

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 13 Issue 11

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org

August 2009

UNANSWERABLE QUESTIONS

There are some questions Intelligent Design advocates can't answer.

Someone who calls himself "Wowbagger" has posed some questions on the web that he says Intelligent Design advocates can't answer. It is true that ID advocates can't answer these questions; but not because they don't have good answers. They can't answer these questions because evolutionists have gone to court to prohibit them from answering them in American public schools. If not for censorship, Wowbagger would know the answer to these questions. But groups like the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Center for Science Education think that scientific knowledge can be increased through forced ignorance.

Science Against Evolution does not endorse creationism or Intelligent Design—but as you can see from the title of our newsletter, we disclose "things evolutionists don't want you to know." Evolutionists would like you to believe that evolution must be true because there are no answers to Wowbagger's questions. Those answers are things evolutionists don't want you to know. Therefore, we feel duty-bound to disclose them.

Wowbagger's questions fall into five general categories that we will address one at a time.

PRACTICAL VALUE

The first set of questions are all different ways of asking, "What practical value is there in studying Intelligent Design?"

Part 1: The Practical Issues

1A. How can I.D. be applied to medical science, to help us fight diseases?

1B. How can I.D. be used as a framework for solving problems in any scientific field?

1C. If I.D. were to completely replace Evolution as the standard theory taught in U.S. schools, how would that give our students a

competitive advantage in understanding the science of biology, on the world's stage? ¹

We could turn the question around and ask, "How can evolution be applied to medical science, to help us fight diseases?" You might be surprised to learn that evolution is not currently part of standard medical school curricula, and is not likely to become part of it.

When George Williams and Randolph Nesse made their first pitches for Darwinian medicine in the early 1990s, they turned some heads, but not the right ones. Reviving and building on European traditions that melded medicine and evolutionary biology, the duo argued that diseases could be best understood from an evolutionary perspective. Their first meeting on the subject in 1996 attracted 60 enthusiasts but few practicing clinicians, probably because physicians couldn't envision practical applications. ... Although a better understanding of the evolution of drug resistance has helped shape the use of antibiotics, when it comes to evolution, "medical schools are mostly oblivious," says Nesse, a psychiatrist at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. ²

Despite the intellectual appeal of adding evolution to the medical school curriculum, medical schools are already straining from an explosion in information and technology, and clamors for change come from many directions. "Medical schools have a lot on their plate," says James Lupski of Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, Texas. And, notes Harvard evolutionary biologist David Haig,

¹ <http://debatenation.com/forums/showthread.php?t=687>

² Pennisi, *Science*, 10 April 2009,

"EVOLUTIONARY MEDICINE: Darwin Applies to Medical School", pages 162-163

"Evolutionary thinking is not going to give cheap medical solutions."³

Do you want to go to a doctor who believes that your lung disease can be cured by holding you underwater to make you evolve gills? ☺

Seriously, ophthalmologists don't waste time speculating about how a light-sensitive spot could have evolved into an eye. They don't believe random changes will, in the long run, make things better, so they don't treat your vision problem randomly. Instead, they treat eye diseases based on the notion that the vision system has been carefully designed, and each component of the vision system has a specific purpose that must function properly.

Question 1A is based on the faulty premise that Darwinian evolution is vital to medical science, and rejection of evolution would prevent doctors from curing diseases. ID isn't going to replace evolution in medical research because evolution isn't currently in medical research.

Let us emphasize that by "evolution" we mean real Darwinian evolution, not variation and changes in demographics. Evolutionists intentionally confuse drug resistance (which is simply a change in the proportions of an existing bacterial population) with evolution. DRUG RESISTANCE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ORIGIN OF NEW FORMS OF LIFE. Just because drug resistance is called, "evolution," doesn't mean it has anything to do with the evolution of new forms of life.

Generally speaking, many fine hospitals and medical research facilities are run by religious organizations that reject evolution. Specifically, the Loma Linda University Medical Center is run by a bunch of young earth creationists (Seventh-day Adventists). If you have a serious disease that requires cutting-edge technology to save your life, Loma Linda should be at (or near) the top of the list of places to go for treatment.

Evolutionists want you to believe that if evolution isn't taught in the public schools, then doctors won't be able to cure you when you get sick. The attempt to tie the theory of evolution to medical research is just simply fear-mongering.

