

Aurel Enea

EVOLUTION VS. CREATION

33 arguments
supporting the scientific theory
of the origin of life through evolution

Editura Gutenberg Univers

2015

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Enea Aurel
PNT Arad
Calea 6 vânători, F.N.
310530 / Arad
ROMANIA
E-mail: aurelenea10@gmail.com
Blog: eneaareul.wordpress.com

TRANSLATED FROM ROMANIAN

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României ENEA, AUREL

**Evoluție vs. Creație: 33 de argumente în favoarea
teoriei științifice a apariției vieții prin evoluție / Enea Aurel.**
– Arad : Gutenberg Univers, 2015

ISBN 978-606-675-054-7

2:5

Editura Gutenberg Univers Arad –
Editură recunoscută de C.N.C.S.I.S.

Tipărit la xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxx

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & DEDICATIONS

CONTENTS

PREFACE	7
WHY I WROTE THIS BOOK	8
SCIENCE	
1 Science is based on observation (objective), religion on experience (subjective)	13
2 Systematically science has explained 90% of myths => eliminating Biblical basis	25
3 Science uses the terms “God” and “creation” improperly => it doesn’t believe them	37
4 Police investigators no longer consult psychics => there is no supernatural	44
5 We’ve been born with God and the Bible => we cannot judge totally impartial	52
6 We start with 10% myths unexplained by science => to us it seems like a lot	59
7 Creation is based on the 10% unexplained by science => called God of ‘voids’	64
RELIGION	
8 The East converts to Christianity while the West loses faith => it’s a cycle	71
9 Authenticity of Bible stories is confirmed only by the authors of the Biblical text	76
10 Diet: fruits only (in Eden) => not recommended by nutrition specialists	83
11 Avoidance, self-justification, personal attacks => signal the lack of arguments	92

12 A guilty person hiding something avoids
verification (Bible demands: “faith”) 101

EVOLUTION

13 Darwin didn’t prove the evolution completely,
but offered a very probable hypothesis 109

14 90% of eco-system’s causes are explained
=> we can expect the rest 10% will be too 120

15 Life appeared too late and slow
to be the result of divine intervention 144

16 Comet ISON 23.11.2013 contains
water => so the Earth is not unique 149

17 Instinct not understood suggested a purpose,
now it’s explained (without a Creator) 156

18 DNA shared between man-primates,
or cats species => is a determining factor 164

19 Africans appeared first, but they also
resemble primates (most of all races) 167

PURPOSE

20 Birth is random: due to
random successful insemination 171

21 Entire species (majority) disappeared
over time (without any sense or purpose) 174

22 Life’s disappearing is random:
due to uncontrolled natural catastrophes 177

23 Creatures that eat other creatures
=> have been made this way by design 182

24 Flora and fauna: unexplained level of
complexity, still they disappear forever 185

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

MAN

- 25 For humans we “see” a purpose => because
we relate to ourselves (subjective) 190
- 26 Life’s pleasures are not for
our happiness => but they satisfy needs 195
- 27 The sky is blue not for our eyes
enjoyment, but due to its composition 200
- 28 Senses, emotions, feelings:
reduced to a few basic ones (= animal) 206
- 29 The brain is imitated, equated, outrun by:
computers and software (in principle) 217
- 30 Difference from (other) animals = one
dimension extra (of the same category) 229

MORALITY

- 31 Personality: is random and
changing => with no merits of its own 239
- 32 Freedom of choice and obedience
represent simply: reactions of matter 242
- 33 Morality test is: the test of health, intelligence,
environment (= animal training) 246

Book Synopsis

- GROUPING OF ARGUMENTS** 253
- DESCRIPTION OF ARGUMENTS** 255

PREFACE

This is a courageous book, written by a man who has faced many questions and begun to work on some answers.

He is wrestling with the many differences between the biblical accounts of creation and the human condition, and how science explains them. He concludes, after lengthy and careful argument that Christianity and science cannot be in harmony.

He poses a strong challenge to Bible fundamentalists who adopt a so-called scientific and literal approach to the Bible, showing how their arguments have abused the concept of 'faith' by reducing the God of creation to a God who accounts for the things that science has not yet explained. He criticizes their account of miracles, of how the Bible and history can be explained together, and much more.

He does, however, assume that scientific investigation is without its own form of 'faith' in its methods, and so is completely objective in a way that no human endeavor can be.

I hope that many Bible fundamentalists read this book, and realize how many unintended consequences their methods can bring, especially to serious thinkers like the author of this book.

Margaret Barker

Margaret Barker (born 1944), studied theology at the University of Cambridge, after which she has devoted her life to research in ancient Christianity. She was president of the Society for Old Testament Study in 1998 and in July 2008 she was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

WHY I WROTE THIS BOOK

Relatively recently I realized that:

1. Science contradicts religion in all aspects (scientific explanation of things differs from the Bible's version)
2. Science has much and convincing evidence (it is based only on verifiable demonstrations)
3. Christians are not aware of this conflict (they believe that religion and science are in harmony)
4. Religion's arguments are few and unscientific (this becomes obvious when compared with scientific demonstrations)
5. Religion has no expertise in scientific fields (they refer to them, but without being historians, archeologists, geologists ...)

Bible Authenticity:

Christians believe that history, archeology, geology confirm the authenticity of the Biblical text. But that's not the case at all. These fields do not confirm it.

Origin of life and of the Universe:

Christians believe that the Bible is exact and that the version of creation is confirmed by science. But that's not the case at all. Science does not confirm this version.

Miracles mentioned in the Bible:

Christians believe that science confirms Eden, the Flood, Egypt's plagues, the prophecies, healings, Jesus' virgin birth ... etc. But that's not the case at all.

My surprise:

I was actually behind a curtain.

I did not know what was behind that curtain. I thought I knew all the existing scientific evidence and that there was no other.

- This made me consider “science” as something vague, uncertain.
- And if scientists have the same little evidence that I was also aware of, and only that, but still they come to other conclusions, different from religion, then I automatically considered scientists to be wrong. That they are: bad, weak, incompetent, unworthy of trust

The key moment or transition point for me was when I read some academic theological manuals. These provide a “bridge” between religion and science, and thus I came (indirectly) to be exposed to the scientific methodology.

The conclusion was that the world is larger and that scientists have much more evidence on which they base their conclusions than what I was aware of. Now, after I discovered what was behind the curtain (in the science yard), I understand the scientists’ reasoning and why they are right. They were always objective. I was the subjective one.

I BECAME AN ATHEIST

MY REASON: “Because science supports atheism”

Only relatively recently I realized that my entire life I avoided a responsible answer regarding a positioning towards science. Now I understand that here lies the key, and that’s why I recommend anyone interested in the current debate to answer the following essential question personally.

MY QUESTION: “Why does science not believe in the existence of God?”

Below I will list some potential answers from those who are not (yet) atheists.

1. Some do not treat the question seriously, the subject does not interest them too much.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

My reply: Of course, everyone is entitled to his/her opinion. However without a personal motivation, people do nothing, so neither will they investigate this question.

