

Truth in Advertising: Damaging the Cause of Science
by Dr. John Ankerberg and Dr. John Weldon

If evolution is not a fact, and yet the scientific world declares evolution is a fact, then the unkind conclusion is that the scientific world is either deceived or somehow doesn't know the meaning of the term "fact." The Macmillan Dictionary for Students (1984) defines fact as "something known to be true or real; that which has actually occurred." For reasons that we will demonstrate later, it is impossible that evolution can be "known to be true." Further, the evidence declares that evolution has not occurred and could never occur.

Unintentional Damage

Scientists who declare that evolution is a fact should recognize the damage they do to the credibility of science—and not just evolutionary science but all of science. As more and more people gradually learn the truth that, deliberately or innocently, science has misled them on an extremely crucial issue, their trust in the authority of science will be over. The implications are hardly small.

The public trusts the scientific world to know the difference between fact and speculation, between the proper interpretation of observable data that can be proven valid and unwarranted conclusions derived from faulty premises. When scientists everywhere assert that a highly suspect, indeed incredible, theory is "an established fact of science," why should anyone trust scientists to tell them the truth in other areas? If the scientific world won't tell the truth in so critical an area as our own origins, with vast implications for each of us, why should it tell the truth in matters of lesser import? In fact, the public's trust in science has already eroded significantly because of consequences stemming from its adherence to naturalism,¹ and because of sloppy science generally.

One of those logical consequences is a nihilistic outlook on life.² Even an article in the prestigious journal *Science* for August 15, 1997, correctly warned, "much of the anti-science mood in the country today stems from the perception that by venerating meaninglessness, science has become inhuman."³ But most scientists are unaware of how the theory of evolution itself damages the progress of science.

Consider the comments of the Canadian scholar Arthur C. Custance, discussing a text by noted evolutionist G. G. Simpson, *This View of Life*: "Throughout the book this begging of the issue runs like an unending refrain. Evolution is a fact, not a theory; evolution is one of the few basic facts; it is an unassailable fact; a fact supported by all other facts; a fact which only dishonest biologists would argue against.... According to Simpson, those who refuse to accept it are either idiotic, dishonest, or both."⁴

Custance's comment here is significant because it applies to so many modern science textbooks. Custance also says, "Observing the literature carefully over a period of some 40 years, it is my impression

that the sense of urgency and special pleading in assuring the public that Darwin was right, has increased steadily with the passage of time."⁵

Actually, as more and more damaging evidence accumulates against the idea of evolution, it is presented more forcefully as fact. This cannot be science (or reason) operating, this is emotion and "politically correct" science, pure and simple. And if scientists do science on the basis of emotion and "political correctness," we are all in trouble.

Of course, lay people aren't the only ones realizing that the scientific establishment has been less than truthful. Many scientists who investigate the matter openly are also discovering that the theory of evolution has little or no evidence in its behalf. As Dr. Isaac Manly (MD, Harvard Medical School) comments, "What I have learned in the past ten years of review of recent scientific knowledge of cellular morphology and physiology; the code of life (DNA), and the lack of supporting evidence for evolution in the light of recent scientific evidence is a shocking rebuttal to the theory of evolution.... There is no evidence of any kind for this theory."⁶ Dr. Manly also commented that, as he read Darwin's *Origin of Species*, he was "struck by the lack of any real evidence for Darwin's theories."⁷

We continue to have the same conclusion as we read modern evolutionary literature. Manly is correct concerning Darwin's successors attempts to prove evolution: "they were quite willing to speculate and theorize to degrees of absurdity to prove the unprovable."⁸

Indeed, the conclusions of noted U.C. Berkeley law professor Phillip E. Johnson can be multiplied hundreds of times from scientists on the basis of scientific evidence alone. Johnson stated evolution

is not only unproven but actually contrary to the overwhelming weight of the evidence.... [W]hat is presented to the public as scientific knowledge about evolutionary mechanisms is mostly philosophical speculation and is not even consistent with the evidence once the naturalistic spectacles are removed. If that leaves us without a known mechanism of biological creation, so be it: it is better to admit ignorance than to have confidence in an explanation that is not true.⁹

