

What are those Evolutionary “Scientists” (Biologists) Up To?

How Philosophy is Subverting Science

David A. Carlson

Cheongshim Graduate School of Theology

Introduction

There is an intense culture war being waged in America, not with bullets but with ideas and values. The outcome of this culture war may very well decide the fate of Western civilization, if not the entire world, as we know it. Most people who keep up with current events have most likely heard of the fight being waged about “gay marriages,” (New Jersey recently passed a law in favor of gay “unions”). Another dimension of the culture war, just as epic, is the controversy now being waged concerning “evolution” versus “creation” or “design.” Evolutionary biologists are asserting evolution as a scientific fact capable of explaining about the origin of life on this planet, whereas other people, especially those who hold to some religious belief, are contending that creation by a Creator God or a Designer is the real source of living things on this planet. This paper is an attempt to address this controversy and some of its ramifications, and to come to terms with it.

My Academic Studies (in Biology) in the 1960s

When I was a college student back in the 1960s my major field of study was biology. I had grown up on a farm in Colorado, next to Colorado Springs and located near the foot of Pikes Peak, and experienced life in an incredibly beautiful environment.

It was somewhat natural for me to pursue the biological sciences in my studies, and that is what I did. Attending the University of Colorado in Boulder as a biology major, I studied the various biological sciences: bacteriology, chemistry, ecology, environmental biology, immunology, molecular genetics, organismic biology, physiology, zoology, and so on. My general chemistry and biological textbooks all contained the most up-to-date knowledge and scientific discoveries of the day. In chemistry I studied

inorganic chemistry and orbital theory, and organic and biological chemistry which fascinated me. In biology I studied such subjects as physiology, genetics, ecology, microbiology, and cell physiology. I also studied the fossil record, Darwin's finches, peppered moths, Haeckel's embryos, fruit flies, etc. In cell physiology I studied about DNA and RNA and protein synthesis. It was all quite fascinating to me and I held science in very high regard, respecting the dedication of the scientists to discovering the truth and the profound knowledge they were bringing to light for such eager students as myself.

There was a lot of overlap between these courses and, of course, in the background of all these fields of learning was the evolutionary viewpoint. Everything had "evolved" to what it was at the present time through a long process, and we were learning the secrets of this process, little by little. I was generally fascinated by everything I read. Most of the college textbooks I read included concepts, theories, and fragments of evidence on the evolutionary theory. I pretty much believed what my textbooks stated since I had no real reason to think or believe otherwise, no reason to believe that the "facts" were anything other than just as they were stated in the textbooks. After all, it was all "science" and therefore, scientific truth. If we did not know the complete picture about something, I had the (naïve) scientific faith that it was because we simply had not yet uncovered all the pertinent facts we would need to have a complete and true understanding.

When I had a "lab" in connection with one of my science classes, I was able to do some "hands on" work and carry out various experiments, thus "discovering" for myself some of the phenomena I read about in the texts. I truly enjoyed studying biology, and about science in general, and felt I was learning a lot about the workings of the natural world around me, and especially about the human body. I held science in very high regard, and felt secure in the scientific method, as I understood it.

My professors all seemed to be quite knowledgeable and presented their lectures very systematically (even though they may not have always been completely clear), and I enjoyed studying science. I knew many of my professors personally and knew them to be, overall, people of integrity and sincerity.

I had a healthy respect for science and for scientists. I believed the scientific method was such that it did lead us to truth. After all, it was "science," and science had been a trusted mode of investigation ever since the Renaissance. One would formulate a hypothesis and test it through experiment and, based on the results, one would go back and check their theory again. Thus, little by little, we were acquiring the truth about the universe, and doing so in a near infallible manner. Logically, it was just a matter of time

before we knew everything about the world in which we lived.

I did not have a significant interest in philosophy at this time because I was tentatively planning on a pre-medical career. I do recall reading such books as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, and thinking vaguely about the impact of science on our life, but my philosophical leanings did not go much further than that.

In the intervening 30-40 years, I have come to realize that, although the scientific endeavor itself still has integrity, some of its practitioners are apparently not as honest as one would hope. In this paper, I would like to explain what I mean by this, and why I have changed my views regarding the practice of science. In fact, it seems to me that the "scientific" enterprise has been, in some respects (and I will describe them in this paper) completely subverted by a philosophical agenda that is anything but a well-meaning search for truth. Let me give some background on this.

A Philosophical Interlude

In the early 1970s, my academic life was suddenly interrupted with my induction into the United States Army (I was "drafted"). My life from this point took a quite different direction than it had previously. I spent a full two years away from any serious scientific study. I did not "keep current." From the little study I was able to do, and from media reports on scientific breakthroughs, it seemed to me that, although the basic fundamentals were still the same, a good deal of what I had learned in college was out-dated. Such advances stimulated my desire to renew my study of some of the fields I had enjoyed earlier. During that time, however, as the end result of a long process including religious reflection and self-examination, I underwent a profound spiritual transformation; my values changed and, without completely giving up on my science interests, I began to focus more directly on philosophy and the philosophy of religion. At that time, I personally experienced no profound contradiction between my faith in God (which I had always had) and the sciences I had studied earlier. That is probably because I was too philosophically naïve to realize that most scholars did recognize certain differences (whether or not they were correct in this "recognition" is another matter).

