

AN ATTEMPTED ATHEISTIC SNOW JOB ON BELIEVERS:

The Merits of Creationism: Comments on the PBS Debate on Firing Line

by John Woodmorappe

1. Overall Impressions
2. The Evolutionists' Slick Game of Definitions
3. Motives...Motives...Motives...and Ad Hominems
4. Inescapable Atheism of Evolution
5. No Final Causes--Really?
6. Just When Did Organic Evolution Suddenly Stop Being Unsupervised?
7. The Pope's Remarks: Exploited by Evolutionists for Propaganda Purposes
8. The Big Lie: Theology Vs. Science As Different Ways Of Knowing
9. The Created Kind--A Jumping Cow Is Not A Moon-Jumping Cow
10. Irreducible Complexity (Behe): Not Jury-Rigging A Functioning System
11. Biochemical Repair: Modifying Vs. Originating A Complex System
12. Human-Chimp Biochemical Similarities: No Booze Ever Needed
13. The New Hawaiian Butterfly: From Pre-Existing Genetic Information
14. Fossil Succession: The Evolutionists' Double Standard
15. Bogus Transitional Forms: Or Stringing Together A Phylogeny Of Spoons
16. Parasites And Design: Malevolent Design Is Still Design
17. Haeckel's Embryo Fraud Removed--Only 100+ Years Later (Wow!)
18. Of Moles And Mountains: Evolutionists Confuse Complexity With Size
19. Could God Use Evolution? Could An Anhydrous Process Use Water?
20. Limiting God: The Atheistic Shoe On The Evolutionists' Feet
21. Evolution Has Failed Every Test
22. Fatal Flaws Not Fleas
23. No Alternative To Evolution Needed.
24. The High Standard Of Evidence Vs. Evolutionistic Whining

1. OVERALL IMPRESSIONS:

It is getting more and more obvious that the evolutionists' latest overall strategy is to conceal, as much as possible, the atheistic character of evolution. Throughout the debate, the evolutionists tried to deny the obvious: the atheistic nature of evolution. Hence the title of this commentary. On the other hand, this is nothing new, as evolutionists have been doing this con job for centuries.

For instance, Darwin, an atheist who sometimes let his guard down and let his hatred of Biblical truth slip out, often coached his theory in theological terms and did a brilliant PR snow job on believers by repeating the notion that there was no conflict between his theory and belief in God.

I generally enjoyed the performance of our side in the recent PBS-televised Firing Line debate. Just as I suspected earlier would be the case, William F. Buckley was rather tepid in his performance, as well as not very well informed. Then again, William F. Buckley is a secular conservative, is not a scientist, and supposes that one can accept God and evolution at the same time. No wonder the evolutionists tried to use him for propaganda purposes by asking him to switch sides.

Furthermore, William F. Buckley is, in my opinion, too much of a gentleman to be effective in debate against these jerks. Reminds me of William Buckley's Firing Line debate against feminist Germaine Greer about 1970. William F. Buckley had the better arguments but was too nice to his opponent. So it was here.

As usual, the evolutionists began the debate with their age-old rationalistic hooey which equates evolutionism with the round earth, and tried to poison the well from the start by boldly claiming that there is no serious question about any aspect of organic evolution being open to serious doubt. And, as always, they tried to define science according to their own self-serving rationalistic prejudices so that they could conveniently label, as a nonscientist (or, better yet, a pseudoscientist or antiscientist bogeyman), any intellectual who does not dance to their rationalistic tango.

In terms of the tone of the debate, I particularly enjoyed Dr. Berlinski's feisty style of debating. Reminds me of Dr. Duane Gish. Berlinski did not let the evolutionists get away with any of their baloney. A better debate, in my opinion, would perhaps have consisted of Berlinski and Dr. Duane T. Gish against any two evolutionists. I also enjoyed Phil Johnson's deft response to the evolutionists' provocation of showing him a book obviously intended for children, and dealing with a topic not relevant to this debate (dinosaurs and men).

Overall, there are some comments that I have which I think could improve our performance next time. As always, we can never be wise enough to all the bogus arguments and tricks of the evolutionists.

