

## CA: Philosophy and Theology

CA000: Ethics

CA001. Evolution is the foundation of an immoral worldview.

CA001.1. Crime rates etc. have increased since evolution began to be taught.

CA002. Survival of the fittest implies might makes right.

CA002.1. Evolution leads to social Darwinism.

CA002.2. Marx admired and corresponded with Darwin.

CA005. Evolution is racist.

CA005.1. Darwin himself was racist.

CA005.2. Darwin's work refers to "preservation of favoured races".

CA005.3. T. H. Huxley was racist.

CA006. Evolution encourages eugenics.

CA006.1. Hitler based his views on Darwinism.

CA006.2. Stalin's policies were influenced by Darwin.

CA008. Evolution encourages promiscuity and lust.

CA009. Evolution teaches that we are animals and to behave as such.

CA010. Homosexuality receives approval from evolutionists.

CA012. Evolutionists are intellectual snobs.

CA040. Fairness demands evolution and creation be given equal time.

CA041. Teach the controversy.

CA041.1. Federal law (Santorum Amendment) supports teaching alternatives.

CA042. Biology can reasonably be taught without evolution.

CA045. Inherit the Wind is false propaganda.

(see also CH010: Creationism is good.)

This referral to Creationists claims are not completely honest. It should be clear at the end of the Philosophy and Theology section.

The evolution the Index refers to should be called “The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory” ( without any involvement of a Creator) and most educated Creationists ( with a capital C) will have valid scientific doubts about this theory.

The meaning of the word evolution has to defined before it can be used as an argument against Creaationists and in favour of “The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory” .

To define the term , the user should first have an understanding of the history of the linguistics the word evolution.

The Oxford Dictionaries description of the etymology of the word ‘evolution’ as follows:

“ It is curious that, although the modern theory of evolution has its source in Charles Darwin’s great book On the Origin of Species (1859), the word evolution does not appear in the original text at all. In fact, Darwin seems deliberately to have avoided using the word evolution, preferring to refer to the process of biological change as ‘transmutation’. Some of

the reasons for this, and for continuing confusion about the word evolution in the succeeding century and a half, can be unpacked from the word's entry in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). OED definitions :

1 The process by which different kinds of living organism are believed to have developed from earlier forms during the history of the earth.

2 The gradual development of something.

3 Chemistry

The giving off of a gaseous product, or of heat.

'the evolution of oxygen occurs rapidly in this process'

4 A pattern of movements or manoeuvre .

5 Mathematics

The extraction of a root from a given quantity.

The word evolution first arrived in English (and in several other European languages) from an influential treatise on military tactics and drill, written in Greek by the second-century writer Aelian (Aelianus Tacticus). In translations of his work, the Latin word *evolutio* and its offspring, the French word *évolution*, were used to refer to a military manoeuvre or change of formation, and hence the earliest known English example of evolution traced by the OED comes from a translation of Aelian, published in 1616. As well as being applied in this military context to the present day, it is also still used with reference to movements of various kinds, especially in dance or gymnastics, often with a sense of twisting or turning.

In classical Latin, though, *evolutio* had first denoted the unrolling of a scroll, and by the early 17th century, the English word evolution was often applied to 'the process of unrolling, opening out, or revealing'. It is this aspect of its application which may have been behind Darwin's reluctance to use the term. Despite its association with 'development', which might have seemed apt enough, he would not have wanted to associate his theory with the notion that the history of life was the simple chronological unrolling of a predetermined creative plan. Nor would he have wanted to promote the similar concept of embryonic development, which saw the growth of an organism as a kind of unfolding or opening out of structures already present in miniature in the earliest embryo (the 'preformation' theory of the 18th century). The use of the word evolution in such a way, radically opposed to Darwin's theory, appears in the writings of his grandfather.

According to Etymology on line:

"evolution (n.)"

1620s, "an opening of what was rolled up," from Latin *evolutionem* (nominative *evolutio*) "unrolling (of a book)," noun of action from past participle stem of *evolvere* "to unroll" (see *evolve*).

Used in medicine, mathematics, and general writing in various senses including "growth to maturity and development of an individual living thing" (1660s). Modern use in biology, of species, first attested 1832 in works of Scottish geologist Charles Lyell. Charles Darwin used

the word in print once only, in the closing paragraph of "The Origin of Species" (1859), and preferred descent with modification, in part because evolution already had been used in the discarded 18c. homunculus theory of embryological development (first proposed under this name by Bonnet, 1762) and in part because it carried a sense of "progress" not present in Darwin's idea. But Victorian belief in progress prevailed (and the advantages of brevity), and Herbert Spencer and other biologists after Darwin popularized evolution. ”

In the modern use of the word, it usually refers to change over time. It is also important that it refers to chronological events or observations, events that follow each other in a chronological order. The word evolution can also be substituted with the word history without actually changing the meaning.

The evolution of aviation — history of aviation.

The evolution of life on earth — history of life on earth.

The creation descriptions in the Judeo-Christian Bible can also be regarded as describing the unfolding or evolution of events that follows a chronological order.

Another important aspect neglected by the “creators” of the “Index to Creationist Claims” is to define the words “creation” and “create” which basically just mean to make something new or to change an existing thing into something new. Creations can be physical (things that are created in factories etc,) or abstract things like ideas, literature, music, computer software, etc.