The Two Fields of Science and Religion, and a Philosophy to Unite Them

I continued to maintain my interest both in science, and in the purity and integrity of scientific research and endeavor. I experienced no serious conflict between

science, which I had so much enjoyed, and religious faith, which had now become of such great importance in my life. In fact, the Unification Principle and Unification Thought (1), as I was coming to understand them, expressly held that religion and science, seeking internal and external truths, respectively, should be united in their one integrated undertaking in the pursuit of Truth. (2) I personally had no problem with this. In fact, I liked the idea a lot. It resonated with my own personal experience of the unity between the sciences I had been studying, and religion, that is, my faith in God. I was especially impressed with Unification Thought and its coherent ontological perspective: subject and object and give and receive action; internal nature and external form; the order, hierarchy, multiplicity, and beauty of the creation; and the idea that just as human beings conceive, design, and create “things,” so, too, the entire creation was of one “grand design.”

I was especially impressed with some of Father Moon’s teachings on evolution. In the 천성경 (Cheon Seong Gyung), which is a new, authoritative text on Unification teaching, a full twenty-three pages (Book 11, Chapter 1, Section 4, pp. 1,675-1,698) is spent on Father Moon’s comments regarding Darwinism and the theory of evolution. Father Moon is an electrical engineer by training, so he knows much about science, but he nevertheless takes a decidedly spiritual perspective on things. Concerning Darwin’s theory of evolution (Darwinism), he emphasizes the following:

- 1) Everything was created in a pair system, and this is inviolable.
- 2) There are countless “gates of love” (male and female) that exist between the level of the amoeba and that of the monkey. Each species develops in its own line and it is wrong to conceive of any species as developing by passing upward through a different gate other than its own. Species don’t “evolve” into new species: pairs multiply after their kind.
- 3) The distinction between species is very strict and cannot be crossed.
- 4) Monkeys and human beings are different at the roots.
- 5) Outside energy must be supplied in order for any new species to appear; and this energy (and purpose, and plan) is supplied by the Creator.

Did the Theory of Evolution “Evolve” over the Years Since I Studied It in College?

I was especially satisfied, intellectually, with Unification Thought, which set forth a vision able to account for the phenomenological perspective of growth and development, as it is described by evolution theory. That is to say, within certain parameters “evolution” could be accounted for, although design and creation by God

now outweighed, in my mind, the notion that human beings descended strictly from the higher animals, with no further considerations. I had imagined that science, as it developed, would more and more come to the realization of the “truth,” about reality, and thus it would have developed a more comprehensive perspective which would allow it to explain many things in resonance with what I had been learning from religion and philosophy. After all, much of what I had learned about molecular biology in the 1960s had become very out-dated since more scientific discoveries had been made in the interim period, and much of what I had learned in college was very old-fashioned; people seemed to understand things much more deeply now, and in greater detail. I was sure that biology had advanced considerably. Scientists had mapped out entire genomes or gene sequences and were speaking of the possibility of genetically solving some of our major diseases. I assumed that all the sciences were similarly developing as they came increasingly to find the “truth.” Little did I realize the surprise that awaited me.

Evolutionary Theory Seems Stubborn (It Appears to be “Fossilized”)

I focused my study on religion and philosophy for a number of years, virtually leaving the study of science and physiology aside. But, as I have gradually begun (in the past 3-4 years) the process of looking back at the sciences I used to study, becoming aware of the present state of science today, especially what people are thinking about evolutionary theory, and so on, I discovered that not much had changed.

You may imagine my shock when I came to the realization that evolutionary theory, rather than discovering more and more deeply the “truth” about the mechanism which enabled human beings to come to exist as they do, on this planet, and so developing their own (“evolutionary”) ideas just as new ideas were coming to the fore in, say, molecular biology and ideas about DNA, was apparently still holding to the exact same concepts and tenets that it had always held to. It seemed almost as if there had been no new scientific “truth” discovered in the intervening years, since I left my study of science behind!

I found this hard to believe, since the scientific method was something which enabled our knowledge about the world to continually develop as more knowledge was discovered; it was not a “static” enterprise. Surely with the advance of scientific knowledge in virtually all fields of science, evolutionary theory, itself, should have become more sophisticated, and more up to date. Surely, new and more sophisticated findings in other fields of science would have influenced the thought of evolutionary biologists! But, in fact, it seemed to me that their thinking had not changed at all.

Personally, I could no longer believe in evolution as it had been taught to me, specifically, the understanding that human beings strictly evolved from the apes, and that there was nothing else to say about it. I could not help but wonder why evolutionary thought had not developed more than it had. Surely, new scientific facts had been discovered? Surely new light was being shed on old problems? It was known even when I was in college in the 1960s, for example, that scientists at the time of Darwin had not been aware of just how complex living things really were. Surely, new research had been done which illuminated previously vague and tentative theories, making them much more insightful and inclusive of new understanding, solving some of the long-standing problems and issues? Surely, something had been found to close some, at least, of the “gaps” that were so well-known, especially in evolutionary theory?

Insight Comes

About this time, I received (from the author, a friend) a copy of Jonathan Wells’ book *The Icons of Evolution*. (3) I read this book with great interest, and considerable astonishment. I read it with great interest because I was renewing some of my earlier love for science and scientific exploration, for scientific fact and discovery, for scientific thinking itself. But I also read with great astonishment what was being said to me. I could not fault Wells’ research, and as I followed his arguments, what he said came as a great shock to me. I had little reason to doubt what he said. In fact, I found his arguments very convincing. As I reflected on it, I found it hard to believe how evolutionary biologists were seemingly holding, apparently, to “proven” falsehoods, continuing to present them as “true,” while yet presenting what they were doing as genuine science. I was especially shocked because these “falsehoods” were the same ideas (“truths”) that I had studied years earlier in college, and which I had (then) taken on face value. I resonated with his opening reflection: “I believed almost everything I read in my textbooks. I knew that the books contained a few misprints and minor factual errors...but I thought that most of what I was being taught was substantially true.” (4). But he later states (which I also resonate with):