2. Some say: “So what, why do we care about what science believes or does not believe?”

My reply: It could help to remember: “In how many other fields does experience teach us that it is recommended to ignore the opinions of specialists?” Or: “What does it indicate about our interest for finding the truth in a certain field if we ignore the specialists’ opinions in that very field?”

3. Some actually don’t know the position of science and if it has an official position regarding this subject. Or they may even assume the opposite, that it supports the existence of God.

My reply: A quick way to confirm the position of science in this case maybe a simple look at the theory of evolution taught (universally) in the entire accredited education system. Also, a look at official structures of the state, as well as the activities of the industry in general reveal society’s acceptance of a materialistic explanation of things, therefore atheistic.

4. Some Christians, who understand that science supports atheism, but consider that it is mistaken and that it provides a wrong theory at this point, make suppositions like the following:

A. Reasoning of “evolution” is flawed due to negligence and incompetence.

My reply: Logically we ask: “Who notices the flaws in the researchers’ reasoning?” If we do, then: “How reasonable is the conclusion that we, from the outside, could demonstrate a level of competence superior to the specialists, and that in their very field of expertise?”

B. The field of research is manipulated by interests groups with malefic purposes.

My reply: It is important to verify the evidence for such extreme statement, especially since the idea is not accepted either by the press or the rivals of the supposed group.

Such level of conspiracy is incompatible with the transparent nature of modern research, which is distributed into independent groups, spread across politically divided geographical areas. Suggesting an influential force that goes against so many obstacles, but without leaving any traces at all, seems at the least unrealistic.

C. The entire international scientific community is suspected of subjectivism and serious moral flaws which cloud their thinking and pervert the results of their work.

My reply: We distinguish between the object of the accusation and the processes involved. The theory of evolution is produced by an exact science based on objective observations, transparent methods, verifiable demonstrations, and results that are critically evaluated by specialists. This rigorous process confirmed over time eliminates the suspicions regarding the human factor. And without financial stakes, the total corruption of all interdependent fields is at the very least improbable. Why not judge the work instead of its human authors.

CONCLUSION:

If all complicated attempts of answer face insurmountable difficulties, does the simple, direct version have a better chance? The easiest answer to the question: “Why science does not accept the existence of God?” would be: “Because God does not exist”.

If science came to the conclusion of “evolution”, then this is based on serious reasons.

SECTION I

SCIENCE

Using a systematic approach, science has developed a superior methodology based on: logic, transparency, objective observation and critical verification. Thus it has discovered things unknown before and has explained phenomenon not understood up to that time. The result is that the supposed God who held the place of the unknown and unexplained in antiquity, no longer exists. He has been replaced by the natural causes.

- 1 Science is based on observation (objective),
religion on experience (subjective) 13
- 2 Systematically science has explained 90%
of myths => eliminating Biblical basis 25
- 3 Science uses the terms “God” and “creation”
improperly => it doesn’t believe them 37
- 4 Police investigators no longer consult
psychics => there is no supernatural 44
- 5 We’ve been born with God and the Bible
=> we cannot judge totally impartial 52
- 6 We start with 10% myths unexplained
by science => to us it seems like a lot 59
- 7 Creation is based on the 10% unexplained
by science => called God of ‘voids’ 64

1

SCIENCE IS BASED ON OBSERVATION (OBJECTIVE), RELIGION ON EXPERIENCE (SUBJECTIVE)

Scientists measure things around us and analyze them according to principles of logic. They are concerned with learning the truth. A Christian, however, experiences at one time in his life the impact of faith in God upon him: If the results of this impact are perceived as beneficial, he will decide to believe in his existence – regardless of the evidence or despite the fact that the same impact can also be explained based on other factors, besides God.

Between the object of research, the methods used and the results obtained, methodology represents the most significant aspect which defines the essence of and, at the same time, determines the difference between science and religion.

If some are not sure about the object of research, if it is the same or not in the case of science and religion, it is unanimously accepted that *methodology* is definitely different. And this difference is responsible for the correspondingly different results, whether the object of research is the same or not in the case of those two fields.

It can be summarized that: The scientific method is based on observation, while the religious method is based on experience. The difference between observation and experience consists, on the one hand, in **the direction** of action, **where** each one looks: Observation looks **outside** the person, the experience **inside** him/her. The first refers to the **perceived reality**, the other to the **perception of reality**. And, on the other hand, first is **detected** also by others, who **can verify** it, but the other is known only by **the person** involved, with **no one else** to verify it. The first is the **objective** reality, **not influenced** by the factors involved and which is **the same** for everyone, but the other is a **subjective** reality,

affected by characteristics of the individual and which can **differ** from person to person. In the first case, the conclusion is expected to be established *after* the analysis of data, **deduced, derived** on the basis of a **recognized** process, **available** to man. In the second case, the conclusion is presupposed *before*, **induced** in the analysis, the person is **not aware** of the demonstration, and s/he does **not have access** to it.

1 – (Science). What does “science” mean exactly and how does it actually work?

Science does not start from existing ideas, invented or received, but it starts from: 1. observing the reality around, then, based on observations made, 2. it formulates a hypothesis and 3. searches for evidence supporting and does experiments demonstrating the hypothesis. After it succeeds, 4. it shares the results of the analysis with other scientists for critical evaluation, and after it is confirmed unanimously, 5. it is declared as an accepted theory.

In spite of this process, which follows a rigorous structure, sometimes science returns to a past theory and, if there are mistakes discovered, it will change it. Of course, some Christians saw in these instances a proof of science’s weakness and therefore have raised the issue of the trust that we can put in science.

In order to answer to these accusations, we’ll ask if the modification of a past theory can also reveal another image, besides weakness and lack of trust on the part of science:

- What is the alternative to the rigorous but imperfect effort of science? Maybe, God?
- Is it a proof of right measuring to place on one side of the scale something real, and on the other something supposedly better, but not proven? (*Doesn’t this sound like trying to sell something that is not yet in our possession?*)

Was it truly a sign of weakness and lack of credibility if:

- at the time, it was the best explanation, provided by best qualified specialists, based on the latest information and technology?

- they honestly admitted the mistake once new information became available and have refused to close their eyes to the observations of other researchers?
- they have revealed the entire process transparently and did not hide from critical investigation, even with the risk of someone finding a mistake in that theory?
- the vast majority of their work was confirmed and, in spite of minor occasional mistakes, no one questioned the scientific *methodology*?

2 – (**Religion**). What exactly is the activity of “religion”?

Essentially, religion presents man with the idea of a supreme authority called God and it deals with a certain attitude of man towards God. But from what perspective?

It does not deal with this attitude from many perspectives, but only from a single one. It is not a free observation, but rather a guided one. Not a study of both options (pro and con), but only of a single one. It does not try to understand if or to what extent that attitude is justified and really beneficial, but religion is interested only in *producing* it: causing, maintaining and stimulating / intensifying it. It does not analyze if and why it is necessary, but it assumes that it is. How do we know that it is? Well, the idea has been passed on over from ancient generations, and the implied understanding is that the analysis of reasons and evidence supporting its truth had been demonstrated and established permanently already by others at some initial moment in the distant past.