WHY BIRDS SING

Questions 1B and 1C both ask how viewing problems from an ID point of view is better than using an evolutionary point of view. Let's look at the simple question, "Why do birds sing?" from three different points of view.

The evolutionary answer is that bird songs are

the result of chance filtered by natural selection. It is pointless to look for the designer's purpose because there is no designer.

The creationist is likely to focus on the emotional aspect of "why." That is, a creationist would interpret the question to ask, "What emotional reason would God have for making birds sing?" Therefore creationists would emphasize God's love and the beauty of the Earth, made for man's enjoyment.

The Intelligent Design advocate would look at the practical aspect of "why." That is, he would hear the questions as, "What practical reason would an intelligent designer have for making birds sing?" Therefore, he would look for the social benefits (warning of danger, location of food, attraction of a mate, etc.) of bird songs.

Which of these three points of view has the most practical value? It seems to us that the evolutionary point of view is clearly the least useful. From an evolutionary point of view, there is no reason to study bird calls, so why study them?

But wait! Don't evolutionary scientists study bird calls? Well, yes—maybe.

The general (but false) assumption is that all scientists are evolutionists. According to evolutionists, anyone who doesn't believe in evolution isn't a real scientist, so it must be true that all real scientists believe in evolution. But there are lots of scientists who don't believe in evolution without expressing their disbelief in order to keep their jobs.

Any scientist who is studying bird calls to discover their function must (at least subconsciously) believe that the bird calls have a purpose. The foundation of the theory of evolution is that life has no meaning or purpose. Therefore, these scientists can't really be evolutionists.

True evolutionists who study bird calls do so in order to discover evolutionary relationships. Their premise is that birds with the most similar bird calls share an ancestor who acquired that call by accident. So, they can build evolutionary trees based on similarity of bird calls. Furthermore, since they think bird calls are accidental, they spend a lot of time trying to calculate probabilities. Speculating about the probability of mutations, they can guess how many generations would be necessary for a specific bird call to evolve.

So, let's return to the question at hand. Which framework has more practical value? Is it more useful for a scientist to assume that bird calls were designed on purpose, and attempt to figure out what purpose (or purposes) the bird calls

³ *ibid.*

serve? Or is it more useful to speculate about how bird calls might have originated by accident?

It seems to us that the assumption of Intelligent Design is much more helpful to scientists trying to understand how living things operate than the assumption that there is no purpose behind biological processes. The assumption of Intelligent Design has great practical value, whereas the assumption of purposeless evolution has no practical value at all.

THE DESIGNER

Part 2 consists of several questions about the designer. Although creationists care a lot about who the designer is and what the designer is like, these questions are totally irrelevant to Intelligent Design advocates. These questions would be better posed to creationists. But evolutionists have tried to paint ID advocates as creationists in disguise, so it is understandable that these questions are based on a false understanding of ID. If ID were allowed to be discussed in American public schools, these questions would not even be asked.

Part 2: The Designer

2A. Where is the evidence that a Designer exists? And, why do so many Creationists act like this question is not even important, when they claim they are doing science? ⁴

The existence of something that must have been designed is evidence that a designer exists. The existence of Mount Rushmore is evidence of one or more sculptors. One can't determine the name of the sculptor, or how long it took him (or his team) to sculpt Mount Rushmore simply by looking at it, but it should be obvious to anyone that the four faces are not the result of random erosion.

The second part of the question is ridiculous. It is a question about creationists, not ID advocates. Furthermore, creationists believe the question is vitally important!

Question 2A is a perfect example of how ignorant the questioner is. We aren't saying Wowbagger is stupid. We are just saying that he is woefully uninformed and misinformed. The fault is not with his intelligence. The problem is that he is the innocent victim of propaganda and censorship.

2B. How are we to assess the engineering skills of the Designer? Can we determine what constraints existed for the Designer, in terms of materials, labor, and so forth? (This would seem important, if we are going to replace Evolution

for use in medical research, for example.) ⁵

One can assess the skills of the chief architect of Mount Rushmore by how well the faces actually resemble former presidents of the United States. We can assess the skills of the ancient Egyptians by studying the pyramids, tombs, obelisks, and temples they built. Granted, it is difficult to assign a numerical value to the skill of the Mount Rushmore architect and the skill of Egyptian pyramid builders in order to compare their skills; but the fact that they each had great skill cannot be denied.