The “creators” of “Index to Creationist Claims” neglect to mention that they are also creationists (with a ‘c’) that believe in a “naturalistic spontaneous unguided” creation process with a possible origin in a quantum vacuum or something similarly.

The “creators” of “Index to Creationist Claims” are only against the possibility of an intelligent eternal creating entity. They believe in a possible mindless vacuum entity of fluctuating force fields and virtual (nonexisting) “particles” appearing and disappearing due to quantum fluctuations. Their antagonism against an intelligent creator is a cynic (not sceptic) belief that it is impossible for such an entity to exist. According to their logic our reality is the product of the mindless interaction of force fields.

However our intelligence gave us the ability to manipulate some of these force fields and that is why you are able to read this post. Mindless creation, according to their arguments, has the ability to produce intelligent minds able to manipulate the quantum world to their advantage, according to their belief.

The ‘Index to Creationist Claims’ will hereafter be referred to as The Index.

The theory of evolution is actually “The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory” and will be referred to as NE(Naturalistic Evolution). Life’s history is either guided by NE or by an intelligence. In other words The Index and the counter response to it, is actually about NE against ID (intelligent design).

## **CA: Philosophy and Theology**

## CA000: Ethics

### Claim CA001:

Evolution is the foundation of an immoral world view.

#### Source:

Moon, Rev. Sun Myung. 1990 (27 Mar.). Parents day and I.

<http://www.unification.net/1990/900327.html>

#### Response:

1 Evolution is descriptive. It can be immoral only if attempting to accurately describe nature is immoral.

Counter response to 1. : Incorrect . If NE is true, it is completely without any morals . Morals is a nonexisting term in NE. Mutations and natural selection are not guided by morals. If they were they contradict the basic view of NE and introduce predetermination into the NE theory. The claim and the response to it doesn't support nor contradict NE.

Believing in a Creator , is a belief that morals are a trait programmed by the Creator and only the Creator can judge morals. Without a Creator morals doesn't exist and every living organism's behavior is decided by the environment it exist in , according to the organism's selfish needs.

2. Any morals derived from evolution would have to recognize the fact that humans have evolved to be social animals. In a social setting, cooperation and even altruism lead to better fitness (Wedekind and Milinski 2000). The process of evolution leads naturally to social animals such as humans developing ethical principles such as the Golden Rule. ( Treat others as as one's self) ( the Christian Golden Rule)

Counter response 2 : Was it evolution through mutation and natural selection that created social behavior? It is important to remember that in sexual reproduction mutations only occur in gonads, a very, very slow process. . This evolution referring to social behavior is more by a monkey sees , monkey likes, monkey does and monkey sees , monkey dislike monkey doesn't do , process. A type of intelligent guided evolution and not NE.

More a type of intelligent guided evolution and not NE. Also important is that the same event the monkey likes sometimes , can be frequently disliked at other times. . A continuous fluctuation between like and dislike. Also called human nature .

3 Some bad morals, such as eugenics and social Darwinism, are based on misunderstandings of evolution. Therefore, it is important that evolution be taught well to negate such misunderstandings.

Counter response 3. An argument made without much support. The so called misunderstandings are not explained. Counter response 2 also applies. LE theory has no place for morals of any kind. Eugenics and social Darwinism are the products of human reasoning and not LE.

4 Despite claims otherwise, creationism has its own problems. For one thing, it is founded on religious bigotry, so the foundation of creationism, by most standards, is immoral.

Counter response 4: Absolutely false regarding TRUE CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND MORALS.

Real Christianity is not supposed to be influenced by bigotry. You will know real Christians by their fruit. If asked about their beliefs they should respond as follows :

“But in your hearts revere Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. **But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ may be ashamed of their slander.** For it is better, if it is God’s will, to suffer for doing good than for doing evil.”

–1 Peter 3:15–17

Also do not judge:

“Do not judge and criticize and condemn [others unfairly with an attitude of self-righteous superiority as though assuming the office of a judge], so that you will not be judged [unfairly]. 2 For just as you [hypocritically] judge others [when you are sinful and unrepentant], so will you be judged; and in accordance with your standard of measure [used to pass out judgment], judgment will be measured to you” Matt 7

5 Probably the most effective weapon against bad morals is exposure and publicity. Evolution (and science in general) is based on a culture of making information public.

Counter reponses 5; Really? Although the media is continuously exposing so called bad morals, is there really any response to the contrary. Exposure actually leads to better ways of hiding bad morals in efforts to prevent exposure. The 11<sup>th</sup> commandment : Anything goes, just avoid being caught or exposed is a more applicable response to exposure.

6. Scientists are their own harshest critics. They have developed codes of ethical behavior for several circumstances, and they have begun to talk about a general ethics (Rotblat 1999).

Creationists have nothing similar.

Counter response 6. Really”? Scientists ( our present age usually referring to researchers) are not at all different from the general population and like the human reaction to all other codes, there will always be efforts to circumvent codes. According the reasoning of response 6 . things like industrial espionage doesn’t exists. Really?

Responses 5 and 6 are also not directly related to NE, but more to a “the what monkey sees” reaction.

7 Some people feel better about themselves by demonizing others. Those people who are truly interested in morals begin by looking for immorality within themselves, not others.

Counter response 7: Counter response 4 apply. Christian Creationists shouldn’t judge. A so called Creationist that try and demonize others doesn’t believe in the Christian Creator but in a other type of creator.

