



Accusations Against Creation Scientists



1. Creation scientists operate from preconceived ideas
2. Creation scientists are biased
3. Creation scientists are dogmatic
4. Creation science is based on myths and legends
5. Creation science is just religion
6. Creation science is pseudo-science
7. Creation science will stifle creative scientific research
8. Creation science will take us back to the dark ages

“We take the side of science in spite of the latent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfil many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.”

Richard Lewontin, “Billions and billions of demons”, *The New York Review*, 9 January, 1997 p:31

“Writers on scientific method usually tell us that scientific discoveries are made ‘inferentially’, that is to say, from putting together many facts. But this is far from being correct. The facts by themselves are never sufficient to lead unequivocally to the really profound discoveries. Facts are always analyzed in terms of the prejudices of the investigator.”

**Sir Fred Hoyle, “Highlights in Astronomy”, W.H. Freeman & Co: San Francisco (USA), 1975
(quoted in CEN, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1998 p:41)**

“Cosmology is unique in science in that it is a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts. The strong tendency is to replace a need for more facts by conformity ...”

H.C. Arp, et al, “The Extragalactic Universe: an alternative View”, Nature, Vol. 346, 1990 p:812

“The greater problem is that modernist science protects its grand theory of evolution by starting with the basic assumption that God is out of the picture and by sticking to that assumption through every discouragement.”

Phillip Johnson, “Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds”, Intersity press: Downers Grove (USA), 1997 p:88-89

“The only thing that he [William Paley][‡] got wrong – admittedly quite a big thing! – was the explanation itself. He gave the traditional religious answer to the riddle, but he articulated it more clearly and convincingly than anybody had before. The true explanation is utterly different, and it had to wait for one of the most revolutionary thinkers of all time, Charles Darwin”.
 What is the truth? — “Natural selection ... which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life ...”

R. Dawkins, “The Blind Watchmaker” (2nd ed), Penguin: London, 1988 p:4 & 5

[‡] W. Paley in his book “Natural Theology on Evidence and Attributes of Deity”, 1818

“Giving the Darwin lecture to one of the biggest audiences of the week, Durant put forward an audacious theory — that Darwin’s evolutionary explanation of the origins of man has been transformed into a modern myth, to the detriment of science and social progress ... Durant concludes that the secular myths of evolution have had “a damaging effect on scientific research”, leading to “distortion, to needless controversy, and to the gross misuse of science”.”

New Scientist, 11/9/80, p:765 – quoting Dr John Durant (University College, Swansea, Wales)

“Evolution is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.”

Prof. Louis Bounoure (Former President of the Biological Society of Strasbourg: Director of the Strasbourg Zoological museum: and later, Director of Research at the French National Centre of Scientific Research) quoted in *The Advocate*, 8/5/84 p:17

“Evolution is not a conclusion drawn from observations. It is an ideology to which observations are applied when convenient and ignored when not.”

Professor Maciej Giertych (M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc.) head of the Genetics Department, Polish Academy of Science, at the Institute of Dendrology, Kornik, Poland – in *CEN*, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1995 p:48

“... presents an insider’s critique of the scientific world-view based upon the sharp but oft-overlooked distinction between scientific truth and scientific faith ... demonstrates that major tenets promulgated in the name of Science are not in fact scientific truths but rather scientific speculations — for which there is no evidence at all.”

In W. Smith, “Cosmos and Transcendence: Breaking Through the Barrier of Scientific Belief”, Tan Books & Pub: Rockford (USA), 1984 p:168

“[M]uch of contemporary cosmology deals with things like inflation and the big bang that have not been directly observed, and probably never will be. Andrej Pacholczyk of the University of Arizona in Tuscon views cosmology as “noncorrespondence science” — based on almost pure speculation.”

Margaret Wertheim, “God of the Quantum Vacuum”, in *New Scientist*, Vol. 156, No. 2102, 1997 p:28-31

“Many ordinary people, reading the works of a single popularizer, believe that the riddle of human origins has been solved. In no case is this true, and all the ideas in print today — including our own — are more or less naked speculation”

John Gribbin & Jeremy Chaerfas, “The Monkey Puzzle”, Bodley Head: London, 1982 p:160

“[I]t is the Christian world which finally gave birth in a clear articulated fashion to the experimental method of science itself ...It began its discoveries and made use of its method in the faith, not the knowledge, that it was dealing with a rational universe controlled by a Creator who did not act upon whim nor inference with the forces He had set in operation. The experimental method succeeded beyond man’s wildest dreams but the faith that brought it into being owes something to the Christian conception of the nature of God. It is surely one of the curious paradoxes of history that science, which professionally has little to do with faith, owes its origins to an act of faith that the universe can be rationally interpreted, and that science today is sustained by that assumption.”

**Loren Eiseley, “Darwin’s Centenary: Evolution and the Men who Discovered it”, Doubleday:
New York, 1961 p:62**

Save Face

“If scientists ever had to retreat on this issue, the cultural consequences could be significant. Persons who now have prestigious status as cultural authorities would be discredited, and the political and moral positions they have advocated might be discredited with them. This is the fear of Michael Ruse, author of *Darwinism Defended*.”

Phillip Johnson (law professor, Berkley University), in J. Buell & V. Hearn (eds.) “Darwinism: Science or Philosophy?”, Foundation for Thought and Ethics: Richardson (Texas), 1994 p:11

Get Rid Of God

“Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear ... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be dead. That’s the end for me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either.”

William B. Provine (Professor of Biological Sciences, Cornell University), *Origins Research*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 1994 p:9