Similarly, the marvelous capabilities and complexities of living things attest to the engineering skills of the designer.

As we have already seen, evolution is irrelevant to medical research, but he brings it up again. Therefore, it is necessary for us to repeat that drug resistance is called "evolution," but it isn't the kind of evolution that is controversial. Wowbagger has been confused (intentionally) by people who want the fact of variation to be confused with the fantasy of evolution. Nobody is talking about replacing evolution in medical research because evolution isn't in medical research, and never has been.

2C. Why are certain characteristics commonly found in many designed products absent in most life forms? (such as detachable and easily replaceable parts, or "maker" labels, for example) What prevented the Designer from giving us these things? ⁶

This is actually a good question. If you cut one arm off a starfish, it will grow back. If you cut one arm off a person it won't. Why? If you take the evolutionary attitude, the answer is, "There's no reason—that just the way it happened by chance." If you take the ID attitude, you naturally wonder how the design of starfish differs from the design of humans. What mechanism allows cells to differentiate in adult starfish but not in adult humans? The purposeful design assumption naturally leads to cellular research with practical application which could help doctors regrow damaged limbs or organs in human beings.

2D. How can we deduce the motives of the Intelligent Designer? ⁷

ID advocates have no interest in deducing motives. Wowbagger would know this, if not for censorship.

2E. Does I.D. claim that there is supposed to be a specific purpose for life on Earth? If so,

⁴ <http://debatenation.com/forums/showthread.php?t=687>

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

how do you know what it is? (Or what they are?
There could be more than one purpose.)⁸

Yes, ID presumes life has one or more purposes, which naturally leads to an attempt to discover what those purposes might be. Evolution presumes no purpose, so scientific inquiry into the purpose of life would be foolish.

Suppose there is a purpose to life. Should not a scientist want to find out what that purpose is?

2F. Some people are under the impression that life looks as though it was either 'designed by committee' or perhaps 'competing contractors'. But, some *insist* that there was only one Designer. Can you develop a test to determine which is more accurate?⁹

Intelligent Design advocates have no interest in this topic. In this respect they are no different than evolutionists. If one is going to criticize ID advocates for not having a test to determine how many designers there are, one can criticize evolutionists for exactly the same thing.

2G. If I were to claim that the "deducing of an Intelligent Designer" was nothing more than a type of *parendolia* [sic] phenomenon, how could you demonstrate otherwise?¹⁰

We presume he means "paranormal phenomenon." We can only wonder what is going on in his head that would cause him to ask such a question. Without knowing that, it is tough to answer, but we will try.

In the 1960's, there was great scientific interest in Extra Sensory Perception (ESP). Scientific studies were done to confirm or deny the existence of mental telepathy by testing to see if one subject could correctly tell shapes (star, circle, square, etc.) printed on special playing cards viewed by another subject. That was real science, regardless of whether or not ESP really exists. Carefully controlled experiments were conducted and the results were statistically analyzed. That's how real science works.

Suppose the ESP experiment allowed the subject viewing the card to say the name of the shape out loud to determine if vocal transmission of information really occurs. We would expect the blind subject to be able to tell the shape on every card correctly because he could hear what the other subject said. We consider spoken communication "normal" and mental telepathy "paranormal." But, when you think about it, we just consider spoken communication normal because we know it happens all the time. Mental

telepathy is considered paranormal because we think it isn't normal. Does Wowbagger think we should not study things we think aren't normal?

There are some things in quantum physics, string theory, and cosmology that seem downright spooky. Should scientists not study them? What is the value in declaring certain subjects to be off-limits to science? Just because a subject is called "paranormal" doesn't mean it can't be studied scientifically.

SHOTGUN ACCUSATIONS

Part 3 is a grab-bag of unrelated shotgun accusations.

Part 3: The Science

3A. Scientists are often motivated by the *thrill of discovering new things* [italics his]. If you want more scientists to take Intelligent Design more seriously, how would you appeal to that?¹¹

Some of the greatest scientists of all times (Newton is just one example) were motivated by a desire to figure out how God made things work. Are we really supposed to believe that the notion that everything happened by chance is thrilling and inspirational?