Even evolutionist Pierre-P. Grasse, among the most distinguished of French zoologists, remarks that "the explanatory doctrines of biological evolution do not stand up to an in-depth criticism," while evolutionist Bethel sees "Darwin's theory... on the verge of collapse."¹⁰

If scientists want the public to trust them, and to pay taxes to fund their research, then perhaps they should start telling us the truth. Until that time, by declaring evolution a fact, they will only damage their own cause.

The same article in Science magazine for August 15, 1997 correctly warned (citing geneticist Francisco Ayala), "The financial structure of American research depends on the goodwill of a body politic that values religion. We are not wise to have the body politic seeing science as antagonistic to spiritual commitment."¹¹

Voices for Evolution

As an example of how modern naturalistic science can damage the name of science, consider the book *Voices for Evolution*, published by the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) in Berkeley. This text contains the official statements of some 70 scientific, religious, educational, and civil liberty organizations who virtually demand the teaching of evolution, almost always as fact, in public schools, and who demand we reject or strongly oppose the teaching of creation science as a legitimate second theory for an explanation of origins. This text is so full of distortions one hardly knows where to start. The NCSE states its goal plainly enough in the foreword, "The short-term immediate goal of NCSE... is to keep 'scientific' creationism from being taught as legitimate science in public schools."¹²

What is so disconcerting is that this text offers an accurate representation of the views of the scientific establishment, mainline religion, and numerous educational organizations in America. Yet it shows an ignorance as to the true nature of science, the true nature of creation science and the undeniable facts of science as they relate to the creation/evolution controversy. Worse yet, it clearly shows a naturalistic bias which serves to distort science. We have elsewhere cited experts relative to the "evolution is a fact" bias. Consider other examples:

Distortion One: Creation Is Not a Valid Scientific Theory

Abundant documentation exists proving that creation can be a valid scientific theory. But apparently some people don't want the public to know this. If the evolutionary establishment is properly informed on the nature of science, then they are misleading the public by the following pronouncements. If they are not properly informed as to the nature of science, then they should not make pronouncements as to what is or isn't scientific.

- Isaac Asimov in the introduction to *Voices for Evolution*—"There is no trace of anything scientific in creationism...."¹³
- Academy of Science of the Royal Society of Canada—"... 'scientific creationism' has nothing to do with science or the scientific method."¹⁴
- American Association for the Advancement of Science—"... the theory of creation is neither scientifically grounded nor capable of performing the roles required of scientific theories. ... 'Creationist Science' has no scientific validity...."¹⁵

- American Society of Parasitologists— "Creationism is not a science and cannot become a science."¹⁶
- Iowa Academy of Science— "Creationism is not science and the Academy deplores and opposes any attempt to disguise it as science."¹⁷
- University of California Academic Senate—"... a description of special creation as a scientific theory is a gross misunderstanding of the nature of scientific inquiry."¹⁸
- Georgia Citizens' Educational Coalition— "We oppose the teaching of 'creationism' as science in Georgia's public schools. Creationism is based on... religious belief... not on scientific theory."¹⁹
- American Civil Liberties Union— "ACLU also opposes the inculcation of religious doctrines even if they are presented as alternatives to scientific theories. 'Creation science' in all guises, for example 'abrupt appearance theory' or 'intelligent design theory,' is just such religious doctrine."²⁰
- New York State Education Department—"... 'scientific creationism' is not accepted as science by the majority of experts working in those fields of science related to origins."²¹
- American Humanist Association— "Creationism is not scientific: it is a purely religious view held by some religious sects and persons...."²²

The above are only a few examples of the scientific, educational, and civil liberties organizations making such statements. Indeed, virtually all of the organizations cited are opposed to the teaching of creation as a scientific alternative to evolution in public school classrooms. However, if scientific creation is legitimate, as it is, then these organizations are more concerned with scientific indoctrination than scientific education. And recent history has shown how perilous this can be. In this particular case, here is why they are wrong.

