

Faith, Facts, Fallacies, and Frauds

With all due respect to Charles Krauthammers and Amy Jorgensens recent articles in The Courier regarding the Creation / ID - Evolution discussion, I trust the Courier will permit this response in answer to their assertions, not censoring it from public consideration as do the mainstream scientific / educational systems. Will yet another false assertion go unchallenged by suppressing a dissenting view or will the Courier indeed "Give light and the people will find their own way?"

I am a Creationist. I admit this up front, make no apologies for it, nor am I ashamed of my position. I neither hold it merely "by faith" or as a "better felt than told" emotional crutch as my counterparts will no doubt charge. I can make the same empty charges of them, but it proves nothing nor serves any intellectual purpose. I once was an evolutionist, believing the propaganda emanating from their mouths and pens. But evolutionary literature, philosophy, and experience, NOT religion or Creationist's literature, compelled me to separate myself from their camp many years ago. Here is why.

First, contrary to Krauthammer and Jorgensen, religious "faith" in the New Testament is predicated upon evidence, not subjective, relativistic emotional, irrational eruptions or wishful thinking. No doubt they missed this in their quest for knowledge. Just because some ignorant individuals (theists or atheists) exclaim otherwise, does not negate that fact. The apostle Paul stated: "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded..." (II Tim. 1:12). The words "faith" and "belief" are translated from a cognate of the Greek from which our word "epistemology," the study of knowledge, is derived. The word "know" is from the Greek ("to see," by implication, "to know") and from which we derive gnostic (to know) and agnostic (not know). Attempts to deny this merely pervert both the Greek and English languages. If words mean nothing, then all attempts in using them are futile.

Second. The reason Krauthammer, Jorgensen, and many of their persuasion claim no conflict between science and religion exists is because they "believe" science exclusively is "fact" (i.e., truth), and religion is exclusively "faith" (i.e., "myth," thus untrue) with no convergence. But this is blatantly false. Everyone has "beliefs," even evolutionists. But not all "beliefs" are equal or true. Beliefs not based upon reason or evidence, are irrational, foolish, and usually false, whether they are religious OR scientific. To those who deny this, provide the evidence, scientific or otherwise, which falsifies this principle, if it exists. If mere "belief" excludes religion as "scientific" then why not science also? There are just as many false "beliefs" in "science" as in religion. How often have we read "Scientists now believe..." only later to find them "believing" the contrary (remember cancer causing peanut butter and coffee?). Belief is belief, a mental assent toward some person, place or thing, where only the object or concept to which it is directed changes, not the process. It's veracity rests with the validity of its proof. Epistemologists define "knowledge" as "Justified, True, Belief" (where "Justified" is authentication or proof; "Truth" is conforming with reality, and "Belief" is mental assent toward a concept, body of information or object). Knowledge then, cannot exist where no belief, no justification, or a false concept (not conforming to reality, i.e., untrue) is claimed. Remember this when analyzing evolutionism, Creationism, or ID.

Third. "Science" (from the Latin Scientia), also means "knowledge" or "to know" and often refers to the process we call the "scientific method" which incorporates a systematic procedure of observation, definition of the observation, formation of a hypothesis about that observation, deductions from that hypothesis and subsequent predictions, experiments which either validate or invalidate the hypothesis, and the formation of theory or law upon verification and universality of experimental results. No creed etched in stone exists which disqualifies any method as "scientific" (i.e., "knowledge-tific") other than it must be a systematic procedure whereby "knowledge" (Scientia) is acquired.

Indeed, even the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) states,

"Science is a method of explaining the natural world. It assumes that anything that can be observed

or measured is amenable to scientific investigation."

They further state:

"Science also assumes that the universe operates according to regularities that can be discovered and understood through scientific investigations. The testing of various explanations of natural phenomena for their consistency with empirical data is an essential part of the methodology of science."

I know of no Creationist who objects to this.