What about scientists who knowingly make false utterances or misleading omissions but believe the overall effect is not misleading because they are teaching “a deeper truth”? Does the commitment to a supposed deeper truth

excuse conscious misrepresentation? (5)

Wells' arguments were logical, and the evidence he presented, to my mind, was irrefutable. Perhaps it was just that I simply wanted to believe? Perhaps he was just an eccentric scholar? These were legitimate doubts, but as I reflected on the matter, I realized that no, I truly agreed with the things he said. I certainly could not refute his evidence. My perspective was reinforced when I later also happened to read Ann Coulter's book, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism*. (6) I enjoy reading books by Ann Coulter. She writes with wit and humor. In this book, Coulter spends the last four chapters (pp 199–281) discussing evolutionary theory. She begins by describing the nature of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution

which is about one notch above Scientology in scientific rigor.
It's a make-believe story, based on a theory that is a tautology,
with no proof in the scientist's laboratory or the fossil record—
and that's after 150 years of very determined looking. We wouldn't
still be talking about it but for the fact that liberals think evolution
disproves God. (7)

Coulter is not a scientist of the stature of Dr. Wells, but, overlooking her writing style, I could easily accept much of what she was saying. I have come to trust conservative writers/scholars to a certain degree because much of what they write resonates with my own experience, which is my touchstone, and I believe they write with an honest motivation. Although Coulter has been assailed by liberal thinkers in the media, I agree with much of what she writes. There is still no real proof about certain things (there are still gaps and speculations, just as there were when I was in college; and 150 years is a very long time to have to wait without seeing any real progress. I only waited 25 years or so). Indeed, I sometimes wonder about the motivation of those who attack her. Different people hold to very different values; and some people hold to values which are very different from those I hold. In any case, after I carefully thought through Dr. Coulter's arguments, and, given that she is not a scientist, I still found myself in agreement with what she says. She and Wells, even though their arguments were different in nature, were both on the same page, as far as I was concerned. Two books, from different perspective, both resonated with my heart, not to mention my intellectual horizon, thus confirming me in my new-found concern about the "doings" of the evolutionary biologists. Eventually, I came to realize that, as far as the evolutionary

biologists were concerned, I was dealing with some very significant ethical and moral issues, issues which affect more than just the way science is done. I could not help but wonder what these evolutionary biologists were up to?

What are these “Scientists” Doing?

More and more I came to question the attitudes, and then the motivation, of the evolutionary biologists. When faced with what seemed to me convincing and, yes, conclusive evidence to the contrary, they stubbornly resisted and continued to hold to their “pseudo-science” (Coulter’s term) (8), or their “dogmatism,” (Wells’ term) (9). I was dismayed to think that these “scientists” actually seemed to be acting contrary to the enshrined axioms of science and scientific investigation, indeed, violating the very scientific method itself. Coulter relates the following:

We begin with a story from the late Colin Patterson, respected paleontologist at the Natural History Museum in London. Like Diogenes searching for one honest man, Patterson was on a quest to find someone who could tell him—as he puts it—“anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing that you think is true.” Patterson said, “I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History, and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious Body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time.” (10)

There is something seriously discomfiting here. Science is a search for “truth” is it not? If evolutionary biologists, who are supposed to be scientists, can’t even come up with one “true” thing, but are nevertheless advocating evolution as true, are they acting against the enshrined axioms of scientific investigation, indeed, violating the very scientific method itself? I have also read some of Thomas Kuhn’s *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (11) and I found myself wondering what the evolutionary biologists were doing when seen in the context of that particular perspective. Why, when it seems so obvious that we stand in need of a new “paradigm,” are the evolutionary biologists resisting so vehemently? The more I read and reflect, the more I realize that certain evolutionary biologists are, indeed, stubbornly holding to concepts

and paradigms which should have been given up long ago because new facts have come to light which give deeper insight into what we earlier understood, so that now we understand things better. Whereas physicists still seemed to be sincerely seeking the truth of reality, and making important new discoveries, it seemed to me that certain evolutionary biologists were doing anything but.

Both Wells and Coulter make the point that it has now come beyond pure science, the science which I had come to love in college, to the point of “philosophy” and I realized with considerable concern that they were correct. Coulter makes the point that what they are doing is actually “pseudo-science:

The great philosopher of science Karl Popper said any theory that cannot conceivably be refuted is not science. The very fact that it is nondisprovable is an “immunizing stratagem,” distinguishing pseudo-science from real science. Either there is no evidence that could possibly disprove Darwin’s theory of evolution—or it has been disproved for about half a century. So it’s possible that Darwin produced an actual scientific theory, but his disciples have turned it into a pseudo-science by their refusal to admit it can be—and has been—disproved. (12)

Certain evolutionary biologists (not all of them, of course), rather than being true scientists, and seeking genuine scientific truth, were more and more pushing a particular “philosophical viewpoint,” that is to say, materialism. They were betraying the very field which they represented. Consider the following:

The only religious belief driving opinions about evolution is atheism. God can do anything, including evolution. But the value of Darwinism for atheists is that it is the only way they can explain why we are here. (It’s an accident!)...Harvard population biologist Richard Lewontin said, “[T]he tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories” of evolution and its willingness to accept “the patent absurdity of some of its constructs” flowed from the scientists’ prior commitment to materialism.” (13)

These scientists continue to hold to what I now can see is a materialistic viewpoint, along with a rejection of any possible Divine activity, and it is this viewpoint

which guides their thinking. The reason they were doing this, it seemed to me, was that they were clearly antagonistic to religion, and especially to any idea that there might exist a Creator Who created everything. Now, it is true that a genuine scientist, following the scientific method in the search for truth, cannot just bring in a “God of the gaps” wherever it seems convenient in order to explain things. Science is science. Moreover, as Wells says: “To a true scientist, nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evidence.” (14) In this case, however, the evidence seems to be against the evolutionary biologists. This does not mean that scientists are necessarily atheists. Even a great scientist like Einstein (the paradigmatic scientist), was humble enough to follow where his research led him.

