

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.)

The index <http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/list.html#CA000>

This index referral to Creationists claims are not completely honest. The so called evolution verses Creationism debate, is actually atheism verses theism.

PART ONE

The evolution they refer to, should be called "The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory" and most educated Creationists (with a capital C) will have valid scientific doubts about this theory.

The meaning of the word evolution has to be defined before it can be used as an argument against Creationists.

To define the term, the user should first give a history of the etymology of the word evolution.

The Oxford Dictionaries description of the etymology of the word 'evolution':

“ 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).

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 used of the word , it usually refers to change over time. It is also important TO NOTE that it refers to chronological events or observations, events that follow each other in a chronological order..

The creation descriptions in the Judo-Christioan 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 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.

The “creators “ of ““Index to Creationist Claims” are only against the possibility of an intelligent eternal creating entity. They belief in a possible mindless vacuum entity of fluctuating force fields and virtual (nonexisting) “PARTICLES”“, that appears and disappears as a result quantum (force fields) fluctuations .

Their antagonism against an intelligent creator , is a cynic (not a sceptic) belief that it is impossible for such an entity to exists. According to their logic our reality is the product of the mindless interaction between force fields. However our intelligence gave us the ability to manipulate these force fields and that is why you are able to read this post. Mindless creation has the ability to produce intelligent minds able to manipulate the quantum world to their advantage , according to their belief. According to their belief mindless entities can create minds

The ‘Index to Creationist Claims’ will hereafter be referred to as The Index.
(<http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/list.html#CA000>)

Part CA : Claims regarding Philosophy and Theology.

Caution , not all CREATIONISTS will agree with the claims referred to in this section. In this section they mainly refer to claims regarding “creationists” opposition to evolution although the claims they referred to, are claims made against “The Naturalistic Evolution of Life Theory” . (Hereafter referred to as NE) They neglect to realize or are ignorent that many so called “creasionists” are not oppose to the history (evolution) of life on earth but against NE . (Ne that became a religion and called EVOLUTION”) .

CA001 Evolution is the foundation of an immoral world view .

Responses 1-7 answered with counter responses.

1 Incorrect , most creationists will regard NE as completely without morals, if true. If NE is true ,than morals are more the result of human interaction and observation. (the monkey behavior description in the next paragraph. The Christian view is however that the creator provided a moral compass and that deep down most people have some form of inborn moral value.(Hard wired into the the human genetic code unrelated to NE)

2. And 3 : Was it evolution through mutation that created social behavior? Also 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 “ monkey sees , monkey likes monkey does or monkey sees, monkey doesn’t like, monkey doesn’t do” process. Social behavior is a type of intelligent guided evolution and not NE guided.. More a product of intelligence.

4 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

5 and 6 is not at all related to NE. To make it more applicable NE believers should give scientific method support of how to differentiate between design and appearance of design and between common design and common descent. How does NE explain bad morals, definitely not by the arguments used in 5 and 6. Knowledge (science) has no affect on morals, and research and applied scientist are not morally superior to the general population. The use of it as an argument is a wild guess.

7 Response 4 still apply. Christian Creationists shouldn’t judge or demonize others. “Love the sinner but hate the sin. Never hates the sinner” . In my experience it is more the NE proponents that try to demonize Creationists.

Refer to <http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/CA/CA001.html> to see Claim CA001 in the Index.

CA002 Survival of the Fittest Implies Might Makes Right

The article they referred to actually states that according to NE , the strongest in a society decides what is good in society. It states not that MIGHT makes right, but that MIGHT SET and ENFORCE the rules.

The response given by The Index is very vague and not convincing.

Counter response to response 1 : Yes NE is observational, a science comparable to archeology and 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 or the best idea or design in intelligent design.

Counter response to response 2: Really? What about Hitler, Stalin, and other dictators. It stays an unsolved moral question without the New Testament’s moral guide.

Look around , even the human cooperation envisioned in the the creation of the United Nations is a huge failure in bringing about The Index argument that “ 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.” Really ? Human conflict seems to be on the increase and the UN really failed to in establishing universal peace. Human cooperation is also busy gailing the to combat the danger of global warming.

The real sceptic will read at least Lee Strobel’s books and his references with an open mind to answer the morals of might, love and over right.