

WitnessKit 2

God And Creation

Class 17

*Science Vs. Philosophy of Science,
Unfair Fights,
Immunity to Evidence,
Micro Versus Macro Change,
Fallacy of Composition*

In “The Black Cottage” Robert Frost said,

**“Most of the changes
we think we see in life
is due to truths
being in and out of favor.”**

Clarence Darrow, who argued the Scopes Trial on the side of teaching Evolution, was quoted in the *New York Times*, as saying this.

“There is no such thing as justice—
in or out of court.”

His worldview eliminated justice.

Evolution as the basis for a worldview
has many implications beyond itself.

We live in a technological age.

- Technology demonstrates the power and validity of science.
- But many parts of life are above and beyond technology.
- The idea of a Transcendent Creator has different implications for the whole of life than the idea of Materialism. Evolution as the basis for a worldview implies much more than the matters discussed in biology class.

We must give intelligent design ideas to students,
outside the school-day,

Reasons to
Correct a
Mistake

Because the courts have removed Intelligent Design from the schools. Removal was an mistake, for the following reasons:

1. **Intelligent Design is a philosophy of science issue rather than a science versus religion issue.**
2. Eliminating Intelligent Design weakens science.
3. The tactics used to eliminate ID are unfair and manipulative and not scientific.

A decorative horizontal bar at the top of the slide, consisting of a yellow rectangular section on the left and a blue rectangular section on the right.

The issue is a

philosophy of science issue
rather than a
science versus religion issue.

Science Versus Philosophy of Science in the Public Schools

“Evolution as understood in the professional literature is **naturalistic evolution**, the view that the entire universe and all the entities in it can be accounted for by strictly material processes without resorting to any designer....

Therefore, to say evolution is *true* is to say that naturalism (or materialism) as a **worldview is true.**”—Dr. Francis J. Beckwith, in TO EVERYONE AN ANSWER, IVP Academic, p 271, 2004.

It Is Not the Job of Science

To establish a worldview.

That is a job for the fields of Philosophy of Science, and of Philosophy, and of Theology.

Establishing a worldview involves stepping back from the details of science to look at the big picture.

Unfortunately, the scientific elites have failed to recognize that truth.

They and the courts and the school boards have confused the limitations of science with limitations on reality.

Finding an explanation is not the same as finding the CORRECT explanation.

- The methods of science establish limits on the kinds of phenomena that can be explained by science. **Those methods set NO LIMITS on reality.**
- Science cannot see God through a telescope. That does not mean God does not exist.
- That also does not mean science is unable to detect God's activity in nature.

Many Non-Scientists

- Assume that calling evolution **a theory** softens the perspective that evolution is defined as ONLY a material process without a guiding hand. Many evolutionists have begun calling evolution **a fact**, to eliminate that much breathing room from the debate. Those scientists restrict **the theory** to mechanisms, and claim **the fact** for the overall schematic of common ancestry back to bacteria.
- In actuality, when science is defined as a search for material explanations only, the word *theory* cannot stretch to include a Creator.

In *Signature in the Cell*

Dr. Stephen Meyer describes the proper definition of science as **a search for explanations we see operating in the present.**

Since we see intelligence at work in the present world, we **can** recognize intelligence as a cause for events.

So a technique which identifies **the imprint of intelligence** in nature

Can open science to

material causes plus intelligence as a cause.

- It should be clear that this is a more open approach to science than materialism alone. Open is good.

Science at present

DOES recognize the imprint of intelligence as a cause for events in the present world.

Science has mathematical techniques in fields such as code-breaking, to be able to tell the difference between random symbols and a coded message.

To restrict science to material causes only and everything else to religion would be to restrict the field of code-breaking to religion—and that is absurd.

□ So we see bias **against** discovering intelligence mainly when the intelligence we find might imply GOD.

We must give intelligent design ideas to students,
outside the school-day,

Reasons to
Correct a
Mistake

Because the courts have removed Intelligent Design from the schools. Removal was an mistake, for the following reasons:

1. The issue is a philosophy of science issue rather than a science versus religion issue.
2. **Eliminating Intelligent Design weakens science.**
3. The tactics used to eliminate ID are unfair and manipulative and not scientific.



Eliminating Intelligent Design

from discussion
weakens science.

Finding **an** explanation is not the same as finding the **CORRECT** explanation.

If science finds a naturalistic explanation for past events, that is not the same as finding the correct explanation.

For that explanation to be strong enough to rule out *or even weaken* the God hypothesis, it must be an **EXTREMELY GOOD** explanation. A fuzzy maybe-so explanation won't do. The God hypothesis is so probable from the complexity of the living world, that a counter explanation would need to be airtight to even weaken it.