The same arguments can be used against NE believers.

Some NE advocates and atheists are also guilty of demonizing Creationists.

Claim CA002:

Survival of the fittest implies that "might makes right" is a proper guide to behavior.

Source:

Keyes, Alan, 7 July 2001. Survival of the fittest? WorldNetDaily,  
[http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=23533](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=23533)

Response:

1 This claim exemplifies the naturalistic fallacy by arguing that the way things are implies how they ought to be. It is like saying that if someone's arm is broken, it should stay broken. But "is" does not imply "ought." Evolution is descriptive. It tells how things are, not how they should be.

First a general response : The article The Index referred to, actually states that according to NE, the strongest in a society decides what is good for the society. It doesn't state that MIGHT makes right, but that MIGHT set and enforce the rules. The claim has some truth because the most selfish part of the genetic code is supposed to be the most powerful surviving gene, according to the NE theory.

Counter response 1 : This response actually concedes to my own view that all the observations made regarding the evolution of life is only historic observations . The descriptiveness lies in what is observed and the "what is observed "is determined by passed events and not by current events or expectations. "Survival of the fittest" is a historic observation and only recognized as such through history and has no influence over future events. No predictive power.

Yes NE is observational, a science comparable to archeology.

NE leans ( depends) on an observation that is named common descent in NE circles. NE just assumes that common descent ( not reinventing the wheel) is different from common design ( also not reinventing the wheel). The inventing of the wheel implying the survival of the strongest or fittest gene in NE and the best ideas in intelligent design. Is there really a difference or is the difference only in the eye of the beholder?

2 Humans, being social, improve their fitness through cooperation with other people. Even if survival of the fittest were taken as a basis for morals, it would imply treating other people well.

Counter response 2 : Really? Are people in power really treating other people well? Be honest.

Dictators like Hitler , Stalin etc, still exist in our age, You will also find copies of them in all human societies from governments, private companies through to local councils. **Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.**

Claim CA002.1:

Darwinism leads to social Darwinism, the policy that the weak should be allowed to fail and die.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 1985. Scientific Creationism. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, p. 179.

Response:

1 This is an example of the naturalistic fallacy -- the argument that how things are implies how they ought to be. But "is" does not imply "ought." Evolution only tells how things are; it does not say how they should be.

Before responding let us first define "Social Darwinism" and its cousin "Eugenics"

Social Darwinism and eugenics can basically be defined by the same definition and is only referring to *Homo sapiens sapiens* and not to other species :

Both can be defined as attempts to improve the human genetic makeup by encouraging reproduction of desirable traits and discouraging the production of undesirable traits. In other words applying what humans did to other species for ages ( especially to domesticated plants and animals), to fellow humans , usually against their will.

Both are social movements that argue that it is possible to improve the human race and society by encouraging reproduction by people or populations with "desirable" traits (termed "positive" eugenics) and discouraging reproduction by people with "undesirable" qualities (termed "negative" eugenics).

Counter response 1: Already answered partially in counter response 1 in Claim CA0029 PREVIOUSLY) . The argument in response 1 concede an important fact. It concede that LE is a historical science that can't make future predictions and is therefore very difficult to be subjected to scientific method experimentation. NE theory exclude intelligence, social Darwinism and Eugenic include human reasoning.

2 The source of social Darwinism was not Darwin but Herbert Spencer and the tradition of Protestant nonconformism going back to Hobbes via Malthus. Spencer's ideas of evolution were Lamarckian. The only real connection between Darwinism and social Darwinism is the name.

Counter response 2: True but not relevant in the debate about the existence of a creator.

3 Diverse political and religious ideas draw upon evolutionary biology, including ideas advocating greater cooperation.

Counter response 3: A very vague argument and if true the most popular ideas and/or ideas supported by the strongest powerbase in a society prevail. ( fashion trends, political trends, etc.) Diversion usually leads to struggles rather than cooperation.

4 Evolutionary theory shows us that the long-term survival of a species is strongly linked with its genetic variability. All Social Darwinist programs advocate minimizing genetic variability, thus reducing chances of long-term survival in the event of environmental change. An understanding of evolution should then rebuke any attempt at social Darwinism if the long-term survival of humanity is treated as a goal.

Counter argument 4 : What about domesticated animals and plants? Their survival doesn't depend on their genetic variability, but on their usefulness and emotional relationship with humans. ( food , pets and flowers are examples). Long term survival depends on more than genetic variability , cyanobacteria are still with us after a journey that exceeded more than 2 billion years.

5 Eugenics and social Darwinian accounts are more often tied to the rise of the science of genetics than to evolutionary theory.

Counter argument 5 :

Most geneticists that believe in NE theory will take exception. They will argue the the genetic science support NE. THE TRUTH IS ACTUALLY THAT REGARDING OTHER SPECIES EUGENICS IS AN ACCEPTABLE PRACTICE. It improved agriculture's ability to feed t billion of humans. Eugenics and genetic engineering are basically the same thing.

Claim CA005:

Evolution promotes racism.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 1985. Scientific Creationism. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, p. 179.

Response:

1 When properly understood, evolution refutes racism. Before Darwin, people used typological thinking for living things, considering different plants and animals to be their distinct "kinds." This gave rise to a misleading conception of human races, in which different races are thought of as separate and distinct. Darwinism helps eliminate typological thinking and with it the basis for racism.