2. THE EVOLUTIONISTS' SLICK GAME OF DEFINITIONS:

As usual, the evolutionists tried to define evolution as "change through time". That way, the viewing public would be led to believe that anyone who does not believe in evolution must believe in a perfectly static earth. This evolutionary chicanery also facilitates this common non-sequitur: If you agree that any change occurs in living systems, or in populations of living systems, then you must also admit that molecules-to-man evolution takes place. After all, they are merely different degrees of the same process--or so the evolutionists would have us believe.

3. MOTIVES...MOTIVES...MOTIVES...AND AD HOMINEMS.

As always, evolutionists resorted to ad hominem attacks by questioning the motives of those who challenge evolution. Notably underhanded was their badgering of William F. Buckley about his motives for questioning evolution (Is it because socialists were evolutionists? etc). What about the motives of those who cannot bring themselves to question evolution, or, better yet, cannot bring themselves to recognize the fact that intelligent scientists can legitimately question evolution just like they can legitimately question any other theory?

4. INESCAPABLE ATHEISM OF EVOLUTION.

Per the statements about Richard Dawkins, Carl Sagan, etc: As perceptively pointed out by the Creationists, evolutionists selectively dissociate themselves from these stellar evolutionists whenever it suits their purposes, as they did in this debate. And, isn't it funny that, if evolution indeed is not atheistic, that atheists (notably the Communists) had been using evolution as a weapon against religious belief in general, and a Creator God in particular, for such a long time? Again, evolutionists are trying to wheedle out of the atheistic implications of evolution. This is part of their strategy to mollify believers: a classic con job. This intellectual and spiritual fraud can be better exposed by challenging them to show ONE evolutionary journal where God plays a role in evolution. If there is at least one currently-accepted version of evolution which is compatible with the existence of God, then it should easily be possible to locate some mention of a God-directed evolutionary theory (in a biology text or a biology journal). Needless to say, there is none. This clearly shows that those who insist on a Creator God and organic evolution happily coexisting are simply rhetorically papering over the irreconcilable conflict between the two.

Indeed, "theistic evolution" is simply a semantic invention, and no such thing as "theistic evolution" exists ANYWHERE in the biological sciences. It is merely a nominal religious belief tacked on to an atheistic evolutionary system. (To elaborate and illustrate this fact, see my Fable about the Horse and Tractor <https://rae.org/essay-links/tractor> along with some of my other anti-evolutionary articles there, all courtesy of Doug Sharp).

What of the claim that God "could be" involved incognito behind the evolutionary process? The best rebuttal to this nonsense is the fable of the Gardener by atheist philosopher Anthony Flew. Two people had a disagreement as to whether a gardener had been tilling a given plot of land. When it became obvious that there was no evidence of

the garden being cultivated in any way, the proponent suggested that perhaps it was a gardener doing the work incognito. The antagonist then correctly pointed out that an "incognito gardener" is, for all essential purposes, identical to a nonexistent gardener. So it is with an "incognito creator" ostensibly hiding behind a purposeless evolutionary process. Again, stress the fact that NO form of evolutionary theory finds ANY need for ANY kind of external being involved in the process, not even an "incognito creator". So, for those who imagine that God could be an "incognito creator" within the evolutionary process, point out that AN "INCOGNITO CREATOR" IS ESSENTIALLY NO DIFFERENT FROM A NONEXISTENT CREATOR. As a result, this brings the truth back to the surface: the inescapably and inherently atheistic nature of evolution--something which again the evolutionists are trying to cover up with their chicanery.

5. NO FINAL CAUSES--REALLY?

Evolutionists are very disengenuous when they say that "science does not deal with final causes". Evolutionary theory certainly does--if not by statement then certainly by implication. And it most certainly is not limited to the late Carl Sagan and his transparently atheistic assertion about the physical cosmos "being all there is and all that ever will be." Since evolutionary theory is built entirely without God, and God has absolutely no place in ANY step of the evolutionary process (including the very origins of life), it is obvious that evolutionary theory IS making a tacit statement about final causes--and an atheistic one at that.