The situation can be compared with that of a group of miners whose concern is obviously mining, but only from the perspective of *producing* it: how to dig in order to get to it, how to extract it, and then searching for the most efficient methods for extracting even more. However they do not analyze if the extraction is necessary and to what extent the extracted material can be sold, so that they could be paid.

Ambivalence of the answers: When faced with this question, some will express the conviction that extraction is necessary exactly because the material will be sold, which is obviously nothing

more than supposing what needed to be demonstrated, a supposition supported by another supposition. (In the words of the Gospel: "One blind guides another blind.") Some will say that others have analyzed these aspects already before them or will give examples of success stories of miners from other regions and periods. All these reflect a suspicious tendency to avoid the answer and signal rather that they are, in fact, not interested in the reason why the extraction is necessary and to what extent the commercial aspect is profitable.

Do we find these same elements also in the case of religion?

Some say, I quote: "*Faith doesn't need to be proven*" or "*Faith is not based on evidence, but on Christ*". At a certain level of observation, both of the above sentences have one thing in common: they get very close to what, in a different context, would be called "propaganda". From a technical stand point, they are arguably "incomplete sentences".

First: "*Faith doesn't need to be proven*". The intended idea is not clear. What doesn't need to be proven, the *act* of faith from the part of the believer, or the *object* of faith, namely what s/he believes in? And if it "doesn't need to", it is not explained "why" it doesn't, who says / guarantees that it doesn't? Perhaps God says so, and thus we guarantee a supposition with another supposition?

The second: "*Faith is not based on evidence, but on Christ*". It is incomplete because the terms are not defined, in what sense is Christ placed in contrast with the evidence. Does Christ have the evidence, and once we get to him, the source of all evidence, then we no longer need to search anywhere else? Or rather the evidence was only necessary to lead us to him, and after that, once we arrived to him, all that he tells us is true without any further need for evidence? In either case, if the evidence is or was there, someone could still ask: "What is that evidence?"

Others claim that the truth of faith is proved by the Old Testament prophets and the New Testament apostles. Supposedly these had seen, heard and experimented the proof of the miraculous works of God, and today we believe in his existence due to

the testimony of these ancient servants of God. Or that the evidence is studied and known by prominent and trusting contemporary personalities and therefore it would not be necessary to reinvent the wheel, namely to search again each of those pieces of evidence for ourselves.

And, of course, the opinion shared probably by most believing Christians that the evidence is found “inside one’s soul”. The effects of faith in the personal life would constitute the most palpable evidence that God exists. As a result of faith, a person may feel different and their behavior may change, which for many is proof enough to be sure that God exists.

This conviction, that the existence of God is confirmed by the effect on the human soul, by the transformations of his/her life due to faith, has the result, on the one hand, of closing the subject, stopping to search for evidence. And, on the other hand, the concern of religion remains faith only from the perspective of *producing* it: how to cause it, how to maintain it, to protect and strengthen it.

Can we identify similarities with the example of miners who are concerned with mining only from the perspective of *producing* it? And the conflicting, evasive and unverifiable answers, could these reveal an unrecognized truth, like that of a student who justifies him/herself in front of the teacher, when in fact s/he did not do their homework?

If religion would agree to examine the evidence and be aware of the perspective avoided until now, in both a direct and an indirect way, this would allow it to ask the question: “Is it possible that even some ideas that are not true, not real, could produce real, verified emotions?” In other words: If God did not exist, but man still believes in him, without knowing that he does not exist, would this false belief be able to produce the same influence upon the human soul and behavior? Let’s take the example of a story that we read in a novel – fictitious actors, fictitious places and events. The message of a song that we listen to, a theatrical show or a movie that we watch on the television screen. None of these are real, but they are only made up scenes, hypothetical ideas artificially manipulated. However, it is confirmed that these are

able to create emotion, and the respective emotion is not only real, but it can be even more intense than the one caused by specific events from the real world.

How different is, in this context, the religious experience? It presents an idea – a story recognized to be from another world – the only verifiable evidence of which can be provided by the reality of the emotion that it is able to cause in the soul of the believers upon hearing it.

So, in principle, we can understand that emotion is produced not only in the case of a true idea, but also of an imagined/simulated one. And if the reality of emotion does not constitute a guarantee of the truth of the ideas in the case of novels, songs, theatres and movies, then why would things be any different in the case of those who chose to continue to believe in the existence of the God presented by religion based only on the effect felt on the person's life? Such a person does nothing more than to chose one out of many options available. But without the option itself being verified. (Therefore one would expect that such person would at least understand to respect the right of others not to share their convictions. And also not to consider their choice more justified than that of others who do not believe.)

It can be argued that the main reason why religion is not based on evidence is because it originated in an era when the scientific method had not been discovered. Therefore it functions on a sort of emotional conditioning which relates man to a supreme authority from another world. Since it is not placed in the world known as real and the only one that we are naturally familiar with, the existence of such authority, for the mind of a reasonable man of our time, would need some very convincing evidence in order to believe and accept it.

Not only is the existence of such authority hard to harmonize with the known reality and the only one recognized by modern man, but the very relation that religion proposes between man and this authority contradicts our natural expectations. It is a relation between the heavenly Father and his earthly children. For man, the role of a child is natural up to a certain age, associated with developing and growing up. But after that period, man is

considered an adult and able to assume responsibilities associated with the adult status. For an adult, accepting the role of child of the heavenly Father it would imply a return in time and a change of position together with the responsibilities associated to it.

One example: The walking cart is used around the first year of life to help the child to learn how to walk independently on his or her own feet. Two small wheels attached on the sides of a bicycle help the beginner to learn how to ride a bike. The idea in both cases is that the person is not only helped, but helped *to learn*. Which means that there will come a time when they will learn to handle themselves alone, not needing those accessories anymore.

In the case of the child who shares responsibility with his or her father, the baby who is using the walking cart, the bike rider using the small side wheels attached, as long as the dependence on the external help is prolonged, the individual will not grow up, will not become mature. This means a handicap that he or she can not get rid of. And the handicap is the more real, as the help that he or she relies on is an imagined one. It can be easily anticipated that a child that is using the help of a tool that does not exist, in fact will fall or get into an accident. The repercussions are verifiable in the real world when someone decides to apply in his or her personal, family and social life the literal instructions found in the Biblical text, the source of which is not verified. It is like someone using unconfirmed, not certified medication, this can lead to side effects or unwanted complications.

As improbable and unproved as the divine authority is, religion is not concerned with the *evidence* for its existence. But its entire concern is moved upon its influence, the way in which it determines man's life and on the emotional experience resulted from the new status in life adopted by man. The emphasis falls on man's need for God, what benefits are promised him and the requirements that man needs to fulfill in order to obtain the divine approval.