Counter response 1: Racism is a selfish trait. Protect the own and be skeptical or hostile to the foreign. Ethnicity, tribalism, xenophobia and racism are all part of this selfish trait. If NE is true and no Creator exists, the probability that it is a NE survival trait, is highly likely. Protect the own and avoid or attack the foreign, is part and parcel of the observed history of life on earth.

2 Genetic studies show that humans are remarkably homogeneous genetically, so all humans are only one biological race. Evolution does not teach racism; it teaches the very opposite.

Counter Response2: NE and evolution as the description of the observed history of life can't give moral judgement on racism. Is (racism)is observed in the history of life? If it is observed, and NE is true, then it was created ( not taught) by LE. The marking of and protection of territories are observed in life and are probably genetic inherit. This indicating that ethnicity, tribalism, xenophobia and racism are part of life's history, In the event that there is no Creator then NE must have created it due to the evolution of self protecting and territory marking genes. If the Christian Creator exists the free will to allow selfish behaviour caused it .

If the Creator exists , the creator is not racist because it is written

“here is [now no distinction in regard to salvation] neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither



slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you [who believe] are all one in Christ Jesus [no one can claim a spiritual superiority]. “

3 Racism is thousands of years older than the theory of evolution, and its prevalence has probably decreased since Darwin's day; certainly slavery is much less now. That is the opposite of what we would expect if evolution promotes racism.

Counter response 3: Really.. Our news reels paint a different story. Humans are still as intolerant and selfish as what they have always been. Human trafficking is still a major problem.

4 Darwin himself was far less racist than most of his contemporaries.

Counter response 4 : A very weak argument , less than a racist than his contemporaries , still means he was a racist.

5 Although creationism is not inherently racist, it is based upon and inseparable from religious bigotry, and religious bigotry is no less hateful and harmful than racism.

Counter response 5: Absolutely not true regarding the Christian Creator .

It is written :

“Real Christianity is not supposed to be influenced by bigotry. You will know real Christians by their fruit. If asked about their beliefs they should respond as follows :

“But in your hearts revere Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ may be ashamed of their slander. For it is better, if it is God’s will, to suffer for doing good than for doing evil.”

–1 Peter 3:15–17 Also do not judge:

“Do not judge and criticize and condemn [others unfairly with an attitude of self-righteous superiority as though assuming the office of a judge], so that you will not be judged [unfairly]. 2 For just as you [hypocritically] judge others [when you are sinful and unrepentant], so will you be judged; and in accordance with your standard of measure [used to pass out judgment], judgment will be measured to you” Matt 7”

6 Racism historically has been closely associated with creationism (Moore 2004), as is evident in the following examples:

George McCready Price, who is to young-earth creationism what Darwin is to evolution, was much more racist than Darwin. He wrote:

The poor little fellow who went to the south  
Got lost in the forests dank;  
His skin grew black, as the fierce sun beat  
And scorched his hair with its tropic heat,  
And his mind became a blank.

Counter respons 6: Does this stupid poem really representative of all creationists's view 'or is the following more a true creasionistic view, especially Christian creationnist:

“Do not judge and criticize and condemn [others unfairly with an attitude of self-righteous superiority as though assuming the office of a judge], so that you will not be judged [unfairly]. 2 For just as you [hypocritically] judge others [when you are sinful and unrepentant], so will you be judged; and in accordance with your standard of measure [used to pass out judgment], judgment will be measured to you” Matt 7"

Claim CA005.1:

Charles Darwin was himself a racist, referring to native Africans and Australians, for example, as savages.

Source:

Humber, Paul G. 1987. The ascent of racism. Impact 164,

<http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=268>

Weston-Broome, Sharon. 2001. Louisiana House Concurrent Resolution no. 74: Civil Rights: Provides relative to racism and education about racism. HLS 01-2652 ORIGINAL.

Response:

1 Virtually all Englishmen in Darwin's time viewed blacks as culturally and intellectually inferior to Europeans. Some men of that time (such as Louis Agassiz, a staunch creationist) went so far as to say they were a different species. Charles Darwin was a product of his times and no doubt viewed non-Europeans as inferior in ways, but he was far more liberal than most: He vehemently opposed slavery (Darwin 1913, especially chap. 21), and he contributed to missionary work to better the condition of the native Tierra del Fuegians. He treated people of all races with compassion.

2 The mention of "favoured races" in the subtitle of Origin of Species merely refers to variations within species which survive to leave more offspring. It does not imply racism.

3 1The views of Darwin, or of any person, are irrelevant to the fact of evolution. Evolution is based on evidence, not on people's opinions.

Counter response to 1.2.an3 Racism is is a moral ethical issue and of little importance in the debate regarding the existence or nonexistence of a Creator. Racism, ethnicity , tribalism and xynophobia is present on both sides of the debate. )9as previous discussed and shouldn't be part of a true Christian creationist).

Counter response specifically against response 3: Evolution is not based on evidence but on observations of historical events. ( compare it to the history or evolution of aviation . The observations do not confirm NE nor exclude intelligent guidance).

Claim CA005.2:

1.The subtitle of Darwin's Origin of Species refers to "the preservation of favoured races," showing the racist nature of Darwin's ideas.