Many noted scientists and experts on the nature of the relationship between science and religion have attested to the scientific case for creation. For example, the volumes by Bird, Moreland (ed.), and Geisler and Anderson²³ are only some of those demonstrating that creation can be scientific.

Bird also points out that,

Seven of the fifteen judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit agreed that the theory of creation is "scientific evidence" that "has no direct religious reference whatever;" and two of the nine justices of the U.S. Supreme Court agreed. They correctly point out that concepts of creation always

have been a basic part of science, and are still a vital part of cosmology....²⁴

In *What Is Creation Science?* Morris and Parker also demonstrate that creation can be scientific.²⁵ Morris has a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota with a major in hydraulics and hydrology and minors in geology and mathematics. He is a full member of Sigma Xi and Phi Beta Kappa and a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Morris has published dozens of research papers in refereed scientific journals, and has spent 28 years on the faculties of five major universities and partaken in scores of debates with evolutionists. Gary Parker earned his Ph.D. in biology with a cognate in geology (paleontology) and has several academic awards including election to the National Universities Scholastic Honorary Society; Phi Beta Kappa, and a Science Faculty Fellowship from the National Science Foundation. His research in amphibian endocrinology earned his election to the American Society of Zoologists.

Dean H. Kenyon, Ph.D., professor of biology and coordinator of the general biology program at San Francisco State University wrote the foreword to the above text by Morris and Parker. Dr. Kenyon is one of America's leading non-evolutionary scientists and has a Ph.D. in biophysics from Stanford University.²⁶ A former evolutionist and co-author of *Biochemical Predestination*, a standard work on the evolutionary origin of life, Kenyon now believes that the current situation where most consider creation science simply a religion in disguise "is regrettable and exhibits a degree of close-mindedness quite alien to the spirit of true scientific inquiry."²⁷ Kenyon is only one prominent scientist who has "extensively reviewed the scientific case for creation" and finds it legitimate.²⁸

In Volume 1 of his *The Origin of Species Revisited*, W R. Bird presents scientific evidence for what he terms the theory of abrupt appearance, similar to the theory of creation. He offers seven lines of evidence in support of abrupt appearance: "These lines of evidence are affirmative in the sense that, if true, they support the theory of abrupt appearance. They are not negative in the sense of merely identifying weaknesses of evolution. Nor do they depend on any assumption that the theories of abrupt appearance and evolution are the only scientific alternatives, except for the probability argument in part."²⁹

These seven lines of evidence include: 1) the empirical evidence of systematic abrupt appearance; 2) the empirical evidence of systematic gaps; 3) the argument from comparative morphology involving empirical evidence of systematic similarity and stasis of organisms; 4) the information content argument relating to natural laws of information science; 5) the probability argument dealing with the laws of statistics; 6) the genetics argument dealing with the natural law of limited change; and 7) the comparative discontinuity argument dealing with empirical evidence from comparative anatomy, comparative biochemistry, and classification.

In essence,

The theory of abrupt appearance is scientific. It consists of the empirical evidence and scientific interpretation that is the content of this chapter. The theory of abrupt appearance also satisfies the various definitions of science in a manner comparable to evolution, as discussed in chapters 9 and 10. Its many testable and falsifiable claims are summarized in sections 10.3(a) and 10.4(a). The theory of creation similarly can be scientific, as a number of its opponents concede.³⁰