Even then...

- Even if science manages to create an extremely good explanation for origins,
- That explanation cannot rule out God as Ultimate Cause, because the explanation may apply only to intermediate causes.
- Materialism is a **faith-in-the-absence-of** God position, independent of the evidence.

Finding an explanation is not the same as finding the **CORRECT** explanation.

- If critiques of naturalism are not allowed in science, their exclusion **makes room for** weak, fuzzy, maybe-so naturalistic explanations, and **NOBODY IS ALLOWED** to say they are weak.
- Obviously, this hurts science and acts as a barrier preventing further progress.
- Progress in science requires challenging the status quo.

Finding an explanation is not the same as finding the CORRECT explanation.

- The fine tuning of the universe tells us that our universe is an exceedingly rare possibility if chance was its cause.
- To counter this difficulty, materialists have postulated that our universe is just one of billions and billions of chance universes. This is a fuzzy idea because there is no evidence for it, and no real possibility of finding any.

Finding an explanation is not the same as finding the CORRECT explanation.

- But suppose billions of universes are happening by chance and ours just manages to be habitable. This implies a universe-creating machine of some kind—and isn't that a kind of “god idea?”
- Why would such a machine be assumed NOT to have intelligence?

If Critiques of *Naturalistic* Science

- Are legally barred from science class, the best teachers stand to lose their jobs over an academic freedom issue. And some of the fun goes out of science, too.
- The future of science in the United States is not served by muzzling teachers in science class.

We must give intelligent design ideas to students,
outside the school-day,

Correcting a Mistake

Because the courts have removed Intelligent Design from the schools. Removal was an mistake, for the following reasons:

1. The issue is a philosophy of science issue rather than a science versus religion issue.
2. Eliminating Intelligent Design weakens science.
3. **The tactics used to eliminate ID are unfair and manipulative and not scientific.**

The tactics used to eliminate ID

are unfair
and manipulative
and not scientific.

DARWIN ON TRIAL looks at the controversy from a legal standpoint.

Phillip Johnson is a legal scholar who studied the Supreme Court case which removed the Creation Science option from Louisiana's public schools. In that case, he noticed that the words *science* and *religion* were used to imply conclusions that judges and legislators and educators “**might not want to state openly.**”

To say that naturalistic evolution is SCIENCE and supernatural creation is RELIGION has approximately **the effect** of saying the former is true and the latter is fantasy.

The National Academy of Sciences

Submitted this argument in a friend of the court brief:

Creation science is not science because "It fails to display the most basic characteristic of science:

reliance upon naturalistic explanations.

Instead, proponents of 'creation-science' hold that the creation of the universe, the earth, living things, and man was accomplished through supernatural means inaccessible to human understanding."

The National Academy of Sciences continued...

"'Creation-science' is thus manifestly a device to dilute the persuasiveness of the theory of evolution.

The dualistic mode of analysis and the negative argumentation employed to accomplish the dilution is, moreover, antithetical to the scientific method."

Dr. Johnson's analysis of their approach...

"The Academy thus defined 'science' in such a way that advocates of supernatural creation may neither argue for their own position nor dispute the claims of the scientific establishment.

That may be one way to win an argument, but it is not satisfying to anyone who thinks it possible that God really did have something to do with creating mankind, or that some of the claims that scientists make under the heading of 'evolution' may be false."

Professor Johnson goes on to say...

"What first drew my attention to the question was the way the rules of argument seemed to be structured to make it impossible to question whether what we are being told about evolution is really true."

"A second point ...was that the very persons who insist upon keeping religion and science separate are eager to use their science as a basis for pronouncements about religion. The literature of Darwinism is full of anti-theistic conclusions..."

An example of such anti-theistic religious conclusions is found in **Oxford Professor**

Dr. Richard Dawkins' 1986 book, THE BLIND WATCHMAKER, and in his newer book, THE GOD DELUSION, which are recruitment treatises for atheism in the name of biology. He is also famous for this description of creationists:

“It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that.)”

According to Philip Johnson, Dawkins explained further that he ***particularly dislikes creationists because they are intolerant.***

Unfortunately, that attitude

From a professor whose opinion determines a student's success in the university—that scorn toward religious students—has a profound impact on the emotions of students.

A professor has spent years accumulating knowledge in his field, and his authority carries emotional weight, regardless of whether he has studied any evidence that counters the orthodoxy of his field or that bridges the gap between science and religion.