Another example: Commercial advertisings represent an appropriate correspondent of the religious phenomenon in the real world. These stimulate human emotions by most impressive offers, but do not focus on the methods that those respective prom-

ises could be verified or on the chances that they might realize in the case of those who pursue them. They announce incredible prizes and then insist that the customer imagine him or herself already in possession of those benefits, to confirm how tempting is the offer and how great the desire is. But the dream is so sweet, that any time and effort dedicated to verifying the guarantees seem to be uninteresting and they are not considered appropriate by anyone.

Religion does not provide the opportunity of analyzing the evidence, but it tries to induce in man a state in which he doesn't even wish this anymore. If God assumes responsibility to care for our needs, then we are relieved of this "burden". The situation where we throw all our worries in God's hands is presented as a comfortable, desired life. All that is necessary is for man to just want, to accept the offer, to voluntarily adopt the attitude of trust toward the divine authority and to obey. To entrust God all his rights, responsibilities, his entire being, to dedicate his personal life to him, to give up his own self, to deny himself, give up all claims, not belong to himself anymore. To admit that he is a sinner and that he owes *everything* to God.

It is unimaginable how much it is asked of man, but without offering him the smallest proof on the basis of which he could convince himself. He is not expected to make a decision based on objective, independent arguments, but the respective attitude is induced in him by the inherent force that such attitude holds in itself.

This method is like a call of the type: "risk yourself" or "throw yourself in the dark of the night", but without offering him verifiable reasons to trust that nothing bad will happen to him. That call holds in itself a (hypnotic) force by the very idea that it transmits. If repeated or if man contemplates to it long enough, he will end up executing it without asking "why" he does it. The very force of the idea itself moves him to action.

Another example: The same phenomenon happens also when a person looks down from a very high place. The simple awareness of the height and imagining the potential danger, the effects of a fall, are enough to make him feel tempted to jump

freely. The force does not come from someone from the outside pushing him, but the very idea in itself has such an impact on the person's psychology, that he doesn't need any additional motivation from the outside, but he will submit to temptation automatically.

Another example: The same principle is found in the story of a young man who invites a beautiful young woman to join him in a foreign country. If the girl is in love "with love", as a concept, he can promise her that he will offer her a castle and indescribable prosperity. And the idea itself will have such a powerful (hypnotic) impact and start to take roots in her heart, and she will accept the invitation without any proof confirming that the promises are not only tempting, but also real, true. In such cases, anyone suggesting a delay in order to verify the truth or guarantee of the promise will be viewed with suspicion and hostility, as if he or she wanted to ruin the girl's dream. The girl's parents who try to suggest caution may find themselves in this position..

Another example: Impostors have acted on the same principle and made phone calls to unknown people and communicated them shocking, but untrue news. They would tell them either that they won some fabulous prizes and in order to get them, they had to send a relatively small amount of money in the criminal's account. Or that their child or a loved one had a terrible accident and they need urgent financial help. Many of those contacted believed the shocking but false stories and have paid the requested money. Without verifying if the stories were true or not. Why? Due to the emotional shock, they became concerned with the story heard because of the force it contained in itself and only from the perspective of solving it, but not from that of verifying the evidence that it is true or not.

Another example: We find the same situation when signing an important document. Often times we are tempted to ignore the terms and conditions printed in very small letters. The reason is because checking the terms and conditions is not able to compete with the emotion generated by the text of the document itself. And being written in very small letters proves the lack of

interest also on the part of those who wrote them that we ever read them.

The Gospel describes this type of faith with no evidence when it says: "Happy are those who do not see and yet believe." (See chapter 12 of this publication.)

The mechanism is circular and uninterrupted like a "perpetual-mobile". It asks for blind trust, the closing of the investigating eyes that look at evidence and opening the so-called eyes of "faith" that see only God. The circle is closing (itself) like this: 1. God tells me not to look for evidence => 2. this way I do not discover evidence against the existence of God => 3. therefore I remain undisturbed in my faith towards God and continue to listen to him and, again, => 1. God tells me not to look for evidence ... etc. Over and over from the beginning, and I never get out of this circle.

Perhaps someone who finds himself already inside this closed circle may ask: "*But why should I want to get out of the circle?*" To such a person, the following question could be helpful: "Well, how did you get inside the circle?" Which means, in other words: How did you come to believe in God without any evidence to support his existence in the first place?

The Gospel (John chapter 3) has the answer: "The wind blows and you hear its sound and feel its presence, but do not see where it comes from or where it goes." In other words, man does not know the mechanics of how he comes to believe. Faith does not follow a transparent scientific process with known measured, verifiable rules. But man simply discovers that he came to believe, without understanding exactly how that happened.

Jesus states that he is the Son of God and he expects people to believe him due to the emotional impulse of the impression that the simple statement creates, due to the (hypnotic) force contained by the idea itself. Jesus does not appreciate people who are hesitant, nor those cautious, those asking for proof or who want to verify the truth of his words.

Today people are encouraged to read the Gospel personally or someone offers to read it for them or invites them to church to hear the "word". Because it is thought that Jesus' spoken words

or those about Jesus contain the necessary power in themselves, namely they create emotion, they impress those hearing them.

When a person is converted, in general, to anything, be it a religion or a political party or even a criminal organization, most of the time and in majority of cases this happens because of an emotional impulse and extremely rarely based on rational considerations. When asked why they have converted, most of them will give answers of the type: “I liked the way they spoke, I liked how they welcomed me, I liked what I saw.” All these represent a subjective perception of the convert – pleasure. They are equivalent to an answer like: “When I saw or heard such and such manifestation, then I felt so and so.” – a sensation.

The same way is converting to a religion. Maybe someone in the church addresses the invitation to repentance with certain authority in his voice or gestures. Maybe he intimidates the listener or makes him feel worthless, with no merits and pressed by guilt and shame. Maybe the speaker shows much confidence and conviction, laughing at any threats. Maybe a religious act takes place, a solemn ritual which inspires something deep, serious, respect, honorable. Maybe the call is associated with nice songs or dramatically cited poems. Maybe the answer is expected by a group, maybe the call itself is accompanied by examples of others who, in one way or another, exert so-called “peer-pressure”. Maybe the people present there express unusual joy and calm.

In all these cases the decision is “influenced”, it is an emotional one. The person is converted because he or she was encouraged by the group, not because they have verified the validity of the information. (Like in the anecdote about a person who notices many people waiting in line and places himself next, but without knowing what that store sells, if there will indeed be any sale ...)

By contrast with the specific functioning of religion, no one would expect something similar from science. Would a scientist ever dare to present himself in front of the public with a new hypothesis, the results of his research work, accompanied by show, gifts and famous artists, loved by the public? And to hope that the

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

chances of his hypothesis being accepted to grow according to the quality of the artistic program presented at its inauguration?

Such manifestations, however, are completely natural in politics. And we are not surprised to see politicians during the election campaign making use of “populous” measures, sensational elements. That they make their appearance next to known VIP’s from the world of music or film, that they make a show and try to “buy” the votes of the electors with a smile and a good time.