George Greenstein, also a physicist, wrote a fascinating book entitled *The Symbiotic Universe: Life and Mind in the Cosmos*. (15) In this book he summarizes some remarkable mathematical coincidences, all of which point to the fact that the cosmos, the universe, exists and operates as if it were designed, that is to say, in such a way that some type of “design” theory was the most plausible explanation for the existence of the universe. As a physicist, he disclaimed any theory of “God,” as being unscientific, but, interestingly, he does raise the question. He states:

As we survey all the evidence, the thought insistently arises that some supernatural agency—or, rather, Agency—must be involved. Is it possible that suddenly, without intending to, we have stumbled upon scientific proof of the existence of a Supreme Being? Was it God who stepped in and so providentially crafted the cosmos for our benefit? Do we not see in its harmony, a harmony so perfectly fitted to our needs, evidence of what one religious writer has called “a preserving, a continuing, an intending mind; a Wisdom, Power, and Goodness far exceeding the limits of our thoughts?”

A heady prospect. Unfortunately I believe it to be Illusory...I believe that the discoveries of science are not capable of Proving God’s existence—not now, not ever...God is not an explanation. (16)

This seems fair, since we cannot see God under a microscope, and that is the nature of science, and the scientific method. The scientific method cannot just pull in a “God of the gaps” whenever there is something we can’t explain. But, I am impressed by his honesty in even raising the question. That is more than the evolutionary biologists are

doing. Again, he states:

It was not for some time that I was able to place my finger on the source of my discomfort. It arises, I understand now, because the contention that we owe our existence to a stupendous series of coincidences strikes a responsive chord. That contention is far too close for comfort to notions such as:

We are the center of the universe.

God loves mankind more than all other creatures.

The cosmos is watching over us.

The universe has a plan; we are essential to that plan. (17)

I appreciate his honesty. He seems, from what he writes, to be an excellent physicist, and writer, being able to explain, to a layperson like myself, complicated physics concepts very clearly in his book, and yet honest enough to express some wonder at what were truly extraordinary “coincidences.” To me this is scientifically acceptable. In contrast, I could not help but wonder about the evolutionary biologists. Faced as they were with considerable evidence (one might almost want to say “overwhelming” evidence) to the contrary, they were, stubbornly, it seemed, continuing to hold to “facts” and “theories” which seemed to have been found to be inadequate at best and false at worst. As Wells states: “Of course, research—even research on evolution—is not a bad thing. But as we saw in several of the icons of evolution, data are frequently claimed to support evolutionary theory even when they contradict it.” (18)

I want to make reference to one other comment, this one from a quantum physicist. Richard Lewis, in his interesting book on quantum physics, states the following. I quote him at some length:

Classical evolution then is definitely assailed from below by the quantum probability revolution in physics. It is also under attack from above, for classical concepts lead us to expect life to be highly, highly improbable. In classical science, a construct as sophisticated as a living cell is highly unlikely. As Fred Hoyle put it, the emergence of living systems is about as likely in classical physics as a hurricane sweeping through a junk yard assembling a fully-functional Jumbo Jet from the bits

and pieces scattered around there.

Just as the chance of junk colliding in just the right way to form A fuselage is small, so, in classical physics, is the chance that atoms and molecules will congregate in just the right way to form cells, organelles, tissues, etc.

This view of evolution permeates all of biology, all of genetics, all of the brain sciences.

“Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution,” is a sentiment embraced by most biologists. The classical science system put such great emphasis on fighting off a teleological explanation of evolution—that there is a purpose and a plan behind the origin of species—that biologists have gone to the opposite extreme and adopted the concept that there is no underlying organizing factor to evolution....

The chance of even one specific protein being formed out of free amino acids is of the order 1 in 10^{300} , while the odds of proteins etc. coming together to randomly form a simple bacterium are on the order of 1 in 10^{34} million). Events with such odds against them could never be expected to happen in our universe that is only 10^{17} seconds old. (parentheses mine (19)

If I am reading Lewis correctly (and he confirmed to me that I was), this kind of assemblage simply could not happen in our universe. And yet this is the very kind of thing that evolutionary biologists would have us believe happened!

One final perspective is from a “believing scientist” named Frances Collins. He wrote a book entitled *The Language of God*. On the cover there is an image of the double helix structure of DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid), and the book directly addresses the issue of the unity between science and religion, an issue which he, apparently, has little trouble with: he is both a believer and a scientist. I was not able to read this book prior to this paper going into print, so I cannot completely vouch for its credibility, but it sounds interesting, and it certainly seems relevant to the discussion. According to the book promotionals on the internet, Collins argues that “human are unique in ways that defy evolutionary explanation—clear evidence of God’s existence.”

Given such thoughts as the above, I could not help wondering why these

evolutionary biologists would continue to insist on pushing what comes down to a “materialism”? “Whatever one may think of materialistic philosophy, there is no doubt that it is being imposed on the evidence rather than inferred from it.” (20) What could be the purpose of such unscientific activity? What do the evolutionary biologists hope to gain by such a stance?

What Are the Evolutionary Biologists Up To?