Because the University Science Departments have been so closed

To the idea of creation, the orthodoxy of Darwinism has stifled inquiry and publication of critical materials.

If only one viewpoint may be presented, and no criticisms are allowed, only that viewpoint will prevail, even if it is wrong.

The other viewpoints will be excluded from publication also, on grounds that they are “not scientific.”

Clearly, to exclude a possibility

Like Intelligent Design from science because it might have religious implications is UNSCIENTIFIC.

- If science demanded that ID be excluded for those reasons, science would have to exclude Darwinism also. We have already seen that Darwinism has religious implications.
- If a reason, such as having religious implications, is used to exclude ID but not to exclude Darwinism, the playing field is not level. The exclusion is not fair.

On *EXPELLED THE MOVIE*,

a professor from Cornell University described how he lost his faith during freshman biology class, because the teacher of that course asked him *to find any reason to doubt naturalism in the freshman biology textbook.*

Well, of course he would not find such reasons there! They are NOT ALLOWED there. Every biology student has to “reinvent the wheel” when it comes to critiques of Darwinism, because those are EXCLUDED from his education.

Another unfair tactic to expel ID

From “Science” is to equate Intelligent Design with Biblical Creationism.

- Biblical Creationism might represent an unfair establishment of religion **if** it taught Genesis chapter 1 in science class, *although historically that WAS allowed in America* prior to the mid 20th century. Intelligent Design does not teach Genesis or any other form of religion.
- Intelligent design is simply the use of a form of mathematical reasoning to detect information or intelligence in nature, and ID has **nothing** to do with organized religion.

Intelligent Design is an Intellectual Bridge across worldviews.

It is agnostic, not claiming to KNOW God, but open to the possibility of a deity and the possibility of detecting an imprint of Deity on nature in terms of MENTAL or INFORMATION processes.

- Where science under the naturalistic, materialistic restriction is atheistic and closed, Intelligent Design is agnostic but open.
- As an intellectual bridge, **nothing of establishment of religion is involved.**

Essentially We Have Five Categories:

- #1. Naturalistic, materialistic evolution– the only theory allowed in school, which is atheistic.
- #2. The possibility of teaching ***critiques of Darwinism*** from science only, but **assuming unguided macroevolution** is how it all occurred. This allows some critical thinking into the classroom.
- #3. Intelligent Design, which is open to the possibility of a Designer without demanding belief in one, and thus agnostic,

My Opinion Is That Essentially We Have Five Categories:

- #4. Theistic evolution, which teaches a guiding hand behind evolution, in a vague or undefined way. (Most citizens blindly assume that this is allowed. It is NOT allowed by the courts. When proponents of Darwinism mention it, they only mean that the person believes evidence of a guiding hand is **impossible to obtain**, so it is outside science—sheer blind faith.)
- #5. And Biblical or other religious creationism, which integrates religious belief and science.

What is wrong with allowing students to understand these categories?

I personally have NO PROBLEM with opening science class to **all** these categories, as long as they are presented appropriately without pressure on students to choose a belief system.

I believe integrating worldviews is a good thing and that fragmentation of worldviews is harmful, especially if a Source for moral universals is ruled out of bounds of consideration.

What is wrong with allowing students to understand these five categories?

By excluding three or four of the five possibilities, the courts are **inadvertently forcing** students **Either** to choose a belief system away from God, **or** forcing them to fragment their belief system.

A fragmented belief system tends toward fragmented decision-making. We see that all the time in lives of students.

A Biblical Example of Government's

Forcing belief **against God** on a population is described in II Kings 17:21-23. “When he (King Jeroboam) had torn Israel from the house of David, they made Jeroboam the son of Nebat king. Then Jeroboam **drove Israel away** from following the LORD, and **made them commit a great sin**. And the sons of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they did not depart from them until the LORD removed Israel from His sight, as He spoke through His servants the prophets. So Israel was carried away into exile from their own land to Assyria until this day.”

(Was there a believing remnant? Yes.)

The Consequences to the Nation



Were very serious.

It is a serious thing to turn away from the living God. Our nation should **not** continue requiring forced godlessness in the public schools and universities. In earlier centuries, a religious worldview was the basis for law. Today a scientific worldview is the basis for law.

(If a religious worldview is allowed as basis for law, it **MUST** be the Judeo-Christian one that the nation was founded upon. Only that worldview is consistent with human rights and freedoms—because of moral universals behind law, and human equality under law.)

The Intelligent Design Category

Contains the middle ground in the scientific discussion, and includes the possibility of theistic evolution.