Source:

Weston, Paula, 1997-1998. The fallacy of racism. *Creation Ex Nihilo* 20(1): 52-53,  
<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/384.asp>

Response:

1 Race, as used by Darwin, refers to varieties, not to human races. It simply points out that some variations that occur naturally survive in greater numbers. *Origin of Species* hardly refers to humans at all.

Counter response 1: Racists, xenophobics and tribalists will regard these varieties as support for their belief. They will point to race in other species especially domesticated animals and plants.

2 Evolution is not racist.

Counter response 2 Agree, the history any evolutionary process is just based on observations. Different similarities are however observed in a species (examples different breeds of cattle, dogs cats horses etc.) in the end and led to terms such as race, subspecies etc, in discussions about the history of life.

Claim CA005.3:

Thomas H. Huxley was racist. He said,

No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal . . . of the white man. And if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities are removed . . . he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried out by thoughts and not by bites."

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 1973. *Evolution and modern racism*. *Impact* 7 (Oct.).

<http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=55>

Foust, Scott, 2005. Evolution perpetuates racist ideologies. *The News Record* (Cincinnati), Feb. 14, 2005.

Response:

1, Huxley's view of the inferiority of blacks was not a product of evolution, but was the prevailing attitude of the time. He was less racist than most of his contemporaries. Abraham Lincoln, for example, held much the same view as Huxley:

I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together on the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said any thing to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence -- the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas that he is not my equal in many respects, certainly not in color -- perhaps not in intellectual and moral endowments; but in the right to eat the bread without the leave of any body else which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every other man (Lincoln 1858).

In the sense of racism as promoting preferential treatment of one group over another, Huxley was not racist. The quote above comes from an essay in which Huxley argues against slavery and for equal treatment of blacks and women (Huxley 1865, 66-67). For his times, he was a

radical reformer.

Counter response 1: It is the observations of differences that exists within a species would lead some people to claim that NE support racism and all the -isms ( refer also to counter response 2 regarding Claim CA005.2 )

2.Mrs. P. A. Taylor, of the Ladies London Emancipation Society, said of Huxley, He believes in the doctrine of freedom, or equal personal rights for all men, and he pronounces the system of slavery to be root and branch an abomination -- thus making his physiological definition of the Negro's place among men equivalent to an earnest plea for Negro emancipation. Nay, as will have been noted, he goes farther, and, in virtue of the strength of his feeling with respect to slavery, avows a state of opinion regarding the American War in which many who share his feeling with respect to slavery will refuse to go along with him (Taylor 1864)

Counter respons 2: The same response as given to in counter response 1.

3 The views of Huxley or any person are irrelevant to the fact of evolution. Evolution is based on evidence, not on people's opinions.

Counter response 3: Respons 3 should actually read "The views of Huxley or any person are irrelevant to the fact of evolution. Evolution is based on observations, not on people's opinions. Peoples opinions are based on conclusions made from the observations."

Claim CA006:

Evolution promotes eugenics.

Source:

DeWitt, David A. 2002. The dark side of evolution.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2002/0510eugenics.asp>

Response:

1 Eugenics is based on genetic principles that are independent of evolution. It is just as compatible with creationism, and in fact at least one young-earth creationist (William J. Tinkle) advocated eugenics and selective human breeding (Numbers 1992, 222-223).

Counter response 1. The history of life is independent of whatever entitiy cause it to exists .It doesn't matter if it was written by NE in the genetic code of by an Intelligent creator. The language it is written in, is the genetic code.. Eugenics is also completely dependent on the genetic code. The genetic code's origin is even a greater mystery than the origin of life.

2,Many eugenics arguments, such as the expected effect of selective sterilization and the results of interracial mating, are based on bad biology. Better biology education, including the teaching of evolution, can only counter the assumptions on which eugenics is based.

Counter response 2: Really, this is being done for ages in agriculture. Only certain characteristics are allowed in the breeding of cattle catle, sheep etc. Eugenic principles is even more common in cat and dog breeders. Better biology ??????

Claim CA006.1:

Adolf Hitler exploited the racist ideas of Darwinism to justify genocide.

Source:

Weston-Broome, Sharon. 2001. Louisiana House Concurrent Resolution no. 74: CIVIL RIGHTS: Provides relative to racism and education about racism. HLS 01-2652 ORIGINAL.

Response:

1 Hitler based his ideas not on Darwinism but on a "divine right" philosophy:

Thus, it [the folkish philosophy] by no means believes in an equality of races, but along with their difference it recognizes their higher or lesser value and feels itself obligated, through this knowledge, to promote the victory of the better and stronger, and demand the subordination of the inferior and weaker in accordance with the eternal will that dominates this universe. (Hitler 1943, 383)

The first edition of Mein Kampf suggests that Hitler may once have believed in a young earth: "this planet will, as it did thousands of years ago, move through the ether devoid of men" (p. 65; the second edition substitutes "millions" for "thousands," and chapter 11 refers to "hundreds of thousands of years" of life in another context.) Other passages further support his creationist leanings:

The undermining of the existence of human culture by the destruction of its bearer seems in the eyes of a folkish philosophy the most execrable crime. Anyone who dares to lay hands on the highest image of the Lord commits sacrilege against the benevolent Creator of this miracle and contributes to the expulsion from paradise. (Hitler 1943, 383)

and

What we must fight for is to safeguard the existence and reproduction of our race and our people, . . . so that our people may mature for the fulfillment of the mission allotted it by the creator of the universe. (Hitler 1943, 214)

Quotes from Hitler invoking Christianity as a basis for his actions could be multiplied ad nauseam. For example:

Hence today I believe that I am acting in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator: by defending myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord (Hitler 1943, 65).