More and more I came to question the motivation of the evolutionary biologists. The facts seem to speak for themselves. These “scientists” seem to be antagonistic to truth. They seem to be deliberately and blatantly pushing a particular philosophy, that is to say, materialism. In the face of data which have virtually been proven to be faulty, wrong, or in error, why do certain evolutionary biologists continue to promote the Darwinian theory of evolution as factual science? Are they scientists ignorant? Are they antagonistic to the truth? Are they deliberately excluding any notion of a Creator? Do they think evolution disproves God? Why would they do such a thing? One motive I can imagine is that they are truly antagonistic to religion, to spirituality, to truth, and ultimately to God. But, Einstein was open to the God question, and no one questions his scientific credentials. Why are the Evolutionary Biologists not of the same spirit? They seem to be philosophically opposed to any conceivable notion that a Creator might be behind things in some way, even if such opposition violates the principles of science. Honestly speaking, I cannot understand it. What do they think they have to lose, if the theory of evolution proves to need revision? Scientific theories have always faced revisions as time passed, and as new data were discovered. I am sure these people are reputable scientists, otherwise. They are recognized scholars, they write books, they make money, they teach in universities and other educational institutions. So, why do they insist on advocating a materialistic theory? I can only think that the most ethical of them genuinely do not believe that there is any better theory available to explain life, the emergence of human beings, etc. They believe that science has all the answers. Unfortunately, it may be that those evolutionary biologists of a less ethical bent, are deliberately, even maliciously, pushing materialism. And of course some of them may have more immediate or practical motives. Wells comments, concerning the speakers at a conference he attended:

One of the speakers began her talk with some jokes about the obligatory confessions of faith in Darwinism that are expected

of speakers at scientific conferences. She went on to explain that DNA sequences do not even uniquely determine the sequence of amino acids in proteins, much less the larger features of cells or embryos. During the question-and-answer session that followed, a participant pointed out that most biologists already know this. She asked: "Then who don't they say so publicly?" The participant responded that it would "reduce their chances of getting money." (21)

In any case, those individuals pushing evolution need to be more humble before the pure scientific method. That is their ethical problem. But, even worse, and this is perhaps far more serious, is the impact they are having on our children, that is, our high school students. Wells points out that "Dogmatic defenders of Darwinian evolution control not only most American universities, but they also wield enormous power over most public school systems." (22) These unethical scientists are having a deleterious influence on the minds, beliefs, attitudes and standards of behavior of our children. Just as atheistic, materialistic Marxism resulted in the physical death of millions of people, atheistic, materialistic evolutionism may result in the spiritual/mental/moral "death" or "dumbing-down" of many high school students.

The Real Damage: High School Students Who are "Forced" to Learn Evolution

High school students study the theory of evolution, taught as scientific fact. My own children, four of whom have graduated from high school, and one of whom will soon graduate, all read their biology texts, and all of them encountered the evolution issue. In all cases, the theory of evolution was taught, along with its "supporting evidence," as so well accepted by scientists that it was veritable fact. I have had discussions with my children about evolution. At the same time, any mention of God, design, the Bible or creationism is often not allowed in the classroom. This means that a materialistic philosophy is being "pushed" down their throats. This is not an appropriate method of high school education. Admittedly, the theory of creationism, or a design theory, does not presently have the same sophistication as science, but that is not an appropriate reason to exclude it from the discussion. At minimum, high school students should be presented with both sides of such an important issue, so that they can be free to make up their own minds about the matter. They should at least be educated to realize not only that much of what they are being taught about evolution is wrong, as Wells has shown, but also that there are other points of view. Evolutionary biologists

should teach our students properly. This is their ethical and moral responsibility. If they knowingly teach pseudo-science as fact, and especially if they continue to do so, even after realizing that it is not true science, they must be held accountable for this, because they are influencing their students, our children, and this is a real problem. Ann Coulter speaks of the matter in this way:

The most fanatical defenders of evolution are not Harvard professors, curators at the American Museum of Natural History, or *Times* science reporters. They are cretinous high school biology teachers and liberal know-nothings trying to relive their fantasy of the Scopes trial. (23)

Especially for this reason, the fact that high school students are exposed to evolutionary biology in the course of their studies, evolutionary biologists should be concerned with “truth” and teaching our children the truth. If a theory or fact is found to be wanting, or even false, then that is an extremely important issue to bring to the attention of high school students. The average high school student is not stupid; let them make up their own minds, after hearing the evidence. Wells’ book highlights several points which would be relevant to this category. My favorite is the famous “peppered moth” (24) experiment used by researchers to promote “natural selection.” I remember studying about this moth when I was in college and so I was surprised to learn that this was actually a fake. According to Wells moths were even glued on to the tree! This kind of thing should definitely be brought to the attention of high school students. The “moth evidence” should not continue to be taught as “truth,” and as “evidence” for evolution, as it has been for so long. Ann Coulter states:

The only evidence for Darwin’s theory of evolution is fake evidence, and every time Darwinians are caught hawking fake “proof,” they complain that it’s merely a gap in the theory. The Darwinians play a shell game with the evidence, but the evidence is never under any of the shells. The point isn’t that schoolchildren should be “taught the controversy”—schoolchildren should be taught the truth. (25)

Coulter goes on to itemize several points which illustrate those “truths” which make evolutionary biologists very uncomfortable. Since Evolutionary Biologists seemingly are ignoring the truth, and continuing to teach pseudo-science to the students, one

absolutely must ask why? What is their motivation for continuing to hold to falsehoods? Why do they not teach our children the truth? Are they intent upon retaining their money, influence, power, prestige? What will they lose if they humble themselves and admit that evolution has flaws? The fact that they insist on retaining pseudo-science is a vivid reflection on their character and their integrity as human beings, not to mention scientists.