The Cambrian fossil data say that theistic evolution is not correct at the level of Phyla—macroevolution— and *could* be correct at much lower levels of biological differences—microevolution.

Unfortunately, ***the courts have ruled out discussion*** of the middle ground.

IF

- We make intelligent design ideas accessible to students outside school, then we **can** open up all the possibilities, and we **can** talk about integrating worldviews.
- We cannot do this by accident. We have to be intentional about it. It takes time and thought and planning to work out an opportunity to teach these ideas.

There is a vast difference between

Establishment of Religion

And Acknowledgement of Religion.

- The courts have failed to make that distinction for the last 50 years or so.
- May God SOON open up a better system for the education of our children, and a better system for science funding, and a clearer understanding among His people.

There is a vast difference between

Establishment of Religion

And Acknowledgement of Religion.

- May the courts correct course, to renew respect for religious belief in the public square—to make freedom of religious speech the standard, and to correct the “freedom from being offended” error.
- And especially may they correct course in their definition of Intelligent Design as “religion.”



A review from the first semester

What IS Intelligent Design?

What IS Intelligent Design?

- “Intelligent Design” is composed of a set of mathematical tools to detect information in nature.
- **Information** is a decision code which gives matter its form or arrangement.
- Complex Specified Information, or CSI for short, is a form of information that is **always** associated with intelligent causes in the present world.

Because CSI indicates

Intelligent causes in the present world,
it also can imply intelligent causes
for items from the past.

For example, the CSI tools are applied in archaeology and paleo-anthropology to identify artifacts made by humans. Even if we do not know exactly how a tool was used, the CSI techniques can tell us it was a tool rather than a random rock or piece of wood or bone.

Complex Specified Information

CSI is information that is complicated enough, and that matches an external, independent pattern,
And the pattern is also obvious enough,
that when we see it, we intuitively think a mind was involved in creating it. By experience with objects people make, if **complex specified information** is present, an intelligence created the objects.

Complex Specified Information



Our minds do this kind of assessment all the time, and we are confident about our ability to recognize manufactured objects. That is why our intuitions are so strong about the existence of a Creator when we see the complexity of nature.

CSI—Complex Specified Information implies Intelligence

- By experience with objects people make, if **complex specified information** is present, an intelligence created the objects.

Example: a player piano roll. Holes are punched in a roll of strong paper, and the information in those holes instructs the piano to play a certain song. A machine has to convert those holes in the paper into motions of hammers on strings. Another machine turns the piano roll.

CSI in a Piano Roll:

- The holes in the paper contain information. The machines built into the piano translate that information into sounds. The information is complicated enough to not have arrived on the paper by chance alone.
- The information matches an external, independent pattern—the notes that make up a song.
- The pattern is obvious as a pattern—it is not just random noise.

Intelligence is in the creation of the piano roll, **not** the playing of it.

- It does not take much skill to play a song if the roll is instructing the keys. ANYBODY or NOBODY can sit at the keyboard.
- However, quite a bit of intelligence is involved in creating the piano roll.
- Would you expect a piano roll to happen by chance? Would you expect a roll punched by chance to produce a recognizable song?

When considering evidence for intelligence behind living systems

- It is important to separate the “creation of the piano roll” from the “playing of the piano roll.”
- Living systems appear self-perpetuating, like the player piano in motion.
- Living systems work based on the encoded information in the DNA and other structures of the cells, without the appearance of involvement from an outside intelligence at the time.
- The perpetuating nature of living systems does not exclude intelligence in writing the codes in the cell structures.

If we see complex specified information in living systems...

Intellectual honesty **demands** that we **consider the possibility** of an intelligence as a source of the information.

- The problem is that science has been defined as a search for naturalistic explanations.
- CSI resolves a dilemma and releases science from that constraint.

There is NOTHING RELIGIOUS

About the tests for CSI. They are math tools.

CSI Detection Requirement

Number 1 of 4: a **contingent** event.

- The occurrence must be able to happen in more than one way. It must occur within a field of multiple possibilities.
- Think of this as a “floppy” event. It is not predetermined, but can “flop” one way or another or another or another.
- It sounds more scientific to say *contingent* rather than floppy. But you can always *think* floppy.

How does this fit the piano roll example?

- The holes in the piano roll are contingent. They could be punched any number of different ways. Any number of different songs can be encoded into the piano roll, or random noise or silence could be encoded instead.

How does this fit the piano roll example?

- If someone sits at the keyboard of a player piano and plays, they can play any number of different ways.
- If the piano roll is causing the sound, the song is fixed at one possibility, and the person on the piano bench is not using their intelligence to plan the next note.
- The creation of the piano roll met the contingency requirement, but the playing of the roll does not.