"[T]he task of preserving and advancing the highest humanity, given to this earth by the benevolence of the Almighty, seems a truly high mission (Hitler 1943, 398).

A campaign against the "godless movement" and an appeal for Catholic support were launched Wednesday by Chancellor Adolf Hitler's forces (Associated Press 1933).

Of course, this does not mean that Hitler's ideas were based on creationism any more than they were based on evolution. Hitler's ideas were a perversion of both religion and biology.

Counter response 1: Hitler's ideas had as bases a fictitious believe in an Arian race. He also had distorted ideas of Religion.

2 The Nazi Party in general rejected Darwinism and supported Christianity. In 1935, Die Bücherei, the official Nazi journal for lending libraries, published a list of guidelines of works to reject, including:

Writings of a philosophical and social nature whose content deals with the false scientific enlightenment of primitive Darwinism and Monism (Häckel). (Die Bücherei 1935, 279)

On the other hand, an undated "Blacklist for Public Libraries and Commercial Lending

Libraries" includes the following on a list of literature which "absolutely must be removed":

c) All writings that ridicule, belittle or besmirch the Christian religion and its institution, faith in God, or other things that are holy to the healthy sentiments of the Volk. (Blacklist n.d.)

Genocide and racism existed long before Darwin. Obviously, they did not need any contribution from Darwinism. In many instances, such as the Crusades and the Spanish conquest of Central America, religion was explicitly invoked to justify them.

Counter response 2.; The Nazi party's fruit was completely the opposite of the fruit that should be produced by real Christians. ( Galatians 5) Response 2 just indicates the evil that existed in the Nazi party. It was just another evil dictatorship , just like the Soviet Union under Stalin.

3 Evolution does not promote social Darwinism or racism or eugenics.

Counter response 3: The history of life is based on observations and these observations promote nothing. There is however interpretations and conclusions of the observations that can lead some to promote eugenics or intelligent manipulation of the code. If it is done to humans it is known as eugenic. The same principles had some to the advancements to humans like changing ("improving") domestic animals and plants.

Claim CA006.2:

Stalin accepted Darwinian evolution, which he used to justify oppression and murder.

Source:

AiG, 1988. What happened when Stalin read Darwin? Creation 10(4) (September): 23.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v10/i4/stalin.asp>

Response:

1 Stalin rejected neo-Darwinian evolution in favor of Lamarckism.

Mendeleev's "periodic system of elements" clearly shows how very important in the history of nature is the emergence of qualitative changes out of quantitative changes. The same thing is shown in biology by the theory of neo-Lamarckism, to which neo-Darwinism is yielding place. (Stalin 1906, 304)

More specifically, Stalin rejected the ideas of August Weismann, a 19th-century German biologist, in favor of Trofim Lysenko, a pseudoscientist who based his ideas on Lamarckism. Weismann, who accepted Darwin's theory of evolution, disproved Lamarckism and proposed that germ cells pass on hereditary information; his work was an early variant of the modern evolutionary synthesis which unites evolutionary theory with genetics. Stalin appointed Lysenko head of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the Soviet Union, where he had great political power. (Rossiannov 1993)

2 Stalin and Lysenko rejected evolution and genetics for ideological, not biological, reasons. (Stalin was quite ignorant of science in general.) The class struggle of Marxism contradicts the individual competition implied by natural selection. More importantly, genetics, implying that traits were fixed at birth, contradicted the ideal of moulding and improving traits. Stalin proclaimed genetics a capitalist pseudo-science.

3 Stalin was, first and foremost, a Marxist dictator, far above any allegiance he might have had to any theories concerning the origin of species, whether Lamarckian or Darwinian. Stalin distrusted scientists as being prone to free-thinking. Though his persecution of biologists and biology were particularly egregious (causing appalling damage to Soviet agriculture), he

imprisoned and killed thousands of scientists and engineers from all fields.

4 Oppression and murder have been used as tools of statecraft long before Darwin published his work.

5 There is no evidence that Darwin's work was used as a justification for oppression and murder. Stalin doubtless accepted Newton's theory of gravity, but creationists do not claim that Newton's theory should be suppressed because Stalin believed it.

References:

Counter response to all references to Stalin.: A continuation of the one used against Hitler and the same counter responses apply. Nothing to do with NE or creators.

Claim CA008:

Evolutionary theory promotes the concepts of promiscuity and lust, pointing out that the quest to produce many offspring is a main goal of organisms under Darwinism.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 2000. Evil-ution. Back to Genesis 140 (Aug).: a-c.

<http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=877>

Response:

1. Description does not imply promotion. Mistaking "is" for "ought" is the naturalistic fallacy. The theory of evolution no more promotes promiscuity and lust than germ theory promotes getting infectious diseases.

Counter response There is no theory of evolution . The only theory regarding evolution is “The Naturalistic Spontaneous Evolution of Life Theory” . Observations made while studying life’s history are only observations of historical events. Observations of the development of an evolutionary event without any information about the guiding force that caused the observed changes, The theory is that these observed changes were the result of spontaneous alterations in the genetic code’s messengers. It is a historical observation and can just as well be called the history of life. “The Naturalistic Spontaneous Evolution of Life Theory” without any intelligent interference. Agreed the theory doesn’t promote promiscuity , but to happen genetic code duplication is necessary.