Suppose I give you two cryptograms. One is a real cryptogram that says something interesting. The other is just a bunch of random letters. Which one would you rather try to figure out? Even if you can find some substitution of letters that makes the random cryptogram say something coherent, what's the point?

Science is based on the notion that things happen for a reason, and we would like to know what that reason is. The theory of evolution is based on the notion that there is no underlying reason, which really kills the motivation to discover the reason.

One famous evolutionist, Richard Dawkins, apparently realizes that there must be a reason, so he postulates a "selfish gene." That is, life has evolved because genes have some selfish motivation to reproduce themselves. In his view, a chicken is simply the means by which an egg produces more eggs. The purpose of life is to fulfill the reproductive desire. But what is the reason for the reproductive desire? Apparently, there is none. The desire just arose by chance.

3B. Could you define your technical terms, (and other words or expressions), that are likely to be misunderstood? For example: What is I.D.'s working definition of "Intelligence" or "Design"? In what ways do they differ from

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.*

forces that are not intelligent and things that are not designed? (In other words, we are aiming for *empirical* definitions.)¹²

Of course the technical terms can be defined as easily as evolutionary terms, but ID advocates can't define them (in American public schools) because of a court order. It would be really interesting and useful to be able to discuss intelligence and design in an academic environment. But such discussions invariably lead down paths evolutionists don't want to go. Therefore, the discussions have to be prohibited.

Engineers have the freedom to talk about information and complexity when it comes to inanimate system design. Information and complexity can be defined in technical terms useful for analyzing data transmission and system complexity. Applying those concepts to biological systems results in some interesting observations and conclusions pertinent to design principles; but evolutionists won't allow students to hear them.

3C. Why do so many I.D. proponents often (but not always) get scientific concepts wrong, such as: junk DNA, macroevolution, thermodynamics, Big Bang Theory, and the whole concept of Natural Selection, etc.? How come so little effort has been made to "do your homework, and "know your enemy" better, before debating these issues on scientific grounds?¹³

This is just nonsense. Clearly he hasn't done his homework and doesn't know his enemy. And speaking of "debating these issues on scientific grounds," why are evolutionists so unwilling to debate evolution on scientific grounds? Why do they always try to turn the discussion to religion?

3D. What observations were originally predicted by your theory?¹⁴

What observations were originally predicted by evolution? There are observations that evolutionists make after the fact, which they claim "could" have been predicted by evolution, but weren't. Evolutionists' "predictions" are nothing more than fanciful tales used to explain observations.

Suppose one believes that birds evolved into mammals. What transitional form would that theory predict? A bat. It looks like a bird losing feathers, turning into a mouse. Suppose one believes that mammals evolved into birds. What transitional form would that theory predict? A bat. It looks like a mouse growing wings. A bat fulfills

two contradictory "predictions."

This whole notion of evolutionary "predictions" is a perversion of science. Real scientific predictions involve experiments that have never been done before with observable results. If we mix this chemical with that chemical we predict a particular result. Then we mix the chemicals and see if we get the expected result. That's a real prediction. Looking for a tooth that looks intermediate between an ape and a man isn't a real prediction because that tooth could have come from a pig. (That is exactly what happened when Nebraska Man was discovered.)

3E. Can you design an experiment that could invalidate (or "falsify") Intelligent Design, depending on the results?¹⁵

He's right. We know of no experiment that has ever falsified Intelligent Design. If Wowbagger knew of one, we are sure he would have mentioned it. On the other hand, we have been disclosing scientific evidence that falsifies the theory of evolution every month for the past 12 years and 11 months.

The theory of evolution depends on the notion that small variations can accumulate without limit. Experiments with fruit flies and bacteria show that no matter how hard one tries to force evolution, fruit flies remain fruit flies and bacteria remain bacteria. There is a limit to how much a species can vary. (Some species can vary more than others, but there always is a limit.) The discovery of these limits falsifies the theory of evolution.

Finding fossils in the "wrong" layer should falsify evolution, but every time fossils are found in the "wrong" layer evolutionists just explain them away.

Whenever a discovery falsifies evolution, the conclusion is ignored.