Some things in nature are not contingent.

- A salt crystal of sodium chloride is always in the ratio of one sodium ion to one chloride ion, and with a specific crystal shape.
- The shape of the salt crystal does not match the contingency requirement.
- If you add more ions to the solution, you get more of the same kinds of crystals. The repeating nature of inorganic crystals does not meet the contingency requirement.

CSI Detection Requirement Number 2 of 4 : **Improbability**

To find intelligence behind an event, it must be **improbable** for happening by chance.

(It is possible for extremely **probable** things to happen due to intelligent planning. The math tools miss detecting those things, because chance veils them from the detection method.)

CSI Detection Requirement

Number 2 of 4 : **Improbability**

To find intelligence behind an event, it must be **improbable** for happening by chance.

Regarding detecting intelligence in biology, Dr. William Dembski sets the probability boundary at 10 to the minus 150th power.

- If an event has a lower than 10 to the minus 150th power probability of happening by chance, it is extremely improbable.

How did Dr. Demski choose this boundary of improbability?

This boundary of 10 to the minus 150 th power represents

- the number of elementary particles in the universe
- and the predicted number of seconds from the Big Bang to the heat death of the universe
- and the fastest possible rate of particle transition.

If an event is so rare that its chances of “just happening” are less than one time in the entire past and future history of the universe ...

- (Assuming all possible chances of anything happening by chance are considered)...
- THEN its occurrence is less likely to happen by chance than one time in 10 to the 150th power opportunities.
- If it ALSO matches an external, independent pattern,
- Then it is a sufficiently rare occurrence to be considered as signifying intelligence as a source.

The extreme improbability boundary...

- Dr. Dembski sets this bar very high for biological systems to make certain to consider only the definite appearance of design in nature, since materialist science denies all intelligence outside a closed universe.
- Of course, this means the criterion misses huge numbers of opportunities to consider intelligent causes in biology.

Detection Requirement number 3 of 4: Independent **pattern** matches.

- The object or event has to match an independent pattern, and the pattern cannot have been added after the event. The pattern has to exist prior to the object or event.
- (The sheet music for the song that is played would be the independent pattern in our player piano example.)

CSI Detection Criteria Number 4 of 4: An Obvious pattern

- The pattern has to be obvious enough that the pattern itself is not just a chance occurrence, and also obvious enough not to have been added after the fact of the event to match the event.
- There are separate mathematical tests to rigorously find out whether the pattern is obvious and independent, as well as to predict the likelihood of an event.
- These tests were developed in the statistical studies called chaos theory.

How do you decide if a pattern is obvious enough?

- The separate tests for obviousness involve a couple of different ideas.
- One idea matches the “edges” of the event with the edges of the pattern. If the match is TOO CLOSE, the pattern could have been added after the event.

How do you decide if a pattern is obvious enough?

- Another test requires a simple description to be possible for the PATTERN, meaning the pattern can be described in a simple set of math sentences or word sentences. Otherwise, it might be just a restatement of the event.
- In the player piano example, the notes have to sound like a song, not just noise, to know that the holes in the paper were intentional.

The CSI Tests are not religious. They are mathematical.

- The CSI tests make intelligence detectable using scientific and mathematical tools.
- Biological systems involve information.
- The CSI tests can be applied to biological systems.

To EXCLUDE them from science

- Because they may incline someone toward religious ideas is unfair.
- The process of excluding them also influences people toward religious ideas, as Dr. Dawkins books amply testify. Consider the title THE GOD DELUSION.



The matters of concern in this class

Are issues in the real world.

On January 22, 2009, the State Board of Texas made a serious decision.

- Before this time, the Texas standards had a statement recommending teaching *both strengths and weaknesses* of scientific theories.
- The standards never had anything related to intelligent design. So of the five possibilities, Texas allowed possibility one and possibility two—to teach evolution as the accepted scientific description of origins, or to teach that plus strengths and weaknesses of the theory.

On January 22, 2009, the State Board of Texas made a serious decision.

- Many teachers would not think any weaknesses exist, so would not teach any.
- Without this option available, any teacher who deviated from the curriculum would be subject to job insecurity.
- So it was an important statement in the standards.
- It also is an important idea in science—a motivation toward new discoveries.
- So it was a win-win statement for teachers.

However,

- Many in the scientific establishment view this kind of statement as an invitation to disbelieve in Darwinism, and an invitation to accommodate religion.
- Protests of the statement in the standards began.