Fourth. Science (knowledge), is acquired by two means: a priori (analytical) or a posteriori (empirical). Analytical is "reasoned" ($2 + 2 = 4$, "If...Then", etc.) while empirical is "physical"(result of mixing chemicals or elements, etc.). Or, as Britannica puts it, a priori knowledge is that which "is independent of all particular experiences, as opposed to a posteriori knowledge, which derives from experience alone." Evolutionism's academia insist that neither creationism nor ID are scientific, but never specify how, analytically or empirically. Nor do they provide scientific proof for their assertion. "Science," as commonly understood or inferred, means "factual" or "true," and rightly so, IF, "science" is indeed "knowledge." Otherwise, of what use is it? To "scientifically" "know" (i.e., understand - redundantly so) something not true or real is absolutely useless. Claiming to "know" something one doesn't is merely a false "belief." To "knowingly" claim the truth of something when it is not, is a lie. Epistemologists note the impossibility of "knowing" a falsehood since "knowledge" is Justified, True, Belief. What evolutionists are really arguing is, anything not "empirical" is not science; and anything not "science" is not real or true. Consider, "Explanations that are not consistent with empirical evidence or cannot be tested empirically are not a part of science. As a result, explanations of natural phenomena that are not based on evidence but on myths, personal beliefs, religious values, and superstitions are not scientific. Furthermore, because science is limited to explaining natural phenomena through the use of empirical evidence, it cannot provide religious or ultimate explanations" (NSTA). But this also is blatantly false!

Fifth. Epistemology itself is:

"the theory or science that investigates the origin, nature, and methods, and limits of knowledge" (Websters New 20th century 2nd ed. Unabridged Dictionary, p. 614).

A "science" which is not "empirical?" Indeed! Moreover, scientists claim to incorporate logic (a philosophical and non-empirical science) in their "scientific" quests. Does using logic "corrupt" science or make it pseudo-science since it is not empirical, as Krauthammer asserts? I think not. Indeed, true science cannot function without it! Yet evolutionism's empiricists claim a monopoly on using non-empirical means to bolster evolutionism while forbidding other non-empirical "science" (i.e., knowledge and understanding) from entering the discussion. To do so would expose their fallacies and deception. What deception?

The deception occurs when evolutionism's scientists assert science does NOT discover "truth" neither can it "know" anything with certainty (never mind the fact that this assertion itself violates and contradicts the claim). Science writer Arthur Strahler writes:

I suggest that in our search for insight into the nature of science we set some strict limits to how we use the words "fact," "actuality," and "truth." Let us vow never again to say 'Scientists discover the truth' . . . Let us admit that the human mind or brain will never be privy to truth in science, but . . . actually contains a certain probability of being in error. (Arthur Strahler. Understanding Science. 1992. p. 21)

Gould wrote:

"...evolution is a theory. It is also a fact. And facts and theories are different things, not rungs in a hierarchy of increasing certainty. Facts are the world's data. Theories are structures of ideas that explain and interpret facts. Facts don't go away when scientists debate rival theories to explain them."

However, "fact," continues Gould, "doesn't mean 'absolute certainty'; there ain't no such animal in an exciting and complex world."

Richard C. Lewontin wrote:

"It is time for students of the evolutionary process, especially those who have been misquoted and used by the creationists, to state clearly that evolution is a fact, not theory, and that what is at issue within biology are questions of details of the process and the relative importance of different mechanisms of evolution."

Does Strahler's statement contain "a certain probability of being in error"? And who is correct about "fact" and "theory" – Gould or Lewontin? They regard "truth" and "facts" merely as deductions of high probability. Their presupposed world view forbids them from being certain of what they "know" (if they ever can). Nor can they determine otherwise. Of this they are "certain"! They use "fact" not as "truth" as we do each day, but as probability, a strong "maybe." This is deceptive because they equivocate when using these words and then accuse Creationists of misquotes or distortion. But Karen A. Schmidt, in her article entitled "Evolution in a Test Tube," wrote:

Charles Darwin set off on a voyage in 1831 . . . five years later, he returned with the discovery of a bittersweet truth about life. (Science News, vol. 144. August 7, 1993. pp. 90-92.)