3F. Why has Evolution, even in its provisional form, been powerful enough to change what I.D. proponents think, over time. But, I.D. has not been powerful enough to change what Evolution proponents think, so far?¹⁶

That's because ID proponents are more reasonable and fair-minded than evolutionists. ☺

Seriously, that's a stupid, loaded question. It implies that evolution (even in its PROVISIONAL form) has changed what ID proponents think. Specifically, what have ID proponents changed their minds about?

There have been evolutionists who have

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *ibid.*

become creationists, and there are creationists who have become evolutionists. It proves nothing either way.

The “question” is just an unfounded assertion that evolution is so much more obviously correct that ID advocates have accepted it, and that there is nothing of value in the Intelligent Design theory.

3G. How come it always seems to be the evolutionary biologists who are publishing new, innovative results and findings, and not I.D. researchers? (If it is “luck”, then why do they get all the “luck”?)¹⁷

It isn’t luck—it is well documented censorship. Everybody in the academic community knows what happens to people like Richard Sternberg if they dare publish an Intelligent Design article.¹⁸ The fact that evolutionists censor all opposing views does not prove that evolutionists are right.

3H. If I were to claim that Intelligent Design studies do nothing but “affirm their conclusions”, how could you demonstrate otherwise?¹⁹

If I were to claim that evolutionary studies do nothing but “affirm their conclusions”, how could you demonstrate otherwise? If a paleontologist has a grant to go to Africa to find the missing link between apes and man, do you really think he will publish a report saying he found fossil evidence that there is no connection?

ALTERNATIVES

Wowbagger apparently has never heard any non-evolutionary explanations, so he naturally thinks there aren’t any. (That’s the goal of censorship, isn’t it?) Consequently, he doesn’t know the answers to these next few questions.

Part 4: The Competition

4A. Can your theory explain why the present distribution of plant and animals in the world came about, the way it is? Why are tomatoes and potatoes *only* native to the Americas, for example? Why are monotremes and a few placental [he no doubt means, “marsupial”] mammals restricted to Australia? Why could they not have been distributed anywhere else?²⁰

Why do penguins live in Antarctica and roadrunners live in the desert? Maybe roadrunners think lizards taste better than fish. Maybe roadrunners aren’t very good at catching

fish. Maybe penguins aren’t fast enough to catch lizards. Who knows? Who cares? ☺

It is hard for us to take this argument seriously, but since it seems so compelling to evolutionists, perhaps we should. But, our 6-page newsletter is already 10 pages long, so, next month we will devote an entire essay to the subject of biogeography, giving it all the attention it deserves. (Actually, we will give it a lot more attention than it deserves.)

4B. Can your theory explain endogenous retroviruses?²¹

Creationism and ID explain endogenous retroviruses just as well as evolution does. Creationism and ID don’t deny random changes in DNA. They just have different explanations. (The creationist explanation has to do with sin, and the ID explanation has to do with entropy.)

4C. For every example of Intelligent Design given so far, how come Evolution has *also* discovered a possible way for it to emerge, naturally? And, how come the natural method is usually the one making better predictions about the example’s behavior? (For example: Evolutionary theory predicted the behavior of mal-formed bacterial agents, better than Intelligent Design.)²²

Evolution has not discovered a possible way life began, or breasts evolved, or eyes evolved, or (on and on). The premise of his question is wrong. He thinks evolution provides a better explanation simply because he has never heard any other explanation. He has never heard any other explanation because of censorship.

POLITICS

We are sometimes asked, “If science is against evolution, why don’t all scientists reject it.” The short answer is that their acceptance of evolution isn’t based on science. Politics, religion, and philosophy trump science.

Part 5: Politics and Values (These are *not* as important as the other four sections, though.)

5A. Why is it so difficult for I.D. proponents to distance themselves from religious fundamentalists?²³

Why is it so hard for evolutionists to keep religion out of the argument? It’s because evolution is the creation myth of their atheistic religion. Evolution is more about religion than science to an evolutionist.

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ *Disclosure*, November 2005, “Conspiracy Proof”, <http://www.scienceagainstevolution.org/v10i2n.htm>

¹⁹ <http://debatenation.com/forums/showthread.php?t=687>

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ *ibid.*

²² *ibid.*

²³ *ibid.*

It is hard for ID advocates to keep religion out of the discussion because, no matter what they say, evolutionists counter with, "It's just religion in disguise!"