On January 22, 2009

- The State Board of Education in Texas voted to accept the recommendations of the scientific elites and ***remove the language from the state's science standards that would include teaching of both strengths and weaknesses of scientific theories...***

The State Board Responded to Protests

This preliminary step was censorship of ideas that run counter to the prevailing closed, materialistic naturalism assumptions and currently understood mechanisms of evolution. However, the Board added some general language that might help a teacher have **SOME** academic freedom.

The process continued.



The standards were up for revision, and new language had to be written.

A months-long process of hearings began. The State Board listened to parents, the public, and people with expertise in science.

Resolution in favor of Possibility Two.

After much study and debate and input from diverse groups, the board resolved the issue in favor of open discussion. The original “strengths and weaknesses” language is now replaced with language that allows **analyses, evaluations, and critiques of scientific explanations.**

This cost the Board Chairman his elected position, and has resulted in several very challenging bids for the next election.



It would be good if Intelligent Design could be added.

But keeping analyses, evaluations, and critiques is **VERY GOOD.**

It is truly **UNSCIENTIFIC** in the extreme to exclude those things.

Analyses, Evaluations, and Critiques

- If we consider the materialistic, naturalistic assumptions of prevailing science teaching as representing atheism – and they DO.
- Then Intelligent Design mathematics are agnostic.
- Teaching “strengths and weaknesses of evolution” or “Analyses, Evaluations, and Critiques” is the middle ground between forced atheism and agnosticism. It is NOWHERE NEAR teaching religion in science class.

If the proponents of Darwinism

- Had a perfectly scientific track record, the subject might be less controversial. The history of Darwinism over the last 150 years has not been perfectly scientific. Parents and dissenters have good reasons to resist Darwinism as indoctrination.
- The attempt to remove “teaching *both strengths and weaknesses* of scientific theories” from public school standards is NOT scientific.
- The extrapolation into religion from people like Professor Dawkins who use Darwinism to proselytize for atheism—all these things add to the parents’ motivation.

We can understand the legal issues in the controversy

Scientific Issues

By reviewing some of the scientific issues.

1. **Darwinism has been susceptible to fraud such as Piltdown Man and Nebraska Man.**
2. Darwinism explains nothing when it is described in a way that is immune to evidence.
3. Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.

The Scopes Trial was a turning point in the teaching of science.

- Clarence Darrow was the attorney defending the teaching of evolution.
- His expert witness was Henry Fairfield Osborn, Director of the American Museum of Natural History. **“Osborn relied heavily upon the notorious Piltdown Man fossils, known to be frauds, and the Nebraska Man fossil, which turned out to be a peccary's tooth.”**
- So a believer in evolutionary fraud is today viewed as the Great Scientist who gave us evolution in schools.

The Cultural Impact of the Trial

Did not hinge on the evidence, but on the cleverness of legal and journalistic and motion picture attack.

- So we may ask—why is Darwinism susceptible to fraud?
- The answer is in two parts. The field has always been **unwilling to critique its own side of the issue**, and the **language** of Darwinism is, to some degree, immune to evidence.

Many Examples Show the Evolutionists' Lack of Self-Examination.

1. Piltdown Man, a hoax perpetrated between 1908 and 1913, was not discovered as such until 1953, **in spite of many doctoral dissertations written about it.**
2. A faulty reconstruction of Neandertal between 1911 and 1913 was not discovered and corrected until 1957—and then left intact as faulty for another 20 years in a major American museum.
3. Evolutionists make no effort to report levels of uncertainty in data when talking to the public.
4. Evolutionists never explain that dating methods are not independent of evolutionary theory.

Many Examples Show the Evolutionists' Lack of Self-Examination.

- Evolutionists bring legal case after legal case and school board fight after school board fight **to silence all dissenting views.**

Self examination is necessary in ANY field to prevent fraud and to discover fraud when it occurs.

A failure to examine for flaws in the present theory FREEZES the theory in its present state of imperfection, and NOBODY can find out just how imperfect that is.

We can understand the legal issues in the controversy

Scientific Issues

By reviewing some of the scientific issues.

1. Darwinism has been susceptible to fraud such as Piltdown Man and Nebraska Man.
2. **Darwinism explains nothing when it is described in a way that is immune to evidence.**
3. Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.

Darwinism explains nothing if it is described in a way that is immune to evidence.

The Law of Natural Selection is actually a tautology. The fittest are **defined as** those who survive and reproduce. To say that the fittest will survive and reproduce is redundant. It is not possible to collect evidence for or against a tautology.

On the other hand, a tautology is static. It does not prove any kind of change must occur. It also does not demonstrate any source for change.