The next chapter (number 2) will present some results of the scientific research. These will show what is accomplished when we analyze certain subjects that religion did not analyze, but that it only assumed that they were so and it has transmitted them from generation to generation, over the course of many centuries, even millenniums.

2

SYSTEMATICALLY SCIENCE HAS EXPLAINED 90% OF MYTHS → ELIMINATING BIBLICAL BASIS

Religion originated in antiquity, when people understood everything with the help of mythology. In the last 400 years, modern science has replaced the mythical image of the cosmos and offered a materialistic, demonstrated explanation of natural phenomenon. Since these material causes were unknown in the past, they used to be attributed to God instead.

Using superior methods of systematic research, science has discovered over time all that was considered hidden or unknown before. And it has explained all that up to that point was not understood about the material world. Its research has extended to all fields of existence and knowledge: cosmos, our planet, laws of nature, properties of matter, life, biology, mechanics, physics, chemistry ... etc.

The result was that all things that religion had previously presented in mythological terms, have received a materialistic, scientific explanation now. A complete overturn has taken place. Far from being two separate fields that never touch each other, science has started from the beginning exactly by questioning (all) the concepts presupposed to be true by religion up to that point. Thus it was discovered that all that was attributed to the supernatural, to some forces from another world, in the past, has in fact a material, worldly cause. The natural processes are not supported, influenced or interrupted by the incalculable intervention of some forces from another world. But rather it was understood that all natural phenomenon can be explained on the basis of other natural, known phenomenon.

At the end of the XIX century, when all natural phenomenon have been studied and received a satisfactory explanation, the "myth" has been eliminated completely. The fight between reli-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

gion and science had ended with the winner, of course, being the latter. Modern society had reached a level from which a return to Middle-Ages was impossible. The reputable Universities of the time no longer expected the possibility of some sensational discoveries in the classical research fields of mechanics, physics, chemistry – there could be no more surprises, much less a return to the concepts of ancient mythology.

The modern man relies on scientific explanations in all areas of life and existence. And this is because science has eliminated not only myths, partially or all the ones investigated. But it has realized a change of mentality by eliminating the very belief in the idea of miracles in the mythological sense. Today we no longer attribute unexplained phenomenon to some ghosts. For the modern man there are only things not yet investigated or explained, but which he trusts that science will be able to explain in the future. For this reason, he no longer believes that the explanation of diseases, their causes and their healing are to be looked for in the spiritual realm; that baptism in water could realize a miraculous life transformation; that the Lord's Supper carries paranormal effects, and the "unworthy" eating of some foods could result in physical consequences. He can no longer believe that something specific in the world is explained on the basis of divine blessing or curse.

True, science continues to advance, and now it studies matter at another level. And there are also things that we do not (yet) understand. However the limits of today's science refer to a level of detail which does not affect its basis or methodology. The scientific principles are not affected or threatened by things not yet understood. Science does not expect the next discoveries to be such as to return us back, to take us paradoxically to ancient mythology and its methods.

The details not yet known expect an exclusively materialistic explanation, based on its properties. It is not expected an identification of God and his intervention where religion had presupposed that they would be, and where the explanations proved to be worldly, materialistic, nor in places where (even) religion did not expect them. What science does not know today is at a level

of detail which goes beyond the point of intersection by these efforts and which has already been solved permanently. That is a closed chapter and a passed stage. Any surprise will not bring them closer, but will further *confirm* the gap between the two.

The confrontation between religion and science makes a fitting analogy with Jesus' question in the Gospel about John the Baptist. "Was his (John's) baptism from God or from men?" The ordinary crowd accepted him as being from God, but Jesus' opponents did not. So they could not answer or chose not to answer the question addressed by Jesus. Today many are confronted with a similar choice when they want to keep both science (accepted by the crowd), while at the same time they do not want to give up religion (which they inherited from the beginning). The two are in opposition, namely they are mutually exclusive. And recognition of one would mean denying of the other and vice versa.

If some of modern believers consider accepting all miraculous works mentioned in the Bible as a matter of will, morality and virtue, in spite of and some times because of the contrary position held by science, I'll ask: "What is behind that motivation and if the decision is derived from the results indicated by evidence?" I will examine three examples of confrontations between science and religion and will ask what the evidence really suggests:

1. First example: Cosmology. Crucifixion is accompanied by two descriptions of Jesus' traveling. After his death, the text says that he descended "down" into Hell, but after resurrection he was raised "up" into heaven.

Ancient mythology imagined the world in three stories: 1. heaven – above the Earth; 2. the Earth – in the middle; 3. Hell – underground. Modern science however has discovered a totally different cosmology: 1. Earth – is round; 2. it rotates – around itself and the sun; 3. gravity – determines the movements of all planets.

QUESTION: Which cosmology seems to be reflected by the New Testament text, that of modern science or that of ancient mythology?

2. Second example: Origin of life. The book of Genesis describes the creation of nature, flora, fauna and man. All have been

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

made by God, each one separately, instantaneously in the course of a week's time.

But accumulated sediments, fossil records and the fuel discovered deep in the ground prove an evolution of the environment over a period of many millions of years, and that each species of flora and fauna adapted to the conditions specific to that time interval. The variety of human races, dogs or domestic animals and cultures of vegetables proves that they had not been created separate, they are not fixed, but are related to each other and they *can* change.

QUESTION: Is the Biblical version of creation supported by this scientific evidence?

3. Third example: Miracles. The Bible attributes diseases to evil spirits and their healing took place when the bad spirits were thrown out by another stronger spirit. At other times the diseases were interpreted as a curse for disobedience to divine laws and their healing happened as a result of prayer by the faithful or when God would forgive sins.

Modern medicine has identified the symptoms of unknown past diseases and has explained both the causes, but also the methods of their healing. Progress has been made in understanding the role of hygiene, proper nutrition and other risk factors. Also, vaccines have been discovered for prevention and medication for treatment. The causes and healing of diseases is no longer attributed to some spiritual forces from another world, but now they have all received a materialistic explanation.

In the Bible, the natural phenomenon, timely rain, good weather and rich production used to be associated with divine "blessing" and obedience to God's laws. By contrast, dryness, bad weather and poor production used to be associated with "curse" and disobedience to God.

Meteorology and modern science have identified the laws of water circuit in nature and have explained the material causes of all other natural phenomenon. Now we know how these work and are able to anticipate the transformations and effects of the factors involved.

Both in the Old Testament and the New Testament, prayer was important because it was thought that God intervenes in all aspects of life. He being responsible for man's food, clothing, house and any success or failure in his life.

QUESTION: Why do the explanations based on spirits from another unverified world coincide with a period characterized by a low level of understanding of medicine and of forces of nature, but the materialistic explanations coincide with the modern period and an advanced level of understanding of these processes? Therefore, is the so-called power of prayer based on objectively proven events or does this represent rather a consequence of lack of evidence and the inherited mythological understanding of natural phenomenon?

ANSWER: Scientists compare the two, religion's version vs. the examined evidence, and for them the answer is obvious: the evidence contradicts religion's version.