5B. Why has so much of the resources spent promoting I.D. been used to fight court battles and school boards, and virtually nothing on labs or new research? ²⁴

There are two fallacies in this question. First, it is the evolutionists who are filing lawsuits to censor the science curriculum. ID advocates are forced by evolutionists to spend money in court to fight censorship.

Second, Loma Linda University (for example) spends a lot of money on research (but, strictly speaking, they are creationists, not ID advocates).

There are lots of research studies into metabolic pathways and cellular biology that don't mention either evolution or Intelligent Design. How do you know that the majority of them aren't conducted by Intelligent Design advocates who don't admit their views for fear of losing their jobs?

The Intelligent Design framework is based on the notion that everything (or nearly everything) has a purpose. This framework, stated or not, is the basis of most scientific studies. The evolutionary framework (that everything is an accident) is not as conducive to studying anything other than how accidents might happen.

5C. Many creationists claim that Evolution is all a hoax, and a conspiracy theory. Why has there been virtually no effort, on the part of legitimate I.D. researchers to point out how Evolution science has already impacted our lives in positive ways? (Such as in the fields of medical research, agriculture, animal conservation, oil drilling, and organic materials research, etc.) How do you answer the accusation that you are "endorsing madness through inaction"? ²⁵ [italics his]

Evolution has nothing to do with medical research, agriculture, conservation, oil drilling, or materials research. Therefore, it hasn't positively impacted our lives in any of those ways.

The development of hybrid corn is the result of conscious design, not random chance.

Animals can be hunted to extinction regardless of whether they evolved or were created.

The correlation of oil deposits with certain kinds of rocks has nothing to do with fables about how or when the rocks were formed.

ID advocates aren't "endorsing madness through inaction." It is the evolutionists who are endorsing madness by wasting valuable scientific resources trying to figure out how unrelated species are related, and how complex systems arise by chance, instead of trying to understand the design principles that permit them to live.

5D. Some people are under the impression that the values behind the Intelligent Design movement are only based on fear, oppression, and guilt. Can you demonstrate otherwise? ²⁶

Some people are under the impression that the values behind the evolutionary movement are only based on fear, shame, and guilt. Can you demonstrate otherwise? ☺ Can Wowbagger prove that the theory of evolution is not motivated by fear of eternal judgment resulting from the shame and guilt of living a selfish, wicked life?

Intelligent Design has nothing to do with fear, oppression, or guilt. ID simply strives to find the purpose behind biology and natural law.

Does it matter if the scientist who finds a cure for cancer does it because he believes in evolution, or believes in creation, or just wants to get rich? It doesn't matter what the motivation to do science is, as long as there is some motivation.

Forty years ago, the United States landed men on the moon. For some, the motivation was to prove that capitalism is better than communism. For some, the motivation was to find proof that life had evolved on the moon. Regardless of the motivation, there was motivation, and so science was advanced. That's all that really matters.

LIMITLESS SCIENCE

The people who have incorrect impressions about the ID movement are the victims of propaganda and censorship.

Can we demonstrate that propaganda and censorship in the American public schools exist? Of course we can. The whole reason we are having this discussion is because public schools present only one side of the issue because of court decisions.

We want to remove the arbitrary limits placed on science by evolutionists. Examine all the possible explanations for how (and why) living things exist.

Unanswerable questions can be answered if one is allowed to speak.

²⁴ *ibid.*

²⁵ *ibid.*

²⁶ *ibid.*

PARADIGM PRISONERS

There are more than just two kinds of evolutionists.

The feature article in our June newsletter described the background behind our video, *Evolution for Intellectuals*, which we entered in the *Discover* magazine contest. (By the way, two months after the contest ended, *Discover* has still not announced any finalists, let alone the winner.)

In the June newsletter we talked about the intended audience for the video. We made the rather off-hand observation that there are basically just two kinds of evolutionists.

One group we called “Intimidated Intellectuals.” This group consists of people like Richard Dawkins and Jerry Coyne who believe in evolution because they are afraid of God. It is pointless to try to reason with these people because their belief is based on fear, not logic.

The only way to get an Intimidated Intellectual to change his mind is to change his opinion about what God is like. We don’t do that. That’s what churches are for. We stick to science.