Unification Thought sets forth a credible theory of education, addressing especially the philosophy of education. (26) The evolutionary biologists (EBs) in question are violating all points of an “ideal” education. In brief, Unification Thought asserts that the first and primary goal of education is to nurture a student’s character, personality and integrity, that is, to empower the person to become a “good” person. Instead, the EBs are denying the spiritual nature with their materialism and encouraging the students to learn wrongly. The second goal of education is then to nurture a student’s social skills and interpersonal life, so that a person can get along well with many kinds of people. Instead, the EBs are nurturing materialistically thinking students, again negating the spiritual dimension. Finally, the third goal of education is to convey facts (truth) and knowledge so that a person can become skilled and knowledgeable. Instead, the EBs are apparently teaching falsehoods to their students. It is simply wrong to teach material that is known to be false or erroneous. This means that a teacher must be a person of unquestioned integrity. The teacher must truly care for the student, and teach their specialty with sincerity and expertise, seeking to nurture the student’s personality and character. From this perspective, evolutionary biologists are violating some of the most important aspects of education. The effects of such a method may have serious consequences in the future. Even beyond these points, however, the EBs are contributing negatively to the culture war, and ultimately are serving as an actual hindrance to the proper and appropriate development of science. This makes it even more difficult to achieve any sense of unity in the sciences, much less a unity between science and religion, and ultimately achieving a more peaceful world.

The Need for a Credible and Coherent Design Theory:
(You can teach evolution, but you can’t talk about God)

I mentioned earlier that any mention of God, design, the Bible, or creationism was not allowed in the classroom in many American schools. For example, Robert Bork writes, with regard to the reading of a Bible:

“Another federal court decided that a school principal was required by the First Amendment to prevent a teacher from reading the Bible silently for his own purposes during a silent reading period. The great danger was that students, who were not shown to know what the teacher was reading, might, if they found out, be influenced by his choice of reading material...The list of these anti-religion decisions is almost endless.” (27)

As I think Ann Coulter might remark about this: Oh, my God! How sinister! The Bible! Now admittedly, creationists (sometimes called “design theorists”) do not have the same intellectual sophistication as many scientists. They can point us to the Bible; they can speak poetically about the elegance of the universe, or even comment on the scientific complexity of the human eye, etc. But these ways of speaking are not, by their very nature, scientific in character and perhaps this highlights the need for a “philosophy of science” discussion to be included, at least in parallel with science courses. Again, design theorists do not have a comprehensive, philosophically sound theory which can adequately explain things in a logical and meaningful manner. They only know that they cannot believe in evolution as long as it teaches that “we came from the monkeys.” What design theorists need is a more substantial intellectual argument in the form of a coherent, even scientific, philosophical view of “design.” Such an argument could contend with any philosophy of science. I believe that that is exactly what we have in Unification Thought. The recent perspective known as the “anthropic principle,” which is nicely summarized in Greensteins’ book *The Symbiotic Universe*, (28) is substantial reinforcement for the viewpoint of Unification Thought. In brief, the Anthropic Principle states that “if some feature of the natural world is required for our existence, then it must indeed be the case.” (29) Again, “The only things that can be known are those compatible with the existence of knowers. That is the Anthropic Principle in its purest form.” (30) This is like saying that the universe exists as “precisely” as it does because it is only as such that it can sustain life. In short, it “almost seems” as if the universe was designed with human beings in mind. As we shall see shortly, this is in complete resonance with Unification Thought. Unification Thought states that:

Only when the significance of God’s creation of human beings and all things has been clarified, can the necessary relationship between human beings and all things become clear.

From the perspective of Unification Thought, human

beings and all things are in the relationship of subject and object. That is to say, the human being is the Lord of dominion over all things, and all things are the objects of joy, objects of beauty, and objects of dominion. (31)

Again,

God's Heart is an irrepressible impulse. It is an irrepressible emotional force and desire that well up from within God. For that reason, an object for God to love was absolutely necessary. That is the very reason why God created the human being and all things. God created the human being as the object of His love; and in order to bring happiness to the human being, God created all things as the objects of the human being. (32)

This still does not answer the question, however, of how a philosophical perspective (a philosophy of science) is to be actually integrated or included into a science curriculum. This is an important issue, but I must leave this question aside for now, and turn to the theory itself.

Unification Thought: A Design Theory Worthy of the Task For Which It is Called

In Unification Thought there is a coherent philosophical and logical explanation as to what the nature of universe is like, how it was designed, how it came to be (how it was created), and how it functions and operates. It includes sections on art, axiology, being, education, epistemology, ethics, and so on. Virtually every question that might be asked about the universal principles of being and existence is implicitly answered in Unification Thought. I believe that Unification Thought can deal intellectually with the fossil record, with peppered moths, and even with Darwin's finches in a meaningful manner. In fact, some of these issues have already been addressed to a certain extent. (33) The reasoning in Unification Thought, given its assumptions, is logical, one might even be tempted to say scientific, and holistic. More importantly, it is testable. Dr. Lee, the author, emphasizes this point, that Unification Thought is a theory meant to be tested, even under the most rigorous scientific conditions. (34) I am confident that Unification Thought will stand up under such rigorous testing. We may never be able to

“see” God “under a microscope,” but Unification Thought, on the assumption that God exists, sets forth a comprehensive philosophical viewpoint that is logical, coherent and, perhaps most importantly, highly explanatory. The Theory of the Original Image and the Theory of Ontology together present a viable philosophical understanding of the universe, life, and how all existing beings function, in accordance with both natural and spiritual law. Many traditional philosophical questions and issues, I believe, can be fundamentally resolved through an understanding of this new viewpoint. Indeed, Unification Thought emphasizes that one of its purposes is to set forth standards, which can solve social problems. Dr. Sang Hun Lee states: “The purpose of Unification Thought is thus to achieve the goal of creating a global family and to realize the everlasting ideal world of God’s true love by solving—fundamentally and once and for all—all the numerous and difficult problems that afflict humankind.” (35)

