

Index to Creationist Claims Countered

This is document to counter the answers made at the following website regarding the probability of a Creator.

(<http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/list.html>)

Some of the answers given by the website's authors are contradicting.

The following sequins is followed on this document when opposing their answers

(I) The claim that they oppose .

(II) The opposing response given by the website's authors

(III) The counter response given in this document.

We start with some contradictory statements on the website.

Claim CA114:

There have been many famous scientists who believed in special creation in the past. In particular, the following scientists were creationists:

Louis Agassiz (1807-1873; glacial geology)
Charles Babbage (1792-1871; computer science)
Francis Bacon (1561-1626; scientific method)
Robert Boyle (1627-1691; gas dynamics)
David Brewster (1781-1868; optical mineralogy)
Georges Cuvier (1769-1832; comparative anatomy)
Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519; hydraulics)
Humphrey Davy (1778-1829; thermokinetics)
Henri Fabre (1823-1915; entomology of living insects)
Michael Faraday (1791-1867; electromagnetics)
John Ambrose Fleming (1849-1945; electronics)
Joseph Henry (1797-1878; inventor)
William Herschel (1738-1822; galactic astronomy)
James Joule (1818-1889; reversible thermodynamics)
Lord Kelvin (1824-1907; energetics)
Johann Kepler (1571-1630; celestial mechanics)
Carolus Linnaeus (1707-1778; systematic biology)
Joseph Lister (1827-1912; antiseptic surgery)
Matthew Maury (1806-1873; oceanography)
James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879; electrodynamics)
Gregor Mendel (1822-1884; genetics)
Samuel F. B. Morse (1791-1872; telegraph inventor)
Isaac Newton (1642-1727; calculus)
Blaise Pascal (1623-1662; hydrostatics)
Louis Pasteur (1822-1895; bacteriology)
William Ramsay (1852-1916; isotopic chemistry)
John Ray (1627-1705; natural history)

Lord Rayleigh (1842-1919; dimensional analysis)
Bernhard Riemann (1826- 1866; non-Euclidean geometry)
James Simpson (1811-1870; gynecology)
Nicholas Steno (1631-1686; stratigraphy)
George Stokes (1819-1903; fluid mechanics)
Rudolph Virchow (1821-1902; pathology)
John Woodward (1665-1728; paleontology)

Agassiz, Pasteur, Lord Kelvin, Maxwell, Dawson, Virchow, Fabre, and Fleming were strong opponents of evolution.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 1982. Bible-believing scientists of the past. Impact 103 (Jan.),
<http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=185>

Response:

1 The validity of evolution rests on what the evidence says, not on what people say. There is overwhelming evidence in support of evolution and no valid arguments against it.

2 Many of the scientists in the above list lived before the theory of evolution was even proposed. Others knew the theory, but were not familiar with all the evidence for it. Evolution is outside the field of most of those scientists.

A couple hundred years ago, before the theory of evolution was developed and evidence for it was presented, virtually all scientists were creationists, including scientists in relevant fields such as biology and geology. Today, virtually all relevant scientists accept evolution. Such a turnabout could only be caused by overwhelming evidence. The alternative -- that almost all scientists today are thoroughly incompetent -- is preposterous.

3 Even if they did not believe in evolution, all these scientists were firmly committed to the scientific method, including methodological naturalism. They actually serve as counterexamples to the common creationist claim that a naturalistic practice of science is atheistic.

4 Evolution is entirely consistent with a belief in God, including even "special creation." Special creation need not refer to the creation of every animal; it can refer simply to creation of the universe, of the first life, or of the human soul, for example. Many of the above scientists were not creationists in the sense that Henry Morris uses the term.

HIGHLIGHTED,

Counter response

(the 4th response is in bold because it is kind of contradictory).

1. Evolution of life can also be called the history of life. The support for evolution rest only on historical support, like any historical event.

2, Evolution as related to life, is just a description of historical events, . The “theory of evolution” however is a belief that it occurred spontaneously without any intelligent guidance and evolutionists usually refer to it as EVOLUTION. Compare it with the history (evolution) of aviation that is a known intelligent guided evolutionary process. There is no evidence that life advanced spontaneously without any form of intelligent interference. The history of evolution therefore doesn’t exclude a Divine interference or a CREATOR.

The scientific support referred to, is not natural science evidence, but historical based scientific support. (Like all the historic evidence that the major components of aircraft remained basically the same during the evolution of modern aircraft, since the Wright Brothers “Flyer”).