However, some believing Christians have tried a possible "harmonizing" of the two, suggesting the following alternative answers to the same three examples discussed above:

1. Cosmology. These have asked if the apparent vertical positioning and expressions "raised (up) to heaven and descended (down) to Hell" might perhaps have a figurative meaning and in fact they should not be understood literally, spatially, in the common sense of those terms.

ANSWER: Yes, the possibility exists that these terms could have a figurative sense. But the question is if the New Testament has intended such a figurative sense in that context or not.

2. Origin of life. They have also asked if the simple fact that some natural causes produce natural results excludes the possibility that God himself could have been that cause? Or at least partially, is the possibility excluded that maybe God has intervened to a certain extent, some times, at least in some places during the long chain of cause-effect?

ANSWER: Yes, the possibility is not excluded, in theory. But the question is, again, how probable is that? What does the fact that it is never specific, or known or precisely identified tell us about the probability of such intervention? Does this look like a

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

verified statement, a conclusion which derives from the evidence or rather an attempt of introducing a preconceived idea into the picture?

What message/conclusion would send the need of later intervention in parts of the mechanism about the capacity of the one who created the mechanism in the first place – mater, nature and its laws – if these need “help” from time to time in order to obtain the final product? And if we attribute to God things that nature does in like manner, conditions and time interval, wouldn't this mean reducing God to the level of nature's creative powers?

3. Miracles. And finally they asked, if science has explained the phenomenon in principle, could some specific incidents be exceptions from this rule, and God may have intervened exactly in those exceptional cases?

ANSWER: In theory this would not be impossible. However, again, what verifiable material indications do we have that such is the case, besides the simple statements of Biblical text itself? Why is it impossible to objectively verify miracles, neither those ancient ones, nor other new ones taking place in front of our eyes today?

If the motivation is that God watches over his laws in order to maintain a balance, then what can be understood about that balance from the chemical explosions which destroy stars, about natural catastrophes which devastate entire eco-systems?

What does all unrighteousness suffered by man indiscriminately of religion or moral reasons, both in the present and also the entire history of our existence, tell us about guaranteeing the strict necessities of life for God's servants?

Theology is relevant in this context of the confrontation between religion and science because it represents “the science of religion”. In other words, it studies religion by and with the help of scientific means. It is not to be confused with religion. But, just as in any field, there is distinction between theory and practice, between professionals and amateurs, so is there a difference between an activity and the science of that particular activity. For example: there is a difference between counting the products sold on the open market, adding the money received or figuring out the difference that needs to be returned to the customer as

change and the science of calculation in general, which we call mathematics – calculating in practice is one thing, but the science of calculation in theory is another thing.

I will define theology as being made up of the professors who teach and / or do research at accredited theological universities anywhere in the world and the books written by these individuals or the manuals used during classes of such courses. Obviously, the field is more extended, but for the sake of efficiency, and in order to express more clearly and simple the distinction, I will compare the example of a student of theology in these two stages: During school, what he does is called “theology”. However, in church, when he acts in his role as a priest, that is no longer theology, but that is actual service. He is no longer theorizing there, but practicing.

The distinction between theology and religion is *not* obvious, most people are *not* aware of this. But the differences are so profound and significant because they cross the immense gap between religion and science. It is paradoxical that between religion and theology there should be such differences, and that these mean total contradiction.

Why does theology have objective value? Because its interest is to protect religion, but at the same time it cannot ignore the verified works of science. Because of the merits of theology, religion often calls to it for help both during public sermons and in publications, where it uses quotes from theological works to strengthen its message and support religion.

Personally I have taken a step recently which I had not done for 30 years. Namely to take not just a limited quote, but to search for the work itself where the quote comes from and which it refers to and to actually read the entire theological work referred to. I should have had all the reasons to do this before, the quote proves the credibility of the source, the author has superior qualifications, and the field of study is exactly the same as the one that religion is concerned with. Therefore, what justified reason could have someone who hears that the religious subject is studied in parallel by two sides (religion and theology), which follow separate paths, and occasionally religion quotes isolated passages

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

from theological works and still not ask him or herself about the other side? To ask if the two should be united, and if that's not possible why are the two sides so different, or why is there another side?

An amateur painter would be interested and happy to go to a school for professional painting. Is it not to be expected that a believing Christian interested in the hidden things of religion also be interested in consulting professionals in the field, in our case theologians?

In short, theology has not remained indifferent towards scientific discoveries. Could a believing Christian have justified motives not to agree with theology's choice? Could s/he say about him or herself, as believer, that they are right, being a faithful follower of the New Testament, but to accuse theology of being wrong, as it deviates from the New Testament text? If theologians have superior education, and they teach the priests (and / or pastors) of the church where the believer worships, is the rejection of theology by believers justified?

Perhaps rejecting the theology of another religion could be justified: Let's say a Protestant rejecting Catholic theology and vice-versa. But an argument in its favor is interestingly the common attitude of theology of *all* religions towards science. They accept:

1. modern cosmology instead of the mythical image of the world found in the Bible
2. evolution of species over millions of years without God's intervention
3. and that miracles never took place in modern time, or in Biblical times

Appendix A (to chapter 2)

Although it was obvious for the Christians contemporary to the first scientific discoveries that these contradicted religion and that between the two there is a total war, today some believing Christians still wonder whether science actually contradicts religion, if the two really are in conflict with each other.

In this regard they probe statements like, and I quote: “I do not read the Bible to learn about the structure of matter or details about the theory of relativity.” And: “Science deals with the physical, material world, not the spiritual one.”

In order to get a larger perspective on the issues involved, namely, if:

- A. the object of scientific study and that of religion coincide (or)
- B. the two represent different fields, act on parallel plains, occupy separate areas which never touch one another ...

I propose the exemplification of three main categories dealt with by science. Then to ask if and to what extent those are also dealt with by religion.

1. First example of fields studied by science: The origin of entire Universe, stars, our solar system, the development of planet Earth, flora, fauna and man.

QUESTION: Does religion express its own parallel opinion regarding all these aspects? (In the sense that God created them each separately)

2. Second example: Science studies natural phenomenon that affect agriculture, climate, rain, drought, heat, light or various damaging insect invasions and other factors threatening the production.

QUESTION: Does religion associate these conditions with divine blessing and curse respectively? (Both in the Old and the New Testament)

3. Third example: Science also deals with the study of man, his physical and mental health, relations and position in the family and society, psychology, sociology, political sciences, justice and ethics.

QUESTION: Does religion attribute mystical reasons to diseases and their healing and imposes its own norms of conduct in all areas of life?

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

CONCLUSION: What derives from (the affirmative answer to the questions) the examination of these three examples regarding the object of activity of the two endeavors:

A. science's object of study and that of religion cover the same areas, although each offers its own different answers and explanations?