We called the second group of people “Innocently Ignorant.” These people assume evolution is true because of all the propaganda proliferated by Intimidated Intellectuals who find safety in numbers. If everybody else believes in evolution, then the Intimidated Intellectuals can rest assured that there is no God. It is important to Intimidated Intellectuals to censor the science curriculum of all evidence against evolution so that the masses of Innocently Ignorant people will accept evolution without any embarrassing questions.

CLASSIFICATION OF EVOLUTIONISTS

It was not our intention to create a perfect taxonomy of evolutionists. Not every evolutionist fits into one category or the other. There certainly are ignorant evolutionists who hate God, and therefore fall into both categories. But, as we have said, we weren’t trying to classify people—we were simply trying to understand people.

Anita realized that there are people who don’t really fit into either category. In the heart of her

email she wrote,

I wonder in which group you place a standard evolutionary biologist. I'm not in the field myself, but I am in another field of science and have an understanding of how much work goes into the career of a scientist of any sort. They could hardly be said to 'not know anything about evolution', considering it's their lives' work. The very nature of science would mean that they wouldn't last very long if they accepted things without question because it was told to them. So it seems they don't belong in the first group.

But the second group seems reserved for those evolutionary biologists (and others, I don't know how many of *Discover Magazine's* editors have biology training) who are vocal about evolution as opposed to creation. Most of the evolutionary biologists I'm thinking of wouldn't even consider it a choice of "Evolution or God", many would be Christian and suffer no dilemma about it.

She makes an excellent point. So, on further reflection, we realize that there is another class of evolutionists which we call “Paradigm Prisoners.”

I personally hate the word “paradigm,” and avoid using it whenever possible. “Paradigm” simply means “how somebody thinks about something.” My emotional aversion to the word “paradigm” is because the phrase “paradigm shift” was so overused (and misused) in the software development community in the late 20th century. In the context of trying to improve the software development process, all the experts kept saying we needed a “paradigm shift.” It didn’t really matter how we changed our thinking—we just had to change our thinking somehow!

Unfortunately, “paradigm” really is the perfect word to describe the situation. Professional biologists are taught to consider everything using the evolutionary paradigm. So, when looking for a term to describe this third category of evolutionists, Paradigm Prisoners narrowly beat out Peer-pressured Professionals. The people that Anita describes are pressured by their peers to adopt the evolutionary paradigm.

CONSENSUS

Once upon a time, scientists discovered truth using the scientific method. Repeatable experiments were done to objectively confirm or deny a hypothesis. That was what made science so reliable. Opinion was excluded. The experimental results didn’t depend on what the scientist thought the results should be. Truth was based on observable results.

But the old scientific method doesn’t lend itself well to subjects such as evolution, global warming, and cosmology; therefore the scientific method has been replaced by consensus. Scientific truth is now determined by majority vote rather than experimental results.

What this means is that if most scientists believe it, it is true. If you believe something different, you are, by definition, wrong. This inevitably leads to “group think.” You will naturally think whatever other people in the group think because you don’t want to be wrong. There is an unconscious (but compelling) peer pressure to agree with other scientists.

Here’s where the paradigm comes in. Biologists habitually, and unconsciously, think about everything using the evolutionary paradigm. For example, a biologist observes a lizard crawling up a smooth glass window pane. His immediate impulse is to think, “How did that lizard EVOLVE feet that can stick to glass?” He thinks that because that is the consensus way to think about things. The consensus of his peers is that everything evolved by chance and natural selection, so the natural way for a professional biologist to think about things is to try to fit everything into the evolutionary paradigm.

A creationist would look at the lizard using the creation paradigm and wonder, “How did God create feet that allow a lizard to climb up a glass window?”

So, a creationist would naturally try to figure out how the lizard feet work, trying to fit this into his creation paradigm; but an evolutionist would try to figure out how lizard feet came about by chance, trying to fit this into his evolutionary paradigm.

In other words, it all comes down to how someone naturally thinks about things. Professional biologists are trapped in an evolutionary paradigm prison. They have to think about it that way because, “Nothing makes sense except in the light of evolution.” Even things that don’t make sense (such as why a caterpillar rests helplessly in a cocoon while turning into a butterfly) have to somehow make sense in the light of evolution.

It is tough for biologists to break out of the evolutionary paradigm prison, especially if they don’t have tenure. As soon as they disagree with the prevailing consensus, they are wrong.

