



Bethany Lutheran Church & Preschool
5051 McCarty Road
Saginaw, MI 48603
www.bethanysaginaw.com
Phone: 989-793-9579

Viewpoints

Observing events in our modern world from the viewpoint of our ascended Savior.

Why Evolutionists Fear Debate ~ February 6, 2014

If evolutionary theory is the truth, why the reluctance to debate it?

[Online Version & Archive](#)

Before it began, an evolutionist predicted that his side would lose the recent [Evolution Vs. Creation debate](#) that garnered national attention. Karl Giberson, Ph. D., lamented in a Huffington Post column that evolutionist Bill Nye was going to lose the debate to Ken Ham. That's right. Dr. Giberson predicted that his own guy, the former "Science Guy" host on PBS, was going to lose to the creationist.

And in the eyes of some evolutionists, the Science Guy indeed failed to win. Here are two.

- *Forbes: a sigh of relief that it was a draw.* "For myself, I was inclined to agree with the scientists skeptical of engaging at all in this particular forum. But in the long run, I think scientists need to constantly engage doubters—and indeed to be willing to come to their turf. And Nye did himself a lot of credit with his performance."
- *US News' The Daily Beast: the bemoaning of a wipeout.* "In a much-hyped showdown, 'the Science Guy' tried to defend evolution against creationist Ken Ham, and proved how slick science-deniers can be. How did the guy who's right go so wrong...? [Possibly] Nye is clueless—that, for all his skill as a science communicator, Nye has less political acumen than your average wombat... After watching the debate, I'm leaning toward [this] possibility. Last night, it was easy to pick out the smarter man on the stage. Oddly, it was the same man who was arguing that the earth is 6,000 years old."

Why did Dr. Giberson predict that his guy, the science guy, would fail to win? He explains: Leading creationists have speaking and writing skills that translate well into the rhetorically dominated debate format. By way of contrast, their debate opponents [the evolutionists] are often more schooled in technical scientific argumentation, where data, expertise, and consensus are far more important than rhetoric... Unfortunately many of the points needing to be made about evolution -- like the reliability of radioactive dating techniques, the interpretation of fossils, or the role of 'assumptions' in science -- are too technical to work in a popular format.

Translation? Dr. Giberson feels that Americans are generally too dumb to understand the methods evolutionists use to support their theory. Yet science is used in courtrooms to convince jurors that someone is guilty and innocent. So the real argument appears to be that Dr. Giberson wants to herd the masses, like cattle, to by-pass courtroom-type comparisons

(like public debates) that allow us common folk to observe how evolutionary theory stacks up against reason and logic.

On behalf of the “herd,” may I respond to Dr. Giberson?

Sir, have you ever considered that the people you insinuate are too dumb to understand evolutionary theory, are actually quite brilliant at understanding the living laboratory called Life? It's true that many of us don't have the initials of “Dr.” affixed to our names, but we do have our Ph D's in the natural science of dealing with used car salesmen, for example. From the School of Hard Knocks we're well educated at discovering statements of inconsistency. This is why it's hard for us to swallow what you claim to be “scientific truth” when our internal scanners detect a suspicious handling of logic. And this is why we appreciate the open and honest rhetoric of someone like Ken Ham. You and your side denigrate creationists because they make the assumption that the Bible is factual. Yet you and your side make assumptions also, which you, however, claim to be scientific truth. Denying that it takes a faith to believe that assumptions are the equivalent of truth offends our logic and reason, especially because we know how frequently evolutionary theory has made wrong assumptions. By definition, truth is never wrong and always right. In addition, many of us are aware that the evolutionary model has conflicts within itself. I therefore maintain that what you actually feared about the debate was more public exposure of this: that what creationists believe in is just as logical and reasonable as what evolutionists believe in—the difference being that your side refuses to admit that your view is a belief system.

In other words, the debate between Nye and Ham, and how people judge who won it, is not so much about the truth of the origin of this world. The real debate is about truth, period. What is truth? Their side defines truth as something that's changeable, flexible, individually defined. Our side defines truth to be always unchangeable, eternally right, never wrong, universal.

The Bible warns about those who redefine truth: **“Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes and clever in their own sight”** (Isaiah 5:20-21). Can't many of society's problems today be sourced to this manipulation of the definition of moral truth, and truth in general?

The Bible also presents Jesus as the perfectly good man, the wisest man on earth. And the Bible quotes him as saying: **“I am the way, and the truth and the Life”** (John 14:6). Further, the Bible quotes him as saying: **“Haven't you read, that at the beginning the Creator made them male and female”?** (Matthew 19:4). Thus, Jesus believed and taught that God created the world and first humans, Adam and Eve. He should know, because he was there at the creation of the world. As the Son of God, he is with his Father, the creator of all things who took on flesh to save us from our sins by dying on the cross (See John 1:1-3 & 14 & 29.)

Can Jesus really be the Savior from sin, when at the same time he believed and taught how God created the world and the first humans? How you answer this question will greatly expose to yourself how you define truth. And this is ultimately what I believe Giberson feared would happen when evolution is publicly debated by someone who believes that Jesus and his Word are true. †††

For further reading, please see my Digging Deeper blog, [Evolution's Internal Conflicts Are Resolved in the Bible](#)

Source Material (Links may become inactive over time.)

[Nye-on-Ham Debate: The Anti-Science Guy Automatically Wins](#) @HuffingtonPost.com

[Nye-Ham Debate on Evolution: A Roundup](#) @Forbes.com

[The Bill Nye-Kem Ham Debate was a Nightmare for Science](#) @thedailybeast.com

To become a recipient of Viewpoints, please email mike.nitz@bethanysaginaw.com and simply type the phrase "VP please" in the subject line. Or if you wish to no longer receive Viewpoints, type the phrase "discontinue VP" in the subject line. Thanks.

Blessings to you and your loved ones, Pastor Mike Nitz