W. R. Bird demonstrates that the theory of abrupt appearance is not only scientifically evidential, in Volume 2 he shows it is scientifically testable and refutable. In the area of biology; he shows that the affirmative evidence for abrupt appearance in paleontology, comparative morphology, information content, probability, genetics, and comparative discontinuity not only have testable claims but they affirm the theory of abrupt appearance. In the area of biochemistry, he shows that the argument from information content, probability, isomers, biogenesis and thermodynamics are not only testable, but also affirm abrupt appearance. And in terms of cosmology he shows that thermodynamics, information content, the Anthropic Principle, heterogeneity, star and galaxy formation, and radio halos are testable and provide evidence for abrupt appearance.³¹

Dr. Wilder-Smith also presents a scientific creation alternative to Neo-Darwinism in his *A Basis for a New Biology and The Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory: Information Sources and Structures*.³²

The scientific case for creation is also ably marshaled by several leading scientists in J. P. Moreland's (ed.), *The Creation Hypothesis* (InterVarsity; 1994). Some of the contributors include: William A. Dembski who holds a Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of Chicago and a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Illinois, Chicago, and has conducted doctoral and postdoctoral research at Cornell (math), MIT (math), the University of Chicago (math and physics), and Princeton (computer science) and has been a National Science Foundation doctoral and postdoctoral fellow. Stephen C. Meyer has degrees in physics and geology and a Ph.D. from Cambridge in the history and philosophy of science. Charles Thaxton has a Ph.D. in chemistry from Iowa State University and was a postdoctoral fellow at Harvard University as well as a postdoctoral appointment in the molecular biology laboratory at Brandeis University. Kurt P. Wise has degrees in geophysical science from the University of Chicago and an M.A. and Ph.D. in paleontology from Harvard University.

Collectively, the authors in this volume alone have published hundreds of scientific articles in refereed scientific journals. They are only nine examples of thousands which make the evolutionists' claims amusing: "No reputable scientist believes in creation."

Finally, if creationism is really only a religion, why do evolutionists consistently lose their scientific debates to creationists? Such debates have been held since 1970. In 1979, The Wall Street Journal for June 15 reported, "The creationists tend to win" the debates. Six months later a report in Bioscience for January 30, 1980 agreed: "Why do creationists seem to be the consistent winners in public debates with evolutionists?"³³ In an ICR letter of August 1979, Henry Morris could report: "By now, practically every leading evolutionary scientist in this country has declined one or more invitations to a scientific debate on creation/evolution."³⁴ One wonders why if evolution is a proven scientific fact and creation only a religion?

By 1993, creationists were still leading, even according to the evolutionists. Evolutionists had 20 years to improve their debating record and yet did not. Today, these debates are "almost always won by creationists, according to evolutionists...."³⁵ and Dr. Morris says of Duane Gish, who has had over 300 formal debates, "at least in our judgment and that of most in the audiences, he always wins."³⁶ In conclusion,

[in all these debates that] have been conducted throughout the U.S. and in other countries during the past 20 years, creationists have carefully avoided all references to religious concepts and literature and have based their arguments strictly on scientific evidence, such as the fossil record, the laws of thermodynamics, the complexity of living organisms and probability relationships, etc. The fact that evolutionists themselves admit that creationists have won most of the debates does seem to be saying something important.³⁷

Perhaps all this helps explain why, despite erroneous and biased legal decisions, polls indicate most people favor the idea of schools teaching the theory of creation in addition to the theory of evolution. This includes more than 85 percent of the national public, two thirds of lawyers nationally (who also find it constitutional), most university presidents at secular universities, and two-thirds of public school board members. One poll indicated 42 percent of public school biology teachers favor the theory of creation over the theory of evolution.³⁸ Yet very few schools actually allow their teachers the option of a two-model approach. Something would certainly seem to need addressing here.

Distortion Two: Poisoning the Well

Among the organizations quoted below are some of the most prestigious and respected in America. But note how the reader is prejudiced against creation beforehand by the terms and language used. Among logical fallacies, this is known as "poisoning the well"—the attempt to refute an argument beforehand by discrediting the source of the evidence for the argument: "Everyone knows creationists are pseudoscientific religionists, so why trust their arguments?"

