potential criticism of his assertions.

The next 40 minutes Miller belittled Creationists and Intelligent Design (ID) theorists, citing Delaware, Georgia, and Pennsylvania court decisions as the official word on Creation and ID’s “scientific” credibility which ironically, legally not scientifically, declared evolution the only “scientific” theory in biology and life origins. This was to show intellectual and scientific backwardness of Creationists and ID theorists, in a sarcastic way to appear non-offensive or insult their intelligence.

An hour later, Miller finally presented his “proof” for evolution: Comparative Anatomy, transitional fossil forms, and genetic mutations. I expected Miller to present something new rather than the old arguments even Creationists could use as evidence.

As a former evolutionist, I too see no conflict between “faith” and “science,” but for a different reason. Miller is disingenuous when stating “I think if we make the case for science for Americans, they are going to pick science every time.” Why “pick” if there’s no conflict? In Miller’s “empiricist” world-view, “science” is only what he can see, taste, touch, smell, or hear, so “faith” doesn’t conflict because its non “science” (non-sense). But it follows, then, that evolution must be strictly empirical (observed) to be “science,” otherwise it’s just a “belief” (religion). Ironically, Miller’s contempt for Creation and ID is his “belief” they are “religion” yet he provides no “scientific” evidence for his claim! Science (Latin: Scientia), simply means “to know” and is based upon rational “belief.” Empirical “science” cannot function without analytical (logical) reasoning. It cannot “empirically” prove the proposition: “Empirical science is the only means by which knowledge is acquired.” So Miller is both disingenuous and equivocates on “science” since many great scientists were Creationists who did not “pick.”

Miller also “baits and switch,” using false pretenses or premises, then substitutes content. For example, an auto ad offers a certain vehicle for a certain price and upon your arrival the dealer says, “we sold that one, but here’s one for X more dollars.” Miller says creatures evolve (change). In this sense, “growth” could be micro-evolution (small change). But no one observes creature X “grow” into creature Y as macro-evolution (large-scale change over long periods of time) asserts. That is unfounded by empirical scientific inquiry. Miller calls opponents of evolution scientifically illiterate, yet in “Biology” (Prentice-Hall, Miller-Levine, 5th ed. Copyright 2000, pg. 7) Miller quotes Villee saying “science” is “Organized common sense” and later writes “you might think that science is a special process used only by certain people and useful only under special circumstances. That is not true at all. We all use the scientific method every day” (p. 11)! When we rationally draw only such conclusions as warranted by the evidence, we practice science!

Yet in another interview Miller stated: “everyone knows that evolution, in a sense, is change over time. But what few people understand is how straightforward the nature of this change is. It’s important to understand, first of all, that individuals don’t evolve. I’m not evolving into something else, and my dog isn’t evolving into something else. I’m going to remain a human being, he’s going to remain a dog. That’s the way things are going to work. What changes over time are populations of individuals, for very straightforward reasons.” Miller contradicts himself! If only populations evolve, then macro-evolution is impossible since individual “quality” must change for creature X to become creature Y, not population Y’s “quantity” changing resulting in creature X! Otherwise creature X must give birth to creature Y, or creature X instantly transforms into creature Y! Experience teaches us neither occurs!

But what about Miller's "proof?"

Comparative Anatomy asserts anatomical similarities (five digits on hands and feet, etc.) are evidence of "evolved" common ancestry since transitional fossil forms exhibit "evolved" anatomical structures. But this begs the question, it assumes a characteristic is "evolved" as evidence it "evolved!" Miller cannot prove a "transitional fossil form" had any offspring, or much less one entirely different from itself!

Genetic mutation arguments assert similarities show relatedness and differences show divergences within genetic lineages, thus all creatures are related by common descent. Heads I win, tails you loose? How does one "scientifically" falsify (test) a theory which argues both its thesis and its antithesis? Such arguments are said to be used by Creationists and ID's which Miller says are "religions." So why isn't evolution?

But similarities also imply design. Lug nuts from GM could have "evolved" from Chrysler lug nuts since while "similar," some have "different" threading. But we know both were designed, not evolved. Interestingly, everything exhibiting design, for which we know its origin, has a designer. Only allegedly "evolved" things, whose origins are unknown, have no designer. This is an argument from ignorance. Miller's "belief" in God, Design, and Intelligence are deceiving because Miller's Intelligent Designer is Darwin's evolutionary natural selection! Either evolution is a religion, or Creation and/or ID are science. If not why not?

For years evolutionists ridiculed Creationists arguing catastrophism explains Earth's geological features. Then evolutionists used catastrophism to conveniently argue for slow or rapid evolution! Creationists also argued Design requires a Designer. Now Miller claims design is evolution's by-product, again stealing Creationists' arguments to shield evolution from criticism! It's amazing how many "religious" concepts are masqueraded as "science" to defend evolution! Did Miller use intelligence and design to write his books? Or are they attributed to mere Darwinian chance?

Miller is irrational to theologically "believe" God created, but "scientifically" deny it. If God created, then evolution is false! But if evolution is true, then no God is needed! Yes, we must "pick," but not between Miller's false dichotomy of "science" OR "religion," but between "evolution OR "science," because "evolution" and "science," not "science" and "religion," conflict! Our Lord practiced true "empirical" science when He taught: "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them (Matthew 7:20)."

Keith Padgett