2 Solving a problem works best if you first understand the source of the problem.

Creationists, by denying sources of behavior, are less likely to deal with behavioral problems effectively.

Counter response 2: Real Creationists, especially Christian creationists actually know the real cause of behavioral problems. The real problem is selfishness, It is very clearly described in Galatians 5, where it clearly states that unselfish behaviour needs no law. “Love your neighbour ( enemies included ) as yourself”. “ Do to others as you would like they should do unto you”.

Claim CA009:

Evolution teaches that people are animals. We should not be surprised when people who are taught evolution start behaving like animals.

Source:

Rendle-Short, J., 1980. What should a Christian think about evolution? Creation 3(1): 15-17.  
[http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/docs/v3n1\\_prof.asp](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/docs/v3n1_prof.asp)

Response:

1 Evolution does not teach that humans are animals; biology in general does (and so does the Bible, in Ecclesiastes 3:18-21). More specifically, humans are a species of primate, which is a category of mammal, which is a category of vertebrate, which is a category of animal. This was known more than 2000 years ago.

Counter response 1 :

The referral to Ecclesiastics 3:18-21 should be compared to the conclusion of the preacher in Ecclesiastes 12 verses 1 and 13:

“1 Remember also your Creator in the days of your youth,

before the evil days come, and the years draw near,  
when you will say, “I have no pleasure in them”;

“13 This is the end of the matter. All has been heard. Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. 14 For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it is good, or whether it is evil.”

A clear indication that the Preacher ( the author of Ecclesiastics) regarded man to be different from mere animals because this conclusion is not applicable to any animal.

The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory (NE) teaches that human life is not at all different from any other life form, all evolve naturally without any intelligent interference of guidance from LUCA ( last universal common ancestor). Similarities in morphology , in molecules and chemistry cycles are indicative of a common descent. LE supporters believe there is difference between “common descent” and a term they hate with compassion namely “ommon design” However they can’t supply a scientific method supported devidence to differentiate between common descent and common design.

.

Creationists believe that common descent and common design are both referring to the same principle. The principle that life didn’t keep on re-inventing the wheel. They believe that the more frequently common design/descent is discovered in life’s history the higher the probability for the existence of an intelligent designer is involed. A designer that keeps on using previous designs.

2. "Behaving like animals" does not mean anything, because different animals behave in different ways. A part of human behavior is the ability of people to learn and to modify their behavior according to cultural norms. Evolution teaches that people behave like humans.

Counter respons 2: The view that human behavior caused by NE has no scientific method support. It is more related to human intelligence and “ the monkey sees , monkey likes, monkey does and monkey sees, monkey doesn’t like, monkey doesn’t do” response in humans, a process starting very early in life. Human behavior can also change during a



human's lifetime, atheists become theists and vice versa. Nothing to do with "NE theory. If it was genetic code ( NE related) the expectation would be that individual behavioral patterns would remain constant.

3 Creationism teaches that similarities are designed, that God designed our bodies to be like animals. If God designed us to be like animals, then (creationism teaches) we should behave like animals.

Counter Reponse 3, Incorrect ,what about plants and other non animal life forms. Common design/descent just implies that all life is cellular based. Creationist just added that the designer installed a free choice AI program called "Human Spirit" in the human body.

Animal behavior is selfish , the basic human behavior included. The Creationist Designer wants another type of behavior that correspond to Ecclesiastes 12 verses 1 and 13 name Galatians 5 verses 19 ,20 ,21 , 22 and 23. Creationists therefore believe in two types of human behavior as clearly described in Galatians 5:19-24

(i) Selfish ( fleshy behavior ) .

(ii) Behavior that allows it to be changed under the guidance (reprogramming) of the Creator's Spirit. ( quite a probability if the creator are able to manipulate the quantum world).

Claim CA010:

Homosexuality is considered acceptable and even desirable by most evolutionists, who point out that homosexuality is common in many species.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 2000. Evil-ution. Back to Genesis 140 (Aug.): a-c.

Response:

1.The acceptance of homosexuality has nothing to do with evolution. It comes from the recognition that homosexuals, like all people, deserve real love, not just lip service about love. Evolutionists (and other non-fundamentalists), including many people who believe the Bible just as much as Creationists do, are not constrained by the narrow interpretations of the people in certain rigid religions, which are the only sources why homosexuality might be considered immoral.

An important ignored point should be mentioned before the counter responses:

"homosexuality is a self limiting trait that should eventually disappear because if it was LE driven and not reproducing offspring it should eventually disappear. (A non- procreating gene)"

Counter response 1: Agreed , it has nothing to do with LE. However it is Biblical just as unacceptable as all other Biblical unacceptable sexual behavior ( adultery, sexual immorality , promiscuity etc.) .

Imagine the Creator's view about what is unacceptable behavior, was followed by humans. Many serious diseases wouldn't exist. These diseases are preventable if Biblical guidelines

are followed. ( example all the sexual transmitted diseases).