Even more explicitly, Father Moon says, concerning Unification Thought:

God’s truth is sent to earth as revelation given through certain providential persons. God’s truth is the absolute truth, which is an almighty key capable of solving any problem, no matter how difficult it may be. I have encountered the living God through a lifetime of prayer and meditation, and have been given this absolute truth. Its remarkable contents clarify all the secrets hidden behind the entire universe, behind human life and behind human history. When this truth is applied to society, social problems can be settled, and when this truth is applied to the world, world problems can be realistically solved. And particularly, when applied to critique communist theory, all the falsehoods of communism have been brought to light and a counterproposal to communism has been established. This is a new view of life, a new view of the world, a new view of the universe, and a new view of the providence of history that has never before existed. It is also a principle of integration that can encompass the whole into one unity, while at the same time preserving the individual characteristics of all religious doctrines and philosophies. I have named this truth Unification Thought or Godism. (36)

All that is necessary now is for people to begin taking these standards seriously, and apply in their daily lives the principles set forth in Unification Thought. Interestingly, one of these social problems might be said to be the phenomenon of the evolutionary biologists who seemingly refuse to teach the truth! The only need then, is for people to take the view set forth in Unification Thought, and seriously seek to actualize it. This is where I fault some of the evolutionary biologists. Not only do they not seem to me to be taking their work seriously, and not taking their public responsibility seriously, what is worse, they continue to promulgate erroneous ideas, not just to the general public, but to our own children. That to me is a moral and ethical problem of the highest degree. That makes them fair game for close moral and ethical scrutiny, with public censure, or worse, as a consequence.

In view of the “ambitious” statement by Dr. Moon, quoted above, there exists a tremendous capacity for hope, whether people take it seriously or not. The idea that social problems can and will be solved through this new perspective is very challenging, but if it is the case, there could be no greater basis for hope in our world. At the present time, our world is filled with violence, conflict and tension. As this sentence is being written, the world is uneasy about the nuclear issues now emerging in North Korea and other places around the world. (37) There are other reasons for major concern as well, on various moral and ethical issues. (38) There could seemingly be no better time for such a viewpoint as Unification Thought to appear, especially if it holds the promise of fundamentally being able to solve real problems.

What is needed now are those persons dedicated enough, and serious enough, to put its precepts into practice. This is the only “missing link.” Since it takes into account the creation of the universe, it treats the reality of natural law. Because of this, Unification Thought is able to bring all of the sciences together in one integrated vision. Thus, it supports science in the long run. It can illuminate the paths science might most profitably take, and the areas in which the most fruitful research and investigation might be carried out. It not only holds forth the promise of integrating science and religion (theology), but it presents a vision as to how the various sciences might be understood to function as one comprehensive system. Science always asks the “how” question, but cannot adequately address the “why” question. To ask “why” means that we are seeking some sense of “purpose” and questions of purpose lie more in the realm of philosophy. Thus, Unification Thought, as a new philosophical system, can effectively not only bring science together with theology; it also has the conceptual ability to unite the various sciences as a holistic field (as evidenced in the ICUS Conferences of a few years ago).

It is already bringing the religions together: Father Moon states: “In the Middle East, one of the world’s tinderboxes, Jews, Christians, and Muslims have found the resources in my philosophy of peace to engage in a new dimension of dialogue.” (39) The task remaining is for scientists from the various disciplines to talk with one another and actually bring their different fields together in cooperation. This was done at a foundational level through the various ICUS conferences sponsored by Rev. Moon a number of years ago.

Unification Thought also sets forth a theory of the original human nature. It states clearly a standard for human behavior. Evolutionary scientists need to be humble, and continue their search, according to the time-honored scientific method, for the real truth. If evolutionary theory (and it is just a theory) stands in need of revision, because it does not fit the facts, then evolutionary scientists need to pursue a revised theory which does fit the facts. This may perhaps be a time when philosophy sets the agenda for science, that is to say, philosophy cannot dictate to science, but it can show it the paths and areas of most fruitful research and investigation. If human beings did not evolve from the animals, as evolutionary biologists hold, then what is the truth about human beings? Here Unification Thought has a logical and rational answer: The Theory of Original Human Nature. It sets forth a design theory worthy of the task. If one looks at physicists, one finds Einstein saying “all I want to know is the mind of God, all the rest is footnotes;” (40) and George Greenstein’s *The Symbiotic Universe*. Here is a physicist speaking about various mathematical coincidences. He even raises the God issue. These realities can easily be accounted for by Unification Thought, and its design theory.

What Does the Future Hold?

It can only be hoped that evolutionary scientists will be able to come to be comfortable with the fact that there might be a Designer, and although they cannot see God under a microscope, and God is still not a tangible part of science, as such, yet they can be humble before the philosophical view that a Designer (God), in fact, designed and created this amazing cosmos, including human beings (including scientists!), and that if, with this attitude, they continue to pursue science as it is meant to be pursued, I believe they will lose nothing. In fact, they will gain a great deal as they continue their research. This will allow the sciences to harmonize one with another, and be united in one comprehensive perspective. Furthermore, scientists will be able to

once again regain the prestige and nobility that great scientists once held. One only need think of Einstein, the paradigm of science, of Newton, of Pasteur, etc. Once science takes its proper position as a balance to values, it can advance our lives tremendously. Divine Principle holds science and religion to be the two spheres of human search for truth. But this search needs to be undertaken in an integrated manner. As Einstein once said, “science without religion is blind, religion without science is crippled.” (41) Both are important, both are necessary, both are important. Both need to be developed to the highest level possible in terms of logic, clarity, and understanding.