6. JUST WHEN DID ORGANIC EVOLUTION SUDDENLY STOP BEING UNSUPERVISED?

Note also the fact that the widely-quoted NABT statement about evolution being "unsupervised " was deleted recently. Why? Did the fundamental structure of evolutionary theory suddenly and dramatically change between 1995 and 1997? Certainly not. The original statement had been far too candid: It had too much of a ring of truth to it--and one that did not fit in with the current evolutionary snow job which attempts to mollify religious believers into thinking that there is no conflict between God and evolution. With this sudden change in wording, we can see for ourselves the intellectual dishonesty of the evolutionists IN FLAGRANTE DELICTO.

7. THE POPE'S REMARKS: EXPLOITED BY EVOLUTIONISTS FOR PROPAGANDA PURPOSES.

Point out that the evolutionists are simply using the pope as a pawn for their propaganda purposes, just as the Communists did. For instance, the Pope John Paul II would at times criticize both capitalism and Communism. Pravda, the Soviet newspaper, would SELECTIVELY report the fact that the Pope John Paul II had condemned capitalism, with of course no mention of his condemnation of Communism. To call their bluff, you might ask the evolutionists that, since they are so eager to accept Pope John Paul II's teaching on so-called theistic evolution, if they would also be willing to accept Pope John Paul II's teachings condemning abortion. Or, if they are not Catholic, if they would now

accept all the pope's teachings and convert to Catholicism. Of course, you could simply point out that had Pope John II said, instead, that he supports a six 24-hour day Creation 6000 years ago, and a global Flood, would not the evolutionists just say: "Why doesn't Pope John Paul II leave the "real" world alone, and just stick to religious matters? What does this old man know about science?"

8. THE BIG LIE: THEOLOGY VS. SCIENCE AS DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING.

One part of the evolutionists' strategy is to try to convince the populace that it one can commit intellectual and spiritual schizophrenia by trying to compartmentalize reality. That way, religious believers can be hoodwinked into imagining that evolution is no threat to God, while at the same time the humanists continue on the warpath in trying to destroy the remnants of theism which still exist in western societies.

The fact that science and religion have different purposes, different language, and different methodology, etc., does not diminish this conflict IN THE SLIGHTEST. Stress the fact that evolution and special Creation definitely address the same issue, so can and do come into conflict.

This whole business of saying that one can compartmentalize reality, and one compartment has nothing to say to the other compartment, is nonsense. Furthermore, the way the evolutionists compartmentalize this matter, it always turns out to be a one-sided compartmentalization. It is always religion that is being reconciled to evolution, and never the other way around. What better proof of this fact is there than the bigotry against Creationists shown by much of the intellectual community? Finally, stress the fact that leaving God out is not part of the "scientific method", but is simply a rationalistic prejudice of most of the intellectual community of the last two centuries.

Obviously, this whole business of "God and evolution are in separate realms of thought, and therefore compatible" is an example of the evolutionists' use of the Big Lie Technique of Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels: Repeat something often enough, no matter how egregiously untrue it is, and enough people will believe it. We Creationists must take more initiative in order not to let the evolutionists get away with their Big Lie.

9. THE CREATED KIND--A JUMPING COW IS NOT A MOON-JUMPING COW

They pressured our side to define how high a kind can go on the standard taxonomic scale. You might have wanted to mention my citation (in my book NOAH'S ARK: A FEASIBILITY STUDY, p. 7) wherein an evolutionist, Bullock, admits that there is no significant increase in complexity within the family unit of taxonomy, and below. Only the (presumed) origin of new orders, classes, phyla, and kingdoms involves an increase in biological complexity. So, the evolutionistic claim that the origin of, say, a new order is really no different from the origin of a new species (albeit given more time), is flatly untrue.

Of course, just because Creationists don't all agree how high a Kind can go, in conventional Linnean taxonomy, it does not give the evolutionists carte blanche to make the leap from speciation to molecules-to-man evolution. In other words, what evolutionists are doing is making a non-sequitur comparable to saying that, since a cow can jump, and we might not agree exactly how high it can jump under favorable circumstances, therefore we are free to believe that a cow can jump all the way around the moon.