So what does she mean here, that evolution is a "truth about life" in a discipline where truth and certainty do not exist! Evolutionists have defined evolution as a "fact" ("world's data" or observed phenomenon), AND a "theory" (explanation of that data). Lewontin says his and Gould's dispute is a "questions of details of the process." It appears then, evolution is everything we see and the explanation for that which we don't! Somewhat circular and a very convenient theory against which no conceivable falsification test exists. This alone makes it non-scientific.

Sixth. Regarding Krauthammer's appeal to Einstein and Newton's belief in God as proof that science and religion can "co-exist," I agree. Yet nothing in Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Biology or any other physical science is contrary with God's existence or His Creation, except Evolutionism. Krauthammer wrote "How ridiculous to make evolution as the enemy of God." Evolutionists say it's a scientific theory which threatens no "belief" (confidence in truth) yet claim it is a "truth about life" a unifying theory explaining all things. Well, either God created mankind, or He did not. Conversely, either evolution created man, or it didn't. No other options exist. Evolutionary pundits deny that it addresses the origin of life, only its process. But that is a bald face lie! Evolution is the "enemy of God!"

In "Darwinism at the Very Beginning of Life" (New Scientist, vol. 94. April 15, 1982. pp. 149-152.), Leslie E. Orgel wrote:

"The origin of the genetic code is the most baffling aspect of the problem of the origins of life."

If evolution does not conflict with a Creator God, why is there a "problem" concerning the "origins of life?" And why would anyone professing a belief in Special Creation embrace a contrary explanation? Are they afraid of being perceived as uneducated or "anti-intellectual?"

More explicitly, Susan Gilbert wrote:

Sometime between the Earth's beginning 4.6 billion years ago and the date that the oldest primitive algae and bacteria became fossilized a billion years later, our earliest ancestor was born: the first self-replicating cell. We know that it must have arisen, somehow, from hydrogen, helium, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, and neon—the six elements that make up 98 percent of the known universe and all the life it holds. But how cells were made from this inorganic matter remains a mystery because every scrap of evidence has vanished." (How Did Life Begin? Science Digest October 1985. p. 36).

Gilbert concludes by suggesting that Ribonucleic Acid evolved from clay and from this inorganic substance, life (organic material) arose. Yet this is diametrically opposed to the Biblical "Special Creation." The theory of evolution is clearly a naturalistic, materialistic explanation of how life began, without a Creator! The real "anti-intellectuals" are they who cling to both God and Evolution with no shame of their ignorance. Rather they glory in their ignorance! (ELP)

So I laugh at the so-called "intellectual superiority" of theistic evolutionists (who believe God exists but created all things by evolution), and the evolutionary theists (who insist naturalism is the only reality yet religiously believe in a supernatural God). The former compromise their beliefs in order to appear "intellectually acceptable" and "scientific" to the academic world, while the latter irrationally contradict their materialistic world view to fill an empty emotional void while appearing "religious" and "inviting" to those unsure of their religious and scientific beliefs.

Seventh. What is really ridiculous and insulting is the conceited arrogance of Krauthammer and his ilk who impose evolution on others and then have the audacity to accuse his opponents, who merely ask for tolerance of alternative explanations, of committing his offense! That is the height of hypocrisy!