Notes:

1. See U.T.I., *New Essentials of Unification Thought Head-Wing Thought*, Tokyo: Kogensha, 2006 and HSA-UWC, *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, New York: HSA-UWC, 1996.
2. HSA-UWC, *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, New York: HSA-UWC, 1996, 6-7.
3. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong*, Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2000.
4. Wells, xi.
5. Wells, 234.
6. Ann Coulter, *Godless: The Church of Liberalism*, New York: Crown Forum, 2006.
7. Coulter, 199.
8. Coulter, 242.
9. Wells, 245.
10. Coulter, 201.
11. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Sec. Ed., Enlarged, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
12. Coulter, 242.
13. Coulter, 262.
14. Wells, 248.
15. George Greenstein, *The Symbiotic Universe: Life and Mind in the Cosmos*, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1988.
16. Greenstein, 27.
17. Greenstein, 26.
18. Wells, 241.
19. Richard Llewellyn Lewis, *Do Proteins Teleport in an RNA World?*, New York: ICUS, 2005, 156-58.

20. Wells, 207.
21. Wells, 192-3.
22. Wells, 237.
23. Coulter, 255.
24. Wells, 137f.
25. Coulter, 243.
26. See the Theory of Education in U.T.I., *New Essentials*, 241-277.
27. Robert H. Bork, *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline*, New York: HarperCollins, Regan Books, 2003, 290.
28. Greenstein, 58-9.
29. Greenstein, 46.
30. Greenstein, 47.
31. U.T.I., *Essentials of Unification Thought: The Head-Wing Thought*, Tokyo: U.T.I., 1992, 318.
32. U.T.I., *Essentials*, 17.
33. U.T.I., *From Evolution Theory to a New Creation Theory: Errors in Darwinism and a Proposal from Unification Thought*, Tokyo: Kogensha, 1996.
34. U.T.I., *New Essentials*, 559f.
35. U.T.I., *New Essentials*, x.
36. Sang Hun Lee, *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought*, Tokyo: U.T.I., 1987, 28.
37. On the nuclear issue see Jerome R. Corsi, *Atomic Iran: How the Terrorist Regime Bought the Bomb and American Politicians*, Nashville: WND Books, 2005; Richard A. Clarke, *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror*, New York: Free Press, 2004; and Michael O'Hanlon and Mike Mochizuki, *Crisis on the Korean Peninsula: How to Deal with a Nuclear North Korea*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
38. On the moral and ethical issues see Sean Hannity, *Deliver Us From Evil: Defeating Terrorism, Despotism, and Liberalism*, New York: Regan Books; Zell Miller, *A Deficit of Decency*, Macon, Georgia: Stroud and Hall, 2005; and Mona Charen, *Do-Gooders: How Liberals Hurt Those They Claim to Help (and the Rest of Us)*, New York: Penguin, Sentinel, 2004.
39. Rev. Dr. Sun Myung Moon, *God's Ideal Family: The Model for World Peace*, inaugural address given by Father Moon in commemoration of the founding of the Universal Peace Federation, 2006, 6.
40. Unknown source

41. Unknown source

References Cited:

- Bork, Robert H. *Slouching Towards Gomorrah*, New York: HarperCollins, Regan Books, 2003.
- Charen, Mona. *Do-Gooders: How Liberals Hurt Those They Claim to Help (and the Rest of Us)*, New York: Penguin, Sentinel, 2004.
- Clarke, Richard A. *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror*, New York: Free Press, 2004.
- Corsi, Jerome R. *Atomic Iran: How the Terrorist Regime Bought the Bomb and American Politicians*, Nashville: WND Books, 2005
- Coulter, Ann. *Godless: The Church of Liberalism*, New York: Crown Forum, 2006.
- FFWPU, 천성경 (Cheon Seong Gyung in English), Seoul, Korea: FFWPU, 2006.
- Greenstein, George. *The Symbiotic Universe*, New York: William Morrow and Co., 1988.
- Hannity, Sean. *Deliver Us From Evil: Defeating Terrorism, Despotism, and Liberalism*, New York: Regan Books, 2004.
- HSA-UWC. *Exposition of the Divine Principle*, New York: HSA-UWC, 1996.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2d Ed., Enlarged, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Lewis, Richard Llewellyn. *Do Proteins Teleport in an RNA World?*, New: ICUS, 2005.
- Miller, Zell. *A Deficit of Decency*, Macon, Georgia: Stroud and Hall, 2005.
- Moon, Rev. Dr. Sun Myung. God's Ideal Family: The Model for World Peace, inaugural address given by Father Moon in commemoration of the founding of the Universal Peace Federation, 2006.
- O'Hanlon, Michael and Mochizuki, Mike. *Crisis on the Korean Peninsula: How to Deal with a Nuclear North Korea*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Unification Thought Institute. *Essentials of Unification Thought*, Tokyo: UTI, 1992.
- Unification Thought Institute. *From Evolution Theory to a New Creation Theory*, Tokyo: Kogensha, 1996.
- Unification Thought Institute. *The New Cultural Revolution and Unification Thought*, Tokyo: UTI, 1987.
- Unification Thought Institute. *New Essentials of Unification Thought*, Tokyo: Kogensha, 2006.
- Wells, Jonathan. *The Icons of Evolution*, Washington, DC: Regnery, 2006.