10. IRREDUCIBLE COMPLEXITY (BEHE): NOT JURY-RIGGING A FUNCTIONING SYSTEM

Besides pointing out, as our team did, that in a modified mousetrap, you are just replacing one part with another, stress the fact that these modifications do not explain how a mousetrap came about in the first place. It is just as if the second hand broke off my wristwatch and, not finding it, I glued a pin to replace the second handle. I only showed how one part could be replaced with another. I did NOT reduce the irreducible complexity of the wristwatch, and most certainly I did NOT show how a wristwatch could develop out of spontaneous changes that were somehow selected for, with each step having some sort of time-keeping capability (or ANY kind of mechanical capability).

Sometimes, when the origin of the eye comes up, evolutionists point out the wide diversity of eyes that exist in the animal kingdom, and the wide variance in function and complexity of these eyes. From this, they make the illogical leap into claiming that this (somehow) shows that eyes can evolve. They are begging the question, because they are ASSUMING what they are claiming took place. It is as if I, while walking on the beach, I discovered not one watch but a series of time pieces ranging in sophistication from highly-inaccurate 17th century clocks all the way to stupendously-accurate atomic clocks, and triumphantly claimed that this proves that time pieces can evolve from sand and water. And why not?

According to evolutionistic logic, I can, all because I have functioning structures with widely divergent levels of sophistication.

11. BIOCHEMICAL REPAIR: MODIFYING VS. ORIGINATING A COMPLEX SYSTEM

Extending this reasoning, point out that biochemical repair only shows that something can be replaced in a pre-existing system. It in no way deals with the central issue: How that complex interactive system ORIGINATED. It is as if an evolutionist said that, because a building with a sprinkler system is self-repairing in the sense that it puts out its own fire, that this somehow proves that such a building could originate from spontaneous natural processes. To further this fact, point out from evolutionary literature that evolutionists admit that they have NO IDEA how such things as the genetic code originated, which also demonstrates that biochemical repair is totally irrelevant to the question of how the biochemical system originated.

12. HUMAN-CHIMP BIOCHEMICAL SIMILARITIES: NO BOOZE EVER NEEDED.

One of the evolutionists said that, had the DNA of humans and chimps turned out to be considerably different, it is something which would have caused evolutionists to spend their evenings drowning their grief in the liquid served by taverns. Point out that it actually wouldn't. Evolution is so plastic that anything can be explained a posteriori. If humans and chimps had in fact turned out to be very biochemically different, it would not have caused any grief for evolutionists, at least not enough to drive them to drinking binges. They simply would have gone on their merry way, asserting that all this shows is the fact that human biochemical evolution had been very rapid since the time that humans had diverged from the most recent human-chimp common ancestor.

To substantiate this fact of biochemical vs. morphological divergence, we could cite some examples where organisms, believed to be phylogenetically close on the basis of comparative anatomy, turned out to be quite divergent biochemically.

13. THE NEW HAWAIIAN BUTTERFLY: FROM PRE-EXISTING GENETIC INFORMATION

You could add the fact that the evolutionist is begging the question. The fact that some genetic material in the parent butterfly stock had been selected for to make a new species, and one that subsists on bananas, begs the question whether that genetic information had come into existence by random mutations, or if it had been created into the population by God ever since His creation of the parent butterfly stock.

14. FOSSIL SUCCESSION: THE EVOLUTIONISTS' DOUBLE STANDARD.

Evolutionists brought up the topic of fossil succession. Owing to the fact that Flood geology, the young earth, etc., were off-limits in this debate, the Creationists could not address this issue. In fact, this shows what happens when Creationists choose to focus only on organic evolution and ignore the related issues of the global Flood and the young earth.

However, it is important, in future, to make it clear that evolutionists are trying to have it both ways. They cited fossil succession as evidence for organic evolution, and even insinuated that no Creator would have done that. (Really, are evolutionists smarter than God?). In other contexts, however, evolutionists sing an entirely different tune. That is, evolutionists never tire of saying that the geologic column (based on correlation of fossil-bearing horizons) was developed BEFORE the Darwinian Revolution, and was not initially believed by Charles Lyell, etc., as indicative of organic evolution. So, essentially, evolutionists are two-faced: When discussing Lyell, etc., they say that the order of fossils is not in itself evidence for organic evolution, and then turning around (as in this particular debate) in insisting that it IS evidence for organic evolution. Much as they might wish for it, they cannot have it both ways.