Eighth. Contrary to Jorgensen's assertion, Darwin's evolutionary theory of "natural selection" does not explain the diversity and origin of life upon the earth. She quotes Gould that evolution is a "fact," as if the assertion itself is proof. It's not. In Gould's article "Dorothy, It's Really Oz" (a deliberate emotional slap at Creationists), the highly "revered" Stephen J. Gould enlightens us poor, ignorant souls that:

...evolution is as well documented as any phenomenon in science, as strongly as the earth's revolution around the sun rather than vice versa. In this sense, we can call evolution a "fact." (Science does not deal in certainty, so "fact" can only mean a proposition affirmed to such a high degree that it would be perverse to withhold one's provisional assent.) (Time, August 23, 1999. p 59).

Gould also asserts, "humans evolved from ape-like ancestors whether they did so by Darwin's proposed mechanism or by some other yet to be discovered" but admits "we have always acknowledged how far we are from completely understanding the mechanisms (theory) by which evolution (fact) occurred. Darwin continually emphasized the difference between his two great and separate accomplishments: establishing the fact of evolution, and proposing a theory--natural selection--to explain the mechanism of evolution."

Natural Selection accounts for the "survival" or "extinction" of life forms not the microbiological mutations which are asserted to produce macro-evolutionary results (i.e., Reptiles to Aves). It merely asserts that the strong will survive and the weak will die - "survival of the fittest." Darwin's "descent through modification" addresses change in species due to hereditary traits. His ignorance of modern microbiology lacked the "knowledge" as then claimed by Lamarck that giraffe necks, and the passing on of this trait, did not get longer with repeated attempts at reaching higher tree limbs, but was inherent in the gene information of that particular "kind" of creature.

Ninth. For years we were taught about Nebraska Man, a transitional between earlier primates and man, as

proof of evolution. From fossil evidence we "knew" about his physical stature, his environment, his diet, even the way he lived. Evolutionists inferred all this from the discovery of a single tooth! Years later, "we now know" the tooth came from an extinct pig or picarry. A problem for evolutionists? No. Meet Piltdown Man. Instead of an overactive, imaginative, "scientific" blunder, Piltdown was a genuine, bona fide case of scientific fraud. Intentionally combining a primate cranium, and filing down the teeth on a canine mandible, it was deliberately buried to be found as a "true" evolutionary transitional. Yes, science has it's own disingenuous agenda crowd. If you build a wall, but the foundation is missing, the structure collapses!

Tenth. Krauthammer's "God did it" charge of tautology cuts both ways. The "mechanism"(theory or explanation) by which the so-called "fact" of evolution occurs is not settled. Gould "confidently"(by faith?) asserts, "humans evolved from ape-like ancestors whether they did so by Darwin's proposed mechanism or by some other yet to be discovered." And what of Gilbert's "must have...somehow" remarks? In other words, no explanation, therefore "evolution did it." And Krauthammer's "natural explanations for what we see in the world around us" such as Chemistry or Newtonian mechanics as being an "unguided process," - isn't that what is in question here? Simply asserting these and the "millions of life forms...derived from accumulated variations in a single double-stranded molecule" as evidence for evolution is circular reasoning. It begs the question to say "of course we evolved, we're here aren't we?" The same can be said for Creation: "Of course we we're created, we're here aren't we?" We're told "faith" in that which cannot be "scientifically" demonstrated, tested or proved, has no place in "science." Except, of course, if its evolutionism.

Eleventh. Jorgensen's "open"door of science has a "Members Only" sign on it restricting anything disagreeing with evolutionism's naturalistic paradigm. Some objectivity! Her comparison with gravity are fallacious and not analogous. We daily observe the effects of gravitation "theory," but not evolutionism. If we define "evolution" as growth, then yes it occurs. If we define it as trans-mutational, cross-species change, then no, it doesn't. Cell resistance to a particular virus, no matter how rapid, is a far cry from that virus becoming a mouse or man. If it occurs faster, then we should see more, quicker cases of new species popping up, IF the evolutionary premise or scenario is accurate. We don't. But we daily observe the "sunrise" and "sunset" and objects do fall per the laws of Physics. But no one, Krauthammer, Jorgensen, not even Gould, has seen a Ramapithecus or Africanus Afarensis transform into a pig, much less a human being. Evolution is only "well documented" in the imagination of evolutionists.