The obvious bias against creationism can be seen in the following examples:

- Society for Amateur Scientists: "SAS [Society for Amateur Scientists] will never participate in creationist research."³⁹
- American Civil Liberties Union: "To reject creationism as science is to defend the most basic principles of academic integrity and religious liberty."⁴⁰
- California Academy of Sciences: "The appropriate place in the science curriculum for the notion that organisms have been designed is the same as that for the notion that the earth is located at the center of the universe."⁴¹
- Utah Science Teachers Association: "[Teachers in the state of Utah should] help students understand that accepting the theory of evolution by natural selection need not compromise their religious beliefs.... [and] help students understand that creationism, as taught by prominent creationist organizations of the day, is pseudoscience and not science."⁴²

These are only a few of the declarations that could be cited. What's worse, scientists who are creationists are actually regarded as incapable of understanding any of the sciences because the scientific disciplines can, supposedly, be understood only in terms of the theory of evolution. We find it incredible that respected scientific organizations would make these kinds of statements. Consider some examples (emphases added):

- American Anthropological Association: "...evolutionary theory is the indispensable foundation for the understanding of physical anthropology and biology...."⁴³
- American Psychological Association: "Principles of evolution are an essential part of the knowledge base of psychology. Any attempt to limit or exclude the teaching of evolution from the science curriculum would deprive psychology students of a significant part of their education."⁴⁴
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology: "[Besides paleontology and biology] evolution is equally basic to geology, because the patterns of rock formations, geomorphology, and fossil distributions in the world make no sense without the underlying process of change through time."⁴⁵
- National Association of Biology Teachers: "Teaching biology in an effective and scientifically honest manner requires classroom discussions and laboratory experiences of evolution.... Effective teaching of cellular and molecular biology requires inclusion of

evolution."⁴⁶

- Freedom From Religion Foundation: "Biology makes no sense without recognizing the fact [of evolution]."⁴⁷

In other words, none of the thousands of creationist or non-evolutionary scientists who reject evolution are considered capable of understanding scientific disciplines such as biology, anthropology, paleontology, geology, or molecular biology! But there's more. Creationists and other non-evolutionary scientists aren't considered able to understand any of the sciences. Indeed, creationists, etc., can't even teach biology apart from evolution:

- Georgia Citizens' Educational Coalition: "It is no longer possible to teach biology without the study of the scientific theory of evolution, which has been universally accepted into mankind's general body of knowledge, and stands today as the organizing principle of biology and the general theory of life."⁴⁸
- Humanist Association of Canada: "A student cannot possibly understand any of the life sciences without understanding the process of evolution that is the foundation of these sciences."⁴⁹
- Biological Sciences Curriculum Study: "It is no longer possible to give a complete or even a coherent account of living things without the story of evolution."⁵⁰
- Society for Amateur Scientists: "Genetics, astronomy, geology, paleontology, biology, physiology, anatomy, and physics all speak with one voice.... The evidence [for evolution] is abundant and irrefutable."⁵¹

In light of such statements, no wonder so many people think creation is pseudoscience and creationists scientific know-nothings. Sources quoted here and others liken creationism to such false ideas as a flat earth, astrology, the anti-germ theory, and even divination by goat entrails!⁵² No wonder the terms used in rejecting creation science are so adamant: "deplores and opposes," "strongly opposed," "strongly deplores," "condemns," "vigorously opposes," etc.