Darwin's Three Propositions:

1. The species are changeable.
2. A process of slow change in inheritable characteristics can account for all the diversity of species we see today, because all have arisen from a common ancestor as simple as a single cell.
3. Natural selection by survival of the fittest accounts for all those changes over time, without any kind of creative intelligence involved.

Some of Darwin's Beliefs

- Came from the purposeful breeding of animal species. In that case, humans select traits they want to produce in offspring of their animals, and then they protect those offspring to help them survive.
- Natural selection selects only for one trait—for survival.
- In nature, wild rabbits of one species all look alike, while domestic rabbits show great variety. Natural selection demonstrates much LESS change than purposeful selection.

Thus, even a superficial look

- At the theory reveals that
- **Eliminating purpose from the discussion is NOT called for by the data.**
- In fact, purposeful selection is much more likely to produce change than natural selection, so why should purposeful selection be ruled out of bounds of the theory?

Neo-Darwinism adds some more beliefs...

1. The genetic code changes in random events called mutations, which are very rare.
2. Most mutations are harmful or fatal and do not survive.
3. Favorable or neutral mutations are incorporated in the genetic material of the cells.
4. Enough favorable **chance** mutations have occurred over the course of life history to account for all the diversity of species.

Item 4 is immune to evidence, since it is a historical statement that cannot be tested in a scientific lab.

If evolution is defined as “change over time”

- And then the definition is switched to “unguided change from molecules to humans,”
- the first definition is open to evidence, but the second is not. The unguided part is an assumption not based upon evidence.
- If science is defined as “a dependence upon naturalistic explanations,” that definition rules out evidence to the contrary.

Natural Selection can be formulated four ways.

1. As a tautology, which explains nothing.
2. As a deductive argument with the assumption that change must happen—but no proof that it must. Sharks have been sharks for the whole fossil record.
3. As a scientific hypothesis whose claims exceed the scope of the data. Microevolution is extrapolated to macroevolution.
4. As a philosophical necessity. “Evolution must have happened because we exist.”

Each of these formulations has faulty reasoning.

We can understand the legal issues in the controversy

Scientific Issues

By reviewing some of the scientific issues.

1. Darwinism has been susceptible to fraud such as Piltdown Man and Nebraska Man.
2. Darwinism explains nothing when it is described in a way that is immune to evidence.
3. **Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.**

Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.

- Microevolution is change (due to chance or environmental events) within one kind of animal or plant. We know that microevolution happens, especially in terms of changes in population frequency. Microevolution is observable.
- Generally, such changes are reversible when conditions return to the original state, unless information has been REMOVED from the genome due to death.

Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.

- We see microevolution in the relative frequencies of bacteria immune to an antibiotic in a bacterial population before and after the antibiotic is applied.
- The bacteria are still the same kind of bacteria. They do not have any new property that was not already present in their genome. Their population has a different frequency of genes before and after the stress is applied, because some of the bacteria die.

Darwinism claims macroevolution on the basis of microevolution—and this is a logical fallacy.

- A micro-evolutionary change is a **different category** from a macro-evolutionary change.
- Darwin said in essence, “if change happens within species (and it does) by some unguided process, then **the same unguided process** can change one species into another, and **CAN account for all changes that produced all species.**
- Ruling God out of discussion changed **CAN to MUST** in science class.
- **This is called the fallacy of composition.**

The fallacy of composition

- Says that if something is true for one portion of reality, it **must** be true for all parts of reality.
- If whirlpools swirl counterclockwise someplace on earth, they must swirl counterclockwise everywhere. Wrong.
- If chance and environmental stress can produce change within a species, they must have produced all the changes in all the species and must be the basis for new species' arriving. OOOOPS! Fallacy!
- Evolution is a Fact! OOPS! FALLACY!

The fallacy of composition

- The speed limit on Highway A is 65 miles per hour. Therefore the speed limits on all highways everywhere are 65 miles per hour.
- A certain medicine is safe for adults to take. Therefore, the medicine must be safe for all humans, including unborn babies. Wrong.

Sometimes a statement can be true for the whole if it is true for a part.

- The fallacy is in saying it **MUST** be true for the whole if it is true for a part.
- The fallacy is in ruling out other possibilities for the whole on the basis of the truth for the part.
- We know that in the case of micro versus macro evolution, the fallacy is at work, because the MECHANISM of micro change *which we see* does NOT require the organization of NEW genetic information. Macro-evolution does require the organization of new genetic information. So to say that Macro must be true because Micro is true is definitely a fallacy.

We who believe in God, have a clear mandate.