15. BOGUS TRANSITIONAL FORMS: OR STRINGING TOGETHER A PHYLOGENY OF SPOONS

Per the evolutionist claim that Creationists would never recognize a transitional form when shown one: first show what is NOT in itself a transitional form. A Creationist debater should prepare a reply poster showing a sequence of "transitional form" kitchen spoons, etc., to make the point that a mere proposed sequence does not make it a chain of transitional forms. Rather, it presupposes evolution, and then imposes evolutionary theory on the evidence.

As for stratomorphic intermediates, point out that an evolutionist could ALWAYS concoct SOME kind of impressive-looking evolutionary sequence. For instance if we, for fun, were to pancake-flip the geologic column upside-down, it would be interesting to see how evolutionists would construct some sort of phylogeny whereby some modern marine invertebrate evolves into a Cambrian trilobite--all the while hailing the sequence as a chain of transitional forms.

When it comes to mammal-like reptiles, point out that these presumed lineages contain such a bewildering array of ostensibly reptilian, mammalian, and unusual traits, that they do not show an unambiguous phylogenetic path to mammals. Therefore, they are best understood as creatures which have a wide and confusing assortment of traits otherwise associated only with reptiles and only with mammals.

I still think that the best way to handle, on the other hand, what IS a genuine transitional form, is the way that Dr. Duane Gish does. Point out that an actual transitional form would be something like a creature having a half-leg/half-wing structure. And if an evolutionist challenges you if you would accept that as a transitional form, say yes. Note that such a half-leg/half-wing structure is absolutely essential because, otherwise, one could always string together a sequence of fossils into a seeming chain of transitions, as evolutionists always do during these debates.

16. PARASITES AND DESIGN: MALEVOLENT DESIGN IS STILL DESIGN

As for Ruse's old argument, say yes, that God created parasites. Stress the fact that parasites are still examples of design. Point out that there is a difference between the issue of a BENEVOLENT designer vs. ANY kind of designer. For instance, a sophisticated anti-ship mine is still a masterpiece of design, even though it is malevolent design. (Of course, I am not accusing God of malevolence--God forbid. I am merely distinguishing the FACT OF DESIGN versus PURPOSE for a given type of design. The PURPOSE of the design of parasites is, of course, theological (related to the Fall and the Curse), and is therefore outside of the scope of this debate).

17. HAECKEL'S EMBRYO FRAUD REMOVED--ONLY 100+ YEARS LATER (WOW!).

So, one of the evolutionists has said that he removed Haeckel's bogus embryo drawings from a commonly-used college textbook (or the Internet version). How wonderful to learn that, after the passage of no less than 100 years, the evolutionists have finally gotten around to withdrawing an outright fraud. Is it barely possible that the Creationist expose of evolutionary falsehoods is what finally got them going after a century of being in the books, and deceiving unsuspecting students?

18. OF MOLES AND MOUNTAINS: EVOLUTIONISTS CONFUSE COMPLEXITY WITH SIZE

Towards the end, one of the evolutionists tried to discredit the argument from design by saying that it is like seeing a molehill being built by a rodent, and then seeing a mountain and insisting that some even more intelligent designer had to have constructed the mountain. What a ridiculous argument! Neither the molehill nor the mountain has a significant amount of information within its structure, to begin with. So both a living and nonliving thing (e. g. wind) can produce a small pile of soil. On the other hand, something complex (such as a complex, branched underground burrow with lining) could only be produced by an intelligent being (rodent) and not by an impersonal process such as wind.

Make it clear that the evolutionist argument is flawed because the mountain is not particularly complex. Ironically, in fact, it is probably less complex than a molehill, only much bigger. Same goes for plastic apples vs. real apples: the latter are immeasurably more complex than the former.

19. COULD GOD USE EVOLUTION? COULD AN ANHYDROUS PROCESS USE WATER?

This one could be answered no, for the simple reason that evolution denies a Creator--the evolutionists' snow job to the contrary notwithstanding. So, in even that sense alone, God could not "use" something from which He is, by definition, excluded. It is analogous to an anhydrous process. Since an anhydrous chemical reaction, by definition, does not use water, therefore an anhydrous process, by definition, cannot use water. Likewise, an atheistic process (organic evolution) does not use God. If God WERE to become involved in the process of organic evolution, it would, technically stop being an evolutionary process!