In the introduction to *Voices for Evolution*, the late scientist Isaac Asimov calls creation, "nothing but a disgraceful imposture" pointing out that "creationists do not hesitate to distort scientific findings, to misquote scientists, and to play upon the emotions and prejudices of their unsophisticated followers." Creation is regarded as "unscientific gibberish" because it believes the literal words of the Bible are true.⁵³ The Council for Democratic and Secular Humanism tells us that "biblical creationism is an ongoing and serious threat to science education, responsible research, critical thought, and free inquiry."⁵⁴

In light of this, it is hardly surprising that we find the following descriptions of creationists, creationism, and teaching creation in science classrooms. Some of the leading scientific, religious, and

educational organizations in the country employ the following terms:

Creationist pseudoscience; bad science; the forces of unreason; counterfeiters; misleading to students; artificial; denigration of legitimate science; misnamed religious propaganda; myth; ignorance; bigotry; a threat to the very integrity of science.⁵⁵

When modern science speaks in such a manner, it should not be surprised that tens of millions of Americans who are creationists would learn not to trust modern science. If science says that the scientific evidence for belief in a divine Creator is a horrible thing to allow in children's science classrooms, scientists shouldn't be surprised at the outcome.

Thankfully however, one can find rare glimpses of the truth. Consider again the West Virginia Academy of Science declaration that, "Dogmatic assertions are inconsistent with objective considerations of any subject. Science is always tentative and does not pretend to offer ultimate truth."⁵⁶ The Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Biologists says that biology teachers in Pennsylvania should teach the theory of evolution "not as absolute truth..." but as the most widely accepted scientific theory.⁵⁷ The Iowa Department of Public Instruction emphasizes that evolution should be taught as a well-supported scientific theory, "not a fact..."⁵⁸

If science should not be dogmatic and evolution should not be presented as a fact, then all the "voices for evolution" must be wrong in dogmatically declaring it a fact.

Distortion Three: Errors as to the Scientific Status of Creation and Evolution

In light of our previous discussion, we will simply list these without comment. Such declarations reveal the unfortunate depth of misinformation on this subject.

When Russell L. French, one of America's leading educators, read W. R. Bird's 1,100-page critique, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, which covers almost everything important in the creation-evolution controversy (including scientific, educational, and legal aspects), he commented as follows: "This book is frightening to me because it clearly demonstrated to me how much I did not know until I had read it. If that was my condition, what about others, perhaps a majority, in our society?"⁵⁹

Regrettably, most people in our society are ignorant on this subject, including the prestigious organizations listed below:

- American Society of Parasitologists: "The 123-year history of creationism clearly shows it to... be overwhelmingly rejected by the majority of Christian denominations and by scientists of all faiths."⁶⁰

- The National Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberties: "Teaching creationism is impermissible as a matter of law; either in lieu of scientific evolution or as a 'companion theory.'"⁶¹
- Louisiana Academy of Sciences: "... organic evolution is amenable to repeated observation and testing."⁶²
- National Academy of Sciences: "[Teaching creation science] would be contrary to the nation's need for a scientifically literate citizenry and for a large, well-informed pool of scientific and technical personnel.... Special creation is neither a successful theory nor a testable hypothesis for the origin of the universe, the earth, or of life thereon. Creationism reverses the scientific process."⁶³
- National Academy of Sciences: "Its documentation is almost entirely limited to the special publications of its advocates. And its central hypothesis is not subject to change in light of new data or demonstration of error. Moreover, when the evidence for creationism has been subjected to the tests of the scientific method, it has been found invalid."⁶⁴
- New Orleans Geological Society: "Creation-science data almost invariably are of questionable quality, obsolete, or taken out of context from the scientific literature. Even well-known creation scientists such as Duane Gish of the Institute for Creation Research have readily admitted that creation science is not at all scientific.... Creationism, as a scientific concept, was dismissed over a century ago and subsequent research has only confirmed that conclusion. Scientific creationism threatens to do great damage to the credibility of legitimate scientific research...."⁶⁵
- New York Academy of Sciences: "Scientific creationism is a religious concept masquerading as a scientific one."⁶⁶
- American Humanist Association: "There are no alternative theories to the principle of evolution... that any competent biologist of today takes seriously."⁶⁷
- Society for the Study of Evolution: "The study of evolution is an empirically based science which employs the scientific process of hypothesis testing."⁶⁸
- Society for Amateur Scientists: "None of the arguments which scientific creationists make against evolution withstands scrutiny and most were first refuted nearly a century ago. And the creationists have never been able to marshal quality evidence that strongly supports their ideas."⁶⁹
- West Virginia Academy of Science: "Their claim that scientific creationism is independent of biblical creationism, which they