However from a true Christian prospective homosexuals , adulterers , sexual immorality indulgers and all sinners should not be :

“Do not judge and criticize and condemn [others unfairly with an attitude of self-righteous superiority as though assuming the office of a judge], so that you will not be judged [unfairly]. 2 For just as you [hypocritically] judge others [when you are sinful and unrepentant], so will you be judged; and in accordance with your standard of measure [used to pass out judgment], judgment will be measured to you” Matt 7

2 Contrary to Morris' assertion, evolutionists don't consider homosexuality desirable.

Counter response 2 : In agreement with the Creator's guidelines. This response of the Index supports the Creator's view.

3 The pervasiveness of homosexuality throughout nature shows, beyond question, that homosexuality is natural (Bagemihl 1998), belying the only non-religious justification for hatred of homosexuality.

Counter response 3. It is observed but is it natural and supported as a sequence of LE, or just and desirable mutation created trait that will eventually disappear. According to LE it a trait that should eventually disappear..

4 The Biblical objection to homosexuality is hypocritical, because those who condemn it do not condemn just as vigorously other prohibited behaviors such as wearing clothing made of two kinds of material (Lev. 19: 19), trimming or shaving sideburns (Lev. 19: 27), getting tattoos (Lev. 19: 28), and charging interest (Deut. 23: 19-20). People who condemn homosexuality do so not because the Bible tells them to, but, ultimately, because they want to. People who condemn others should first examine the morality of their own judgments  
Counter response 4: Counter response is applicable. Do not judge, but remember obeying the Creator's guidelines will prevent certain diseases.

The referrals to Lev 19:10, Lev 19:28 and Deut 23:19-20 is physical trademarks just to show that Israelites were different from people, more signs to mark them as a nation with a special purpose.. It was to mark them as nation from which the Messiah would emerge.

Homosexuality and other sexual immoralities however spread diseases.

CA 012 :

Anticreationist complaints are a form of snobbery. There are many more important traits on which to judge people than whether they believe in evolution.

Source:

Derbyshire, John, 2003. Pseudoscience vs. snobbery: A Doonesbury lesson. National Review Online (Apr. 22), <http://www.nationalreview.com/derbyshire/derbyshire042203.asp>

Response:

1 Most anticreationists would be content to let creationists believe as they wish and not make an issue of it. However, creationists make creationism an important trait. They make a huge deal of it and want to impose it on others. If creationists did not believe that it is one of the most important traits on which to judge people, the creationism-evolution dispute would not exist.

Counter response 1:

The creationism The Index refers to is a belief that a Creator exists. The anticreationists have a CYNIC (not sceptic) belief that there is nothing like an intelligent Creator. If it was a probable argument they would have used the term "appearance" of creation, but unfortunately the word to create means to bring into existence. Life did not always exist on earth and according to anticreationists was created either by a mindless chemical process with what to appear to be "lucky breaks". Creationists believe that life exists through the intervening of an intelligent entity. Anticreationists have to believe in some forms of creative process that occurred completely spontaneously.

The imposing on others is just as relevant to anticreationists, they make a big issue about their cynic belief that it is impossible for an intelligent Creator to exist.

Anticreationists have a greater problem regarding the existence of life, because all life is based on living cells. All life from cells and all cells from cells is still just as valid as it was in Louis Pasteur's time. Nobody had been able to revise a dead cell or assemble a cell and bring it to life. The JCVI's synthetic cell 's is just the transplantation of synthetic DNA in a living cell. The synthetic DNA also contained the genetic code of another organism, not human created genetic code.

2 The complaint of snobbery is based on the attitude that all opinions are equal. Although that attitude sounds democratic and fair, it is indefensible. Opinions have value to the extent that they are informed. If you are suffering serious stomach problems, would you give equal weight to opinions from a professional gastroenterologist and a supermarket bag-boy? When someone speaking on the subject of evolution is woefully uninformed on issues concerning evolution, it is entirely appropriate to point that out. And the claims made by creationists show that almost all of them are woefully ignorant of evolution. There are exceptions (Kurt Wise, for example), but they are very few.

Counter response 2: The facts about evolution are historical facts. It doesn't matter if it was a spontaneous process as NE implies or an intelligent controlled process, the observations are just history. Any evolutionary process is regarded as such, due to the observations made about the history of the process. (analog the history of aviation since the Wright brothers) Research science is neutral. It can not validate the absence or presence of intelligent guidance in the history of life on earth.

3 The resolution of creationism as a scientific proposition rests on what the facts indicate, and facts are not determined by the personalities of the people who talk about them. Creationists are free to avoid this issue entirely by approaching creationism as an entirely unscientific religious viewpoint, but they have chosen not to do so.

Counter response 3: The science that supports evolution, supports the facts

(i) That life on earth changed over time.

(ii) That the historic trail of the process can be traced back to a prokaryotic cell ( LUCA - last universal common ancestor- was most probably a cyanobacterium or similar cell).

These observations do not confirm nor exclude the presence of an intelligent Creator and intelligent guidance. The view that creationism is not scientific is based on cynic and not sceptic arguments.

4 Many creationists have a literally holier-than-thou attitude. For example, they (falsely) claim that believers of evolution are atheistic and evil. You cannot get any more snobbish or elitist than that.

Counter response 4. A theists must believe in a Creator otherwise it is an agnostic theistic belief. Atheism is a cynic belief in the nonexistence of a creator. A belief in NE is an atheistic belief. Belief in the the history of life as revealed through “historic” research is neutral regarding its influence on the what a person believes about the existence or absence of a Creator.