- We must teach our children ourselves about the creation-evolution controversy. Check out Deuteronomy chapter 6.
- That means learning the science ourselves, and teaching it to our children.
- Ignoring the problem is sin.
- Loving God involves awe at His Creation. Loving God involves recognizing His wisdom and authority as Creator.

Deuteronomy 6:4-9

- ⁴ "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD *is* one! ⁵ You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength. ⁶ "And these words which I command you today shall be in your heart. ⁷ You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up. ⁸ You shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. ⁹ You shall write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates. (NKJV)

Deuteronomy 6:18,23-35

- ¹⁸ And you shall do *what is* right and good in the sight of the LORD, that it may be well with you, and that you may go in and possess the good land of which the LORD swore to your fathers,
- ²⁴ And the LORD commanded us to observe all these statutes, to fear the LORD our God, for our good always, that He might preserve us alive, as *it is* this day. ²⁵ Then it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to observe all these commandments before the LORD our God, as He has commanded us.' (NKJV)



Homework

In 3 sets

Proverbs 30:5

Every word of God is tested. He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him.

Homework Class 17 Set 1

- Read Psalm 14 and Psalm 53 and Matthew 5:20-24 and I Peter 3:15 and Romans 1. Difficulties within Darwinism reveal the obviousness of creation. But our culture insists that Darwinism is truth. The Bible is blunt about atheism, and even uses the word *fool* to describe someone who denies God's existence and commits evil. Logically, do other reasons exist as to why someone would be an atheist? Should we make character assumptions about atheists? Should we be wary of atheism? Should we expect the same standard of behavior from atheists as from people who love God?

Homework Class 17 Set 1

- Read DARWIN ON TRIAL chapter 4. What does Gould describe as the two features of the fossil record most inconsistent with gradual evolution?
- If science were defined in a more open-minded way than the present, would those facts lead toward the idea of a Creator?
- How did Johnson summarize Gould's statements?
- What additional problems with the fossil record and evolution are revealed in the Bighorn Basin in Wyoming, where a continuous record of fossil deposits has been found?

Homework Class 17 Set 1

In chapter 4, Johnson summarizes the controversy over punctuated equilibrium.

- If the Darwinian school of evolution is correct, their problem is to show why gradual evolution went undetected in the fossil record.
- If the punctuated equilibrium school is correct, their problem is to demonstrate that variations in species' gene pools after isolation create enough change to produce new body plans and organs and systems.
- Is the Cambrian explosion in the fossil record a problem for either of these views? Why?

Homework Class 17 Set 1

- In this chapter, Johnson lists a set of facts that negate most undergraduate biology courses' teaching about the fossil record. He found these facts by reading the controversy within evolutionary circles about punctuated equilibrium. What are these facts?
- What impact does the PhD attaining process have on the explanations produced by science?

Homework Class 17 Set 2

- Read Acts 17:26-28.
- What attitude are we supposed to have about other people groups? Does this give an opinion about the idea of multiple origins for human beings?
- Read Chapter Five in DARWIN ON TRIAL. What two choices does Johnson mention as explanations for the relationships between items in taxonomy?

Homework Class 17 Set 2

- Does the Cambrian explosion support the idea of **extinct common ancestors** as an explanation for the definite differences among animal kinds in taxonomy? Why or why not?
- What does Johnson mean when he says that Gould draws the line between fact and theory at the wrong place?

Homework Class 17 Set 2

- The fallacy of composition is a fallacy that assumes that something true for a small portion of the whole must be true for the whole, or that something true at one scale must be true for all scales. When the mechanism of change is different at different scales, conclusions for one scale cannot automatically be applied to the other scale. The gaps in the fossil record indicate that microevolution and macroevolution could not be the same process. Why?
- What is the irony of the evidence of imperfection?

Homework Class 17 Set 3

- Read Romans 14:1 through Romans 15:7.
- What attitude is required for discussion of controversial issues in the church? Does this mean avoiding discussion? Does this require great care in discussion? What is the theme about the value in God's sight of those who disagree with us?
- Read Chapter Six in DARWIN ON TRIAL.

Homework Class 17 Set 3

- We have completed BONES OF CONTENTION and OF PANDAS AND PEOPLE which cover the subject of this chapter in DARWIN ON TRIAL in detail. What did you notice in this chapter that adds to the discussion?
- The organization of the chapter summarizes each area of the “family tree.” Create a “sound bite” or “bumper sticker” for each area. Try to write simple one or two sentence summaries for each topic. Write carefully and with zest, to create statements you would be willing to share with other people.