admit is religious, is demonstrably false."⁷⁰

- Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal: "... Virtually no active scientist challenges the fact that evolution has occurred.... There is no scientific evidence supporting the instantaneous creation of the earth and all the creatures on it...."⁷¹
- Freedom from Religion Foundation: "The only 'evidence' creationists present is the story in Genesis, or other religious texts, that must be accepted by faith, not by rational principles of verification."⁷²
- Institute for First Amendment Studies: "By faith [creation scientists] begin with belief in creationism—then they search for evidence to back that belief. True scientists study the evidence, drawing their conclusions from that evidence."⁷³

Upon reflection, such statements are incredible. The falsehood of all the above statements is either documented in our Darwin's Leap of Faith or in other scientific and philosophical literature.⁷⁴ But we would be remiss not to point out two additional statements from this book. First, according to the National Association of Biology Teachers, "science is a constantly self-correcting endeavor to understand nature and natural phenomena" and second, from the Iowa Academy of Science on Pseudoscience, "in contrast to pseudoscientists, scientists seek out, expose, and correct any logical fallacies or other errors which could weaken their theories or interpretations. To assure complete scrutiny, open criticism is not only tolerated but often rewarded, particularly when it results in significant revisions of established views."⁷⁵

If this were true, first, science would be teaching a proper definition of science. Second, it would not be teaching evolution as a fact. Third, creation would not be falsely ridiculed and rejected out of hand on the basis of solely naturalistic presuppositions or other bias. Fourth, creation scientists would not be subject to the extreme prejudice they are currently subject to. Fifth, creation scientists would be rewarded for their research, which has not only advanced science by correcting the deficiencies and errors in evolutionary theory, but has presented quality evidence for a more believable theory of origins.

Even though the definition of science is a philosophical one, scientists should know the definition of science—what it is, what it isn't, and what it involves or doesn't involve. This is part of their responsibility as scientists. If American university life isn't educating them properly on this subject, then so much worse for the state of modern American education.

We can clearly see how and why science suffers today—its own biases and prejudices force it to deal unfairly with the scientific data and to distort the truth. To portray evolution as science fact (and therefore sacrosanct) while portraying creation as merely faith (and therefore suspect) is a reversal of reality. It is evolution that rests on faith, and

creation that employs good science. When the American Institute of Biological Sciences says that "creationism is based almost solely on religious dogma stemming from faith rather than demonstrable facts" it is not looking at the issues fairly.⁷⁶ And when the American Civil Liberties Union apparently deliberately distorts the nature of true religious faith, which is based on logic and sound evidence (as we demonstrated in *Ready with an Answer*), it can hardly expect sympathy from those who know better. Consider this statement for example: "Creationism necessarily rests on the unobservable; it can exist only in the ambiance of faith. Faith—[i.e.,] belief that does not rest on logic or on evidence—has no role in scientific inquiry."⁷⁷

Unfortunately the majority of Americans have no idea of the unjustifiable abuse that creationism is subject to by the evolutionist establishment. It would be unfair of us not to point out that even though this establishment claims to function according to the principles of objectivity and fairness, this is simply not the case.

Notes:

1 Cf., *Phillip E. Johnson, Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law, and Education* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995).

2 *John Ankerberg, John Weldon, Darwin's Leap of Faith* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1998), Chapter 1.

3 *Gregg Easterbrook, "Science and God—A Warming Trend?" Science, August 15, 1997, p. 893.*

4 *Arthur Custance, Evolution or Creation? (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976), pp. 172-73.*

5 *Ibid.*, p. 172.