B. or rather the two never touch each other in any field of activity?

The declared goal of science includes 2 components:

1. understanding the reality of the world around us (and)
2. satisfying man's needs as efficiently as possible

Religion's activity is very similar:

1. it explains the world around through intervention of super-natural forces (and)
2. it satisfies man's needs through contact with another world

Chapter 1 has presented the difference of methodology, and chapter 2 (current one) presents the difference of results. However the *object* of study for both needs to remain the same, in order for the comparison of *methods* and respectively the *results* to be relevant.

Appendix B (to chapter 2)

ABOUT "MYTH"

Mythology dominated the ancient world (until 400 years ago) by two components:

A. Mythical image of the world in three stories:

1. heaven – above; 2. Earth – in the middle; 3. Hell – underground.

B. Mythical thinking believed in:

1. demons and angels – with superior force and knowledge; 2. their intervention in the world – incalculable.

Modern science replaced the myth (in the last 400 years) by two new components:

A. Modern cosmology:

1. Earth – is round; 2. it rotates – around the sun and self; 3. gravity – determines the movement of planets.

B. Scientific thinking:

1. based on an uninterrupted chain of cause-effect; 2. natural phenomenon have a known, materialistic explanation.

THE BIBLE: was written long before the scientific era

- so can it be scientifically correct?
- or does it simply reflect the mythology of the time when it was written?

Did it know that: 1. Earth is round? 2. It rotates? 3. Planet movements are determined by gravity?

CLUES: Christians opposed the first scientific discoveries, and later, surprisingly, they claimed that the Bible knew them from the beginning, even before science did.

The Bible writes: “up” to heaven and “down” to Hell, however today we no longer understand heaven and Hell in this spatial, vertical position.

It associates them with “raising” to heaven and “descending” to Hell.

And it attributes the home of “God” in heaven and that of “Satan” in Hell.

CONCLUSION: What world image and way of thinking seem to be reflected in the Bible? The scientific ones or rather the ancient mythological ones?

Obviously, the Biblical text reflects the mythical world image and thinking of the time both regarding cosmos and also the spiritual causes attributed to worldly events.

Note:

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The first century Christian faith did not demand acceptance of miracles as a separate act of will. For the first Christians, myths were already part of their historical situation. They had been taken over without reflection from the contemporary thinking of the time.

So, accepting or not accepting the miracles mentioned in the New Testament text has nothing to do with the original faith. For the first Christians, acceptance of super-natural, spiritual forces did not constitute an act of faith. For them, the question was not *whether* such forces exist, but only establishing the *relation* between them and the correct distribution of responsibility between each side. The question was about the relation between cosmic forces of good and evil, but no one questioned that such forces existed. The issue was only: which earthly events are the result of one type of forces and which ones of the other type.

Today our situation is very different. If we want to imitate the first Christians' faith, we need to understand that we start from fundamentally different premises. What for them did not constitute an effort or reason for doubt, for us is both irrational and unacceptable.

3

SCIENCE USES THE TERMS “GOD” AND “CREATION” IMPROPERLY ← IT DOESN’T BELIEVE THEM

Hearing scientists who occasionally use terms like “God” and “creation”, some Christians interpreted this as proof that even in the scientific community, some might believe in the existence of God and creation. However, even if scientists may use such terms, the sense is definitely not the one usually accepted in the religious context.

Does science support the version of life’s origin by evolution without God, or does it believe in the existence of God and creation? Is it possible to have an affirmative answer to both of these options?

As obvious as it may seem for most, both in the camp of science and also in that of religion, that science denies the existence of God, incredibly there are still persons in each religious group who would reply instantly, something like: “No, that is not true, science does not contradict the Bible, but it actually supports the existence of God and creation.”

Why these surprises and diametrical opposing answers? What is the basis of replies such as the latter? In part, this is because of certain facts and scientific discoveries taken over by some religious publications which interpret them and offer their own verdict, namely that these would support creation. Obviously, the conclusion is not that of science, where these facts and discoveries had been taken from. But, since the conclusion expressed by the respective religious publication makes reference to scientific research, the idea is easily induced (to some) that science actually supports belief in the existence of God and creation.

On the other hand, the reply is also based on quotes from famous scientists who do not hesitate to freely use terms such as “God” and “creation”. And these, if they appear in religious publi-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

cations, they again could be used to induce the impression that science accepts the existence of God and creation.

How could it be determined for a certainty what science actually believes regarding the existence of God and creation? Of course, most convincing would be if we could refer to something official, rather than to simple isolated quotes by certain individual authors. The same is true for any other institution or community. In each case we find personal opinions, but there is also an official view point. Public relations has become a dedicated science, specially recognized today. Even a country is represented officially by someone, and the official position of that country is communicated and made available through some people, departments and authorized means for this purpose.

In the case of our discussion, we ask, naturally, to what extent those quotes are representative of science and if we have the confirmation that the interpretation given by those who publish the quotes reflects the official position of science regarding the subject of the existence of God and creation.

From the beginning, the interaction between science and religion was not a friendly one, of cooperation and support, but it was fundamentally a conflicting relationship. Science had contested all that had been traditionally understood to be true up to that moment. Before, religion used to attribute the cause of all things to God, but science has offered systematically another explanation and it has demonstrated that all natural phenomenon have material causes. In other words, science has eliminated God's intervention from all the material world, which is equivalent to the elimination of God himself and implicitly of religion too. According to science, everything happened without God.

It is very hard, if not actually impossible, for someone to interpret the actions and definite direction of science as a manifestation of its belief in God and creation.

And, in this regard, what could be more representative than the public education system? Universally, all manuals used in schools in every town, big or small, every country on the globe, at all levels, elementary, medium and higher education are consistent on this point. From biology, history, geology ... and all are-

as that deal in any way with the existence, origin and transformations of any kind in the world, the accepted version is exclusively Darwin’s evolution and nothing is ever attributed to God or the divine intervention. There are no exceptions to this position, at least not in the official system and state accredited institutions.

In this case, if the clear position of science, both at the fundamental level and in the officially recognized manifestations, is an atheistic one, what can be said about the quotes from some renown scientists which seem to send different messages?

In order to keep a balanced approach and to get a larger perspective, I will list five categories for this type of quotes and will ask to what extent they help explain this paradox.

1. First category. In most cases, the quotes are presented exact, but they represent rather a daring act on the part of the author, who is playing with the words while he or she makes use of a borrowed vocabulary from the common religious language. However only the terms are the same, in order to represent the analogy of a similar situation with the religious context, but, taken separately, the meaning of the terms is not understood the same way. (This language is used when there is certainty that the audience doesn’t risk understanding them in the wrong way. It is usually used in an environment where everyone is aware that the author has a strong atheistic, evolutionary conviction, either in a material which refers to or has already explained his or her position somewhere else, or during a public discourse held in front of the coworkers, who are familiar with his or her position, from previous experiences.)

One example of personification could be the expression: “Evolution has created” such and such modification of some species of plants or animals. Although the word “creation” is used here, it does not have the same meaning as that used in the Genesis book, where it describes God’s creation.