Twelfth. Contrary to Gould, people do know, for certain, what they hear, taste, touch, smell, and see. We call it experience (empiricism), and it is the foundation of physical "science." Experience does not show, much less prove, "evolution" as a "fact" or a "theory" (non-demonstrable at that). The question of origins still remains, and evolution does not answer it.

Thirteenth. So what would a reasonable person conclude from the available evidence? Since no one was present in the beginning, no human eyewitness can demonstrate "scientifically" what started life. But we do know by experience (empiricism) from where life does come - living things produce living things (offspring, reproduction, etc.). We also have overwhelming evidence, or the lack thereof, that life did not spontaneously arise from inanimate, inorganic (non-living) objects. Not once in human history has this "fact" (observation) been experienced! This IS a "fact" ("world's data"). Yet despite evidence to the contrary, evolutionists insist on indoctrinating the public (and their school youth) that evolution is a "fact" (observed) and the best "theory" (explanation) "science" (knowledge) has to offer. I say nonsense!

Fourteenth. Yes, supporters of evolutionism are entitled to their beliefs, no matter how fallacious. The difference between Creation and Evolutionism is that the latter is a religious belief protected, promoted, and federally financed by law, and imposed upon those who reject it in violation of the Constitution. The former is a rational religious belief denied these same privileges contrary to the explicit Constitutional "the free exercise thereof."

Fifteenth. The belief that evolutionism is false is not "intellectually inferior." A concerted effort pervades the scientific community to convince people that only they who accept evolution as "fact" are "reputable" and "worthy of a judgment." Consider evolutionist Dr. Richard Goldschmidt's words:

Evolution of the animals and plant world is considered by all those entitled to a judgment to be a fact for which no further proof is needed. (American Scientist. Vol. 49 1952. P 84.)

Translation: only idiots reject evolution. "No further proof is needed?" What an objective, open-minded scientific attitude! Sounds like their definition of "religion!"

Some evolutionists, such as Iowa State University's Dr. John Patterson, even urged the Committee on Instruction in the sciences at ISU to fail all persons who refuse to give up their belief in Creationism regardless of their grades and even retroactively rescind the degrees of persons later discovered as Creationists ("Do Scientists and Scholars Discriminate Unfairly Against Creationists?" IN: Journal of National Center for Science Education, Fall, 1978, pp. 19,20). Such statements are not scientific and objective, but the propagandistic agenda of mainstream evolutionary elitist scientists.

However, no scientific evidence or logical argument exists which warrants that conclusion. That belief is predicated upon a pre-suppositional world view biased against anything not fitting a preconceived naturalistic idea of what is an acceptable scientific explanation.

In conclusion, it is interesting that "scientists" at SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) search for that which Eugenie Scott, Executive Director of the National Center for Science Education, tells us either does not exist, or is not scientific (observable, measurable, testable, or repeatable). Maybe we ought to ask our educational system why it regularly incorporates pseudoscience when applying the Scholastic Aptitude Test in their vain attempts to evaluate some semblance of our student's learning ability (i.e., "intelligence")? Hmmm?

As for Charles Krauthammer, the real insult is him telling others what they ought to believe. If evolutionism is true, reasonable people will see it - but the same is true for Creation and ID, if we are permitted to hear the evidence! And his demeaning remark that "evolution" also gave us the Kansas Board of Education, I might remind him, Jorgensen and others of the 1953, Harold Urey and Stanley Miller laboratory experiments in which amino acids were produced. While touted as proof that chemical reactions could become life by naturalistic evolution, remember that nothing close to life was produced. What this experiment showed is our best deliberate attempts and failures to create that which we're told happened by accident over 4.6 billion years is, it takes an "Intelligent" Designer to "create" life.

Keith Padgett