6 *Isaac V. Manly, M.D., God Made: A Medical Doctor Looks at the Reality of Creation (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1994), pp. 13, 116.*

7 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 143.

9 *Johnson, Reason, pp. 11-12.*

10 *Bethel, "Darwin's Mistake," Harper's magazine, February 1976, pp. 70, 72 in W. R. Bird, The Origin Of Species Revisited: The Theories of Evolution and Abrupt Appearance, Vol. 1 (NY: Philosophical Library, 1991), p. 136.*

11 *Easterbrook, "Science and God," p. 890.*

12 *The National Center for Science Education, Inc., Voices for Evolution* (Berkeley: NSCE, 1995, rev), p. iv.

13 *Ibid.*, p. x.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 16.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 37.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

18 NSCE, *Voices for Evolution: Addendum, rev. edition, 1995*, p. 19.

19 NSCE, *Voices for Evolution*, p. 130.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 159.

21 NSCE, *Voices for Evolution: Addendum*, p. 11.

22 NSCE, *Voices for Evolution*, p. 162.

23 J. P. Moreland (ed.), *The Creation Hypothesis: Scientific Evidence for An Intelligent Designer* (InterVarsity Press, 1994); *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vols. 1 & 2, *passim*; Norman L. Geisler, J. Kirby Anderson, *Origin Science: A Proposal for the Creation-Evolution Controversy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1987); Henry M. Morris, Gary E. Parker, *What Is Creation Science?* (San Diego, CA: Creation Life, 1982).

24 *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vol. 1, p. 6.

25 See the discussion in Morris and Parker, *What Is Creation Science?*

26 See the biography note in *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vol. 1, p. xvi.

27 Dean Kenyon in the introduction to Morris and Parker, *What Is Creation Science?*, p. 3.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 3.

29 *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vol. 1, p. 44.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 45.

31 *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vol. 2, pp. 104-07.

32 A. E. Wilder-Smith, *A Basis for a New Biology* (Einigen/Schweir: TELOS- International, 1976) and his *Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory: Information, Sources and Structures* (Costa Mesa, CA: TWFP Publishers, 1987), cf., p. v.

33 Dennis Dubay, "Evolution/Creation Debate," *Bioscience*, Vol. 30, January 1980, pp. 4-5.

34 Available from the Institute for Creation Research, Santee, CA.

35 Duane Gish, *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics* (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1993), p. ix.

36 *Ibid.*, p. vi.

37 *Ibid.*, p. 63.

38 *Bird, Origin... Revisited*, Vol. 1, p. 8.

39 NCSE, *Voices for Evolution* p. 74.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 160.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

42 *Ibid.*, pp. 154-55.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

44 *Ibid.*, p. 35.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 78.

46 *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 142.

47 *Ibid.*, p. 168.

48 *Ibid.*, p. 130.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 169.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 124.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 73.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 139; addendum, p. 4; see also Karl Wessel in *Commentary*, Sept. 1986, p. 11.

53 NCSE, *Voices for Evolution*, pp. ix, x.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 166.

55 *Ibid.*, pp. 40, 48, 73, 50, 51, 170, 172, 118 and addendum, p. 6.

56 *Ibid.*, p. 81.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 119.

58 *Ibid.*, p. 136.

59 Russell L. French, preface in *Bird*, Vol. 2, p. xviii.

60 NCSE, *Voices for Evolution*, p. 38.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 174.

62 *Ibid.*, p. 51.

63 *Ibid.*, p. 54.

64 *Ibid.*, p. 59.

65 *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 63.

66 *Ibid.*, p. 65.

67 *Ibid.*, p. 161.

68 *Ibid.*, p. 75.

69 *Ibid.*, p. 74.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 82.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 128.

72 *Ibid.*, p. 168.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 171.

74 See *Recommended Reading in Darwin's Leap of Faith*.

75 NCSE, *Voices for Evolution*, p. 48.

76 *Ibid.*, p. 33.

77 *Ibid.*, p. 159.