3. It is very difficult to apply the scientific method to historical events. Antibiotic resistance among bacteria is always used as a scientific method support of spontaneous evolution. The discovery at the Lechuguilla Cave, located within Carlsbad Caverns National Park (USA) of 4 ½ million old isolated bacteria with antibiotic resistance to most modern antibiotics, counteract the claim that antibiotic resistance gives scientific support for spontaneous evolution. *“This work demonstrates that antibiotic resistance is widespread in the environment even in the absence of anthropogenic antibiotic use. Lechuguilla Cave represents a remarkable ecosystem that has been isolated for millions of years, well before the clinical and agricultural use of antibiotics”*

“Antibiotic resistance is ancient and widespread in environmental bacteria”

The Scientific Method , atheistic? If true it will only be made by small scientific illiterate minority,

4 This response to Creationist Claim’s actually support the probability of creationism It is just an attempt to contradict Henry Morris.

Coulter claim: Evolution of life is more about the history of life. Even the chemistry involved is only of historical value. The history of evolution of life and similarities observed in the chemical history of life do not deny or support the probability of a special creator . The history just observes the presence of “common designs” or as evolutionists prefer, “common descents”. Is there really any difference between the two terms? The difference is only present in the world views of the users. Inheritance is also another term that could be used and that is actual used in computer programming, especially in the C++ and Java programming languages.

EVOLUTION (spontaneous advancement of life) is more about a certain view or belief about the history of life , namely the spontaneous onset and advancement of life.

References

Antibiotic Resistance Is Prevalent in an Isolated Cave Microbiome
Kirandeep Bhullar, Nicholas Waglechner, Andrew Pawlowski, Kalinka Koteva, Eric D. Banks, Michael D. Johnston, Hazel A. Barton, Gerard D. Wright
Published: April 11, 2012<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0034953>
Claim CB000:

. “This work demonstrates that antibiotic resistance is widespread in the environment even in the absence of anthropogenic antibiotic use. Lechuguilla Cave represents a remarkable ecosystem that has been isolated for millions of years, well before the clinical and agricultural use of antibiotics”

A diverse intrinsic antibiotic resistome from a cave bacterium

Andrew C. Pawlowski, Wenliang Wang, Kalinka Koteva, Hazel A. Barton, Andrew G. McArthur & Gerard D. Wright

Nature Communications volume 7, Article number: 13803 (2016) | Download Citation
“Antibiotic resistance is ancient and widespread in environmental bacteria”

Compare also with Claim CA602

Claim CA602:

Evolution is atheistic.

Source:

Morris, Henry M. 1985. Scientific Creationism. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, p. 215.

Response:

For a claim that is so obviously false, it gets repeated surprisingly often. Evolution does not require a God, but it does not rule one out either. In that respect, it is no different from almost all other fields of interest. Evolution is no more atheistic than biochemistry, farming, engineering, plumbing, art, law, and so forth.

(Another argument that contradict the the heading “**Index to Creationist Claims Countered**” It appears that the heading should read “**Index to Claims Against Evolution Countered**”)

But read their resonse :

Many, perhaps most, evolutionists are not atheists. If you take the claim seriously, you must claim that the following people are atheists, to give just a few examples:

Sir Ronald Fisher -- the most distinguished theoretical biologist in the history of evolutionary thought. He was also a Christian (a member of the Church of England) and a conservative whose social views were somewhere to the right of Louis XIV.

Pope John Paul II -- a social conservative.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin -- a paleontologist and priest who taught that God guided evolution.

President Jimmy Carter -- a devout and active Southern Baptist.

More than 10,000 clergy have signed a statement saying, in part, "We the undersigned, Christian clergy from many different traditions, believe that the timeless truths of the Bible and the discoveries of modern science may comfortably coexist. We believe that the theory of evolution is a foundational scientific truth, one that has stood up to rigorous scrutiny and upon which much of human knowledge and achievement rests." (Clergy Letter Project 2005)

Anyone worried about atheism should be more concerned about creationism. Creationism can lead to a crisis of faith when people discover that its claims are false and its tactics frequently dishonest. This has led some people to abandon religion altogether (Greene n.d.). It has led others to a qualitatively different understanding of Christianity (Morton 2000).

By saying that only one religious interpretation is correct and universal, creationism typically is a rejection of every other religious interpretation. For example, young-earth creationists reject the religious interpretation that the universe is more than 10,000 years old (Sarfati 2004), and design theorists reject the idea that God has guided evolution (Dembski 1996). For people whose beliefs about God differ from those of a creationist, that creationism might just as well be atheistic.

Links:

NCSE. n.d. Voices for evolution: Statements from religious organizations.

http://www.ncseweb.org/resources/articles/5025_statements_from_religious_orga_12_19_2002.asp

References:

Clergy Letter Project. 2005. An open letter concerning religion and science.

http://www.uwosh.edu/colleges/cols/religion_science_collaboration.htm

Dembski, William A. 1996. What every theologian should know about creation, evolution and design. http://www.arn.org/docs/dembski/wd_theologn.htm

Greene, Todd S. n.d. My motivation.