20. LIMITING GOD: THE ATHEISTIC SHOE ON THE EVOLUTIONISTS' FEET

Second, to ask if God "could have " used evolution is disingenuous in the extreme, because NONE of current evolutionary theory utilizes God in any way, shape, or form. As for "limiting God" by not considering that He could use evolution, this is a frankly ludicrous canard on the part of evolutionists, and an exact inversion of the facts. The proverbial shoe is on the other foot. Fact is, evolutionary limits God TOTALLY by excluding Him COMPLETELY as originator of the substance and constituents of the universe. So, it is evolutionary theory which LIMITS GOD COMPLETELY BY

PREVENTING HIM FROM BEING A CREATOR IN ANY SUBSTANTIVE SENSE OF THE TERM.

What of those who believe that, by some vague and conveniently never-defined manner-- God was behind the evolutionary process? Again, there is NO version of currently-accepted evolutionary theory which involves God as a causative process in ANY way. And, again, an "incognito creator" is essentially identical to a nonexistent creator. So, when it comes to real (as opposed to rhetorical) theistic evolution (where, in the latter case, God actively steps in to guide the evolutionary process) always remember that it is superfluous to add God to an atheistic system. It is like trying to catch a bird by putting salt on its tail. If the bird will sit still while you shake salt onto its tail, then just grab the bird and be done with it. Likewise, if God is to be involved in the universe (factually, not semantically), let Him make creatures de novo instead of trying to graft Him into an atheistic process that does not want Him.

21. EVOLUTION HAS FAILED EVERY TEST.

To the claim that evolution has passed every test, point out that it is just the opposite. Evolution has failed every test. For instance, biological knowledge is immeasurably greater than it was 100 years ago. Yet evolutionists are no closer to showing how life came from nonlife than they were 140 years ago. And Darwin had predicted that if the transitional forms had not been found, his theory would be falsified. The bogus transitions claimed by evolutionists notwithstanding, the transitions (as defined above) have not been found, yet evolutionists will not admit that organic evolution has been decisively falsified by the facts.

22. FATAL FLAWS NOT FLEAS: Stress that these are not fleas on the dog of evolution. It is closer to a dog hair being made into a dog by evolutionists. Evolution is not full of holes: it is mostly holes with a little half-substance here and there.

23. NO ALTERNATIVE TO EVOLUTION NEEDED. Our team correctly pointed out that enumerating flaws in evolution in no way obligates us to propose an alternative. This could be made stronger by pointing out that, since Creationists are not trying any more for Creationism to be taught in schools (because it would be declared unconstitutional by the left-wing ideologues in our courts), various citizens are only trying to enact policies whereby the flaws in evolution to be taught. And, since evolutionists are the ones dogmatically claiming that evolution is a fact, then evolution should be subject to critical scrutiny without any alternative necessarily being provided. If evolution is as factual as the sphericity of the earth, it should be able to withstand any assault without crying for help from the real or imagined deficiencies of Creationism. As it is, evolution fails miserably. No wonder the evolutionists are trying their best to maintain their snow job about the unquestionable factuality of evolution.

24. THE HIGH STANDARD OF EVIDENCE VS. EVOLUTIONISTIC WHINING.

Periodically, evolutionists whined about Creationists not accepting the evidence which evolutionists claimed. Apart from stressing the often trivial, bogus, and irrelevant nature of most of the evidence which the evolutionists had cited, again stress the high standards which the evolutionists have placed on themselves. Since evolutionists have claimed, with no small amount of intellectual arrogance, that their position is absolutely factual, critics of evolution have every right to demand the highest standards of evidence from the evolutionists. A few biochemical repairs here and there, and a whale sequence here and there, just does not cut it.

Topics: Irreducible complexity, Behe, antievolution, anti-Darwinism, teleology, philosophy of origins, atheism of evolution, Creationism controversy, traditionalist Catholics, Creationist science, science education, philosophy of atheism, Pope John Paul II on evolution.