

Response Paper to the Article:

John Rennie: 15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense

Gabor Por

May 15, 2003
<http://pgabor.com>

ANTHRO1

Section #: 27305

Wednesday 6-9

I understand the scientific logic behind the theory of evolution. I believe that the theory has a lot of truths and despite the big holes in the current knowledge about the timeline and exact details in general it is probably very close to the truth. This article may be accurate in its facts however I didn't appreciate its tone. I found it very "unscientific", not fit for serious essay.

My main problem with the article was how it represented the people who have different opinions on the same topic. I understand that the goal of the article was to persuade and to give verbal munitions to those who wish to discuss the theory of evolution with creationist, but I would have preferred a more respectful language. Let me just list a few words and expression, that in my view are loaded with hatred: starting with the title "nonsense", creationist are "dishonest" who use "outward lies". Although the author is entitled to have his own opinion but using these charged words is not helping to gain sympathy for his cause in my eyes. It would have been more balanced to use more neutral language and focusing only on the logical arguments.

I would also like to point out that Mr. Rennie conveniently chose to argue against those arguments where he felt he has a strong point. He omitted the points of the most successful scientist, Kenneth R. Miller, who attempted to consolidate the theory of evolution with the existence of God. The biology professor a firm believer in evolution and devout Christian wrote a book 4 years ago titled *Finding Darwin's God: A Scientist's Search for Common Ground between God and Evolution*. Although I am not Christian, but I believe in God (and wish not to go into details what kind of God is mine) thus I believe there is a middle ground. Although I haven't read Mr. Miller's book but this article and the reaction it caused in me encourages me to do so. Maybe he has more tolerance toward both sides. Mr. Rennie clearly thinks very little about his opponents, or should I use the term "enemies".

I also found a few logical mistakes and omissions in the article. At one point he mentions that there are no creationist articles mentioned in scientific journals. Then in the next sentence he says that those few that were submitted have been refused. I would be curious how many evolutionist articles were published in religious journals. In other words the playing (or battle) field is different therefore it is unfair to conclude anything from the number of articles published in the “other” side’s publications.

We also see a nice little chart that shows the more years people spend within the framework of organized education, the less likely they would believe the sentence ”God created humans in their present form within the past 10,000 years or so.” He assumes the more educated a person is, the more likely s/he will accept the scientific “truth”. There are two problems with this argumentation. If we consider that creationism is not taught in most schools at most level we could call the long years spent there indoctrination of the opposite. Why should we act surprised then if more and more students turn against creationism under the influence of the system. Mr. Rennie also neglects to account for that even among postgraduate students almost 30% does believe in the sentence above. On a related note he also neglects to mention what percentage of active scientists believe in a Higher Power in form of another. Although I don’t have numbers, but I believe it is rather high.

The adjectives he used for God are the ones that most annoyed me. At one point he called it “unidentified intelligence” and at another one “shadowy entity.” Once again I don’t deny him the right to have his own opinion. However if he tries to think just a little bit with the mind of the people he is attacking he would realize how offending these terms are. For a believer this “intelligence” is not unidentified, but rather live. Yes theologically speaking “knowing” God is a unique, challenging and difficult task. But God is very much identified in some religions

anthropomorphic in others, not. Also calling God shadowy” while in most monotheistic religions he is identified or often symbolized with light has no other use than to influence the reader’s unconscious toward a negative picture.

It was an interesting experience to read this article and watch my emotions. While technically I learned a lot from it, I also couldn’t avoid noticing how angry and annoyed I became in the process. I wish he would have been driven more by his logic and less by his convictions.