<http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Thebes/7755/motivation.html>

Sarfati, Jonathan. 2004. Refuting Compromise. Green Forest, AR: Master Books.

Morton, Glenn R. 2000. The transformation of a Young-earth Creationist. Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith 52(2): 81-83. <http://home.entouch.net/dmd/transform.htm>

Further Reading:

Ruse, Michael. 2001. Can a Darwinian Be a Christian? Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Counter response

Believing in God, in most cases imply believing in a Creator. A so called impersonal God is possible, but is it probable that a super intelligent creating entity won't have any interest his creation. (its creation if you prefer). An intelligence without any interest in what is created, doesn't make any sense.

Somebody that believes in God, has no choice, but to believe in a creating God. This also implies a belief that the history of life was either programmed, guided or both. It shouldn't doubt the truth about life's history, but should also acknowledge that their will be different interpretations of historical events

“Pierre Teilhard de Chardin -- a paleontologist and priest who taught that God guided evolution” is mentioned in their references, but somebody who taught God guided evolution of life, also had to believe in a creating God,

Which God.? Christians believe in the God Paulus described in his speech at the Areopagus, in Athens. (Acts 17:23 and further. The only God according to Paul (supported by Hebrew - Christian scriptures) that “ The God who made the world and all things in it, he, being Lord of heaven and earth, doesn't dwell in temples made with hands”.

This claim is not so obviously false as the response implies. Belief in the spontaneous onset

of life and what followed as a spontaneous unguided life event, will lead to atheism and not to God that Paul described in Acts 17:19-c 32.

Claim CB000:

Pasteur and other scientists disproved the concept of spontaneous generation and established the "law of biogenesis" -- that life comes only from previous life.

Source:

Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1985. Life--How Did It Get Here? Brooklyn, NY, p. 38.

Response:

The spontaneous generation that Pasteur and others disproved was the idea that life forms such as mice, maggots, and bacteria can appear fully formed. They disproved a form of creationism. There is no law of biogenesis saying that very primitive life cannot form from increasingly complex molecules.

Counter response

An intensive study of “ spontaneous abiogenesis “ will indicate that the scientific view prior to Pasteur and others who doubted the probably of “ spontaneous abiogenesis “ was that decaying organic material was responsible for life’s existence.

At the beginning of the 19th century, the vertiginous rise of chemistry had introduced terms like crystallization, explosions and spontaneous chemical reactions into the scientific vocabulary. It did not seem that farfetched to imagine that organic molecules could similarly organize, crystallize and react to give rise to living organisms. Exactly a view that correspond to the present postulation of abiogenesis. The only difference is that the modern postulation regard is as a one of occurrence, strating with self replicating molecules that come into being due to natural chemical processes.

Quote from Oparin’s “Origin of Life” translated from Russian 1938:

“ A whole army of biologists is studying the structure and organization of living matter, while a no less number of physicists and chemists are daily revealing to us new properties of dead things. Like two parties of workers boring from the two opposite ends of a tunnel, they are working towards the same goal. The work has already gone a long way and very, very soon the last barriers between the living and the dead will crumble under the attack of patient work and powerful scientific thought “

The law of biogenesis is also currently commonly referred to as: “all life from cells, all cells from cells.” The anti creation view added the following “ it is clear (from the history of life) that the law of biogenesis was it least once violated during a specific time in earth’s history (about 4 ½ billion years ago)

2. DNA and RNA are non living molecules outside living cells. They need a living cell with

functional cellular machinery to decipher and execute the code that they carry. The only exception is in well controlled conditions in laboratories and only by using chemicals that didn't exist on the a-biotic primitive earth (lifeless earth). (example PCR (polymerase chain reaction) used in DNA identification).

According to the present abiogenist theory the replicating molecules had the ability to act as living molecules with the ability to evolve into cells.. The fact that they (the replicators) lost this ability when cells “evolved” doesn't make sense and cast doubt on this hypothesis.

3. Abiogenist is a specified subdivision of the spontaneous generation of life, defined as the spontaneous generation or beginning of a life giving process that occurred during special conditions, during a relative short period in earth's history, with replicating molecules as the starting point.

4 . The fact that the final replicating molecules have lost their functionality to live outside living cells and can be regarded as non living entities outside living cells is , is a scientific method contradiction about the replicating living molecule theory , as the starting point. The living molecules are only alive in living cells.

5. The Press Release announcing the 2015 Nobel Laureates for Chemistry acknowledge that DNA need proofreading and error correction ,without which life would probably be impossible.

According to present theories this implies a type of foreknowledge for replicating molecules that preceded DNA , had to possess. Otherwise how did the proofreading and code correction molecules evolved on a very unstable code copying system?

6. The minimal cell created in the laboratories of the J Craig Venter Institutes laboratories indicated that a cell needs a critical minimum amount of genetic material to be able to survive.