STATUS QUO

To hear us tell it this way, it would seem that scientific innovation is doomed. No scientific breakthroughs can possibly occur because the academic institutions are locked into keeping the *status quo*. And, to a great extent, that really is the case.

If that is the case, how does any scientific progress happen? Scientific progress certainly does happen. The outrageous answer to how it happens is this: Great scientific advancements

generally don’t come from scientists in academia—they come from engineers in private industry.

It wasn’t Professor Bill Gates, or Professor Steve Jobs, who ushered in the personal computer revolution. College dropouts who thought about computers in a different way are the ones who advanced technology. They are the ones who caused the paradigm shift that allowed all of you to read this essay on the Internet.

The public perception is that our great universities are where creativity and academic freedom are advancing human knowledge. The truth is that the universities are just trying to produce crop after crop of graduates who agree with consensus. That’s why they are so fervent about keeping any discussion of Intelligent Design, or fallacies in the theory of evolution, out of the classroom.

Sure, you can find a rogue professor here or there who is open to discovering new truth that upsets the academic applecart; but he is a member of an endangered species. A professor like that certainly isn’t the dean’s favorite.

Universities should be leading the charge for academic freedom, but they aren’t. They are the ones suppressing criticism of the theory of evolution in the name of science. They are threatened by opposing views. They are the academic elite. How dare anyone disagree with them!

Coming back to Anita’s email, professional biologists don’t really fit into either of the two categories we originally proposed. Consciously or subconsciously, they are locked in the evolutionary paradigm prison. They have been taught to see everything as the result of evolution, so most of them won’t question the underlying assumption of evolution. Many don’t even know they are in prison. If they do consciously recognize that the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly against evolution, there isn’t much they can do about it. To question evolution in an academic environment is career suicide. There isn’t an easy escape.

You are permitted (even encouraged) to copy and distribute this newsletter.

You are also permitted (even encouraged) to send a donation of \$15/year to Science Against Evolution, P.O. Box 923, Ridgecrest, CA 93556-0923, to help us in our work. ☺

by Lothar Janetzko

WHY CREATION SCIENCE?

http://books.google.com/books?id=3NBLzpLP4NgC&pg=PA153&lpg=PA153&dq=why+creation&source=bl&ots=LAKSHXj_Sr&sig=QVib4P_JR9Ly_mBQFpUj60KeSOQ&hl=en&ei=NIJ4So-BIZG0tAOE9fn0BA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=5#v=onepage&q=&f=false

Understanding fundamentalism and evangelicalism

This month's web site review looks at a book I found by searching the Internet with Google and the topic "Why Creation?" The link to the book is quite long, but you should be able to find it if you perform a similar search. The topic, "Why Creation Science?" is discussed in Chapter 6 of the book Understanding FUNDAMENTALISM and EVANGELICALISM by George M. Marsden. The whole book surveys the history of American fundamentalism and evangelicalism and reexamines the interpretation of their relationship to politics and science.

Marsden begins Chapter 6 of the book by stating that "during the past century 'evolution' has symbolized some of the nation's most bitter religious and cultural conflicts. In a widely held view that perhaps is gaining in popularity, biological evolution is regarded as an opposite of divine creation and hence incompatible with traditional Christian belief." In his discussion he points out that "the insistence that there are only two polarized positions – creation and evolution—contradicts the facts concerning the views of Christians and other believers..." He points out other mediating positions such as "theistic evolution" or "progressive creation".

Other topics discussed in Chapter 6 of the book include 1) The Role of the Bible, 2) Protestant Scholasticism, 3) Rational and Scientific Christianity, 4) Common Sense, 5) The Sense of Cultural Crisis – The South after the Civil War, 6) The Warfare Metaphor and 7) The Mythological Powers of Evolutionary Explanation.

Since the Google link to the book only provides a preview of the book, not all pages of the book are available for reading. By reading the Table of Contents of the book you can gain insight into the material covered and can decide for yourself if this is a book you would like to purchase.

Disclosure

The official newsletter of



**P.O. Box 923
Ridgecrest, CA 93556**

R. David Pogge, President, Editor
Andrew S. Ritchie, Vice President
Susan S. Pogge, Secretary/Treasurer
www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.org