Another example of personification could be encountered when an atheist is impressed by the beauty of some natural phenomenon and says: “God must have been a high class painter.” This person doesn’t necessarily believe in the existence of God.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

A third example, when supporters of evolution can make free use of the term “creature” while referring to living things. But in reality they don’t mean that the respective beings have been created by God. It is just a termed that they borrowed without taking over its full meaning.

In such phrases, the author is not using a technical language and the purpose of the discussion is in no way that of establishing the author’s position regarding the existence of God and creation. Rather, it is an informal conversation, outside his or her official work, it represents a casual talk, metaphorical, poetical, and less literal or exact expression.

We can understand, therefore, that such expression does not necessarily demonstrate the author’s belief in the existence of God and creation. But using quotes that contain this type of expression in order to induce the conclusion that science supported the existence of God and creation is rather inexact (even misleading).

2. Second category. Sometimes the author expresses a personal opinion regarding the intervention of someone (God?) *before* the origin of the Universe and related to the Big-Bang. But not *after* that. In other words, this excludes the possibility of an intervention in the later stages of the formation and development of the Universe, of our planet and life on it. After the Big-Bang everything appeared exclusively due to the interaction between forces of nature and the properties of matter, according to the theory of evolution.

That intervention does not refer to “someone” who created man. That someone is not interested in him or his life, he has not revealed himself through the Bible, did not give Moses the laws, did not send Jesus, does not ask from us and does not promise us anything. Does not have any of the qualities defining the one we usually call “God”. We can rightly ask if that intervention can properly be called as being from God.

In this case, if sometimes, out of the lack of a better word or because of the sense that the audience is familiar with and the similarities with the context, the word God appears to be used

with reference to the cause prior to the origin of our known Universe, we should ask if the discussion really is about God.

Is it honest and justified to use quotes where the term appears in this context in order to induce the conclusion that science would believe in the existence of God and creation?

3. Third category. Even when the term does appear occasionally in relation to the period prior to the origin of our Universe, what does, on the one hand, the fact that this reference is only made by a minority of scientists tell us about its being representative? Most others prefer the conclusion, consistent with evolution’s principles, that if all phenomenon of later development of the Universe are due to forces of nature and properties of matter, and similar examples of explosions and implosions take place regularly in the creation and destruction of stars, then we have serious reasons to suppose that the Big-Bang itself was produced by similar causes (material / natural).

And, on the other hand, what does the tone in which that reference is expressed by such minority tell us? They never present it as a certainty, based on objective, verifiable proof, in no way as a demonstrated fact, but only as a possibility. The expression reflects a situation which the authors do not consider excluded, so just a potential option.

How long is the way that would need to be traveled if we start from this type of expressions in order to arrive at the conclusion induced by those using the quotes claiming that science accepts the existence of God and creation?!

4. Fourth category. In a few cases the quotes are not even exact, but are manipulated. There are references used to some of the most well known names, like: Albert Einstein, Carl Sagan and others. The false and the manipulation happens when the quote is either not original, so it is itself taken over by a third source, which interprets or pretends to quote the original, or it is original, but it is written for another purpose, sometimes even opposite from the way it appears quoted. The idea defining the sense is found either in the context or inside the phrase, but it is omitted suspiciously in the version quoted incompletely and thus it gives the impression of sending a different message.

The action is not necessarily to be condemned, first because it is possible that it is done with “good” intentions, but also because it is possible that the author may not even be fully aware of what he or she is actually doing.

Anyway, the problem is solved by a relatively simple solution, namely the reader should get access to the original material and verify how it is written as a whole, in the intended sense by the original author.

5. Fifth category. When manipulation is practiced by the quoted author himself. What some may call accommodation or adapting to the specific audience. One specific example, the Romanian author Iosif Țon quotes a laureate of the Templeton prize – which is sponsored in part by religious institutions. The prize winner is quoted as expressing himself respectfully towards God, but without providing any details.

We can ask: Do we see in this expression the proof of scientists’ belief in the existence of God and creation more than in a similar example of a Westerner who makes a business trip to an Eastern country, with religion, culture and values very different from those in his country of origin? What I want to suggest here is that the simple fact that someone learns words in the language of the visited (foreign) country and offers homage according to local customs to some of their values, without presenting a detailed explanation about his own position does not necessarily represent enough proof to identify the visitor as a supporter of that system and nor as an argument supporting such system.

Another example. Has anyone heard the expression “God bless this country” from the mouth of a president of state? Some politicians use slogans like this especially during election campaigns. If we have reasons to believe that the use of such expressions has something to do with the wishes and expectations of the electors, can we also guarantee that these words always represent the personal convictions of those politicians who express them?

For this reason it is recommended to consider more than just the interpretation that a religious publication offers to the quote supposedly by a well-known scientist, without being certain first if

the quote is complete, that it truly belongs to the quoted author and also knowing the context in which it was spoken, the intended sense, the reason why he or she said it, as basis in order to draw conclusions about the official position of science regarding the existence of God and creation in the sense understood by religion.

At the same time, it would also be inexact to suppose, on the basis of such quotes, that science is undecided, divided and even that some parts of it support the existence of God and creation. Evolution is accepted and supported unanimously by all fields of study which research the origin of any aspect of the reality of the material world around. And the fields of study that have any indirect connection with the origin of the material world, they all presuppose evolution and atheism. This is presently science’s official declared position.

POLICE INVESTIGATORS NO LONGER CONSULT PSYCHICS ← THERE IS NO SUPERNATURAL

Police stopped consulting psychics in the last centuries, and they did this against their own interests. Not because they didn't need help, but because all objective verification has proved that those so-called powers do not exist. The reasons must have been serious and convincing, as it would otherwise be in their interest to exploit any chance, if there truly was one.

Do criminal investigators consult spiritual mediums when doing official Police investigations?

This type of evidence is not accepted in a Court of law. And this in itself is enough to determine the majority of people to answer negatively to the above question. If these are not accepted legally, then it means the Police should have no reason to make the effort and gather this type of evidence either.

Another implication is that so long as the evidence is not accepted, that means they have no value, their validity is not confirmed by reality and the scientific verification. That is why they are not considered during a trial in Court. If they are not good for the Court, for the same reasons they should not be good for anyone else, in our case for the Police either.

True, Police procedure manuals do not include regulations for such type of practices and neither do we hear through official channels that Police ever makes use of such occult mediums in the sense of asking for their cooperation or help.

However the situation has not always been this way, and things have not been clear for everyone. Sometimes information leaked through unofficial means or from unverified sources which pretended that in some of the most famous criminal cases Police had asked for the help of spirit mediums. And such information

proved sensational. The very fact that, even without being verified, such information was able to make sensational news and to cause a high level of reaction among the population proves that in reality this is not accepted practice. No one expects that state institutions ask for help from this type of services. If it was normal, the news would not make sensation and cause reaction, in short it would cease to be news at all.

Historically, the help from such agencies was not always rejected. And in books and movies, we still find this type of practices. There were some cases even in our times where Police officers have tried to use unconventional means. But these cases in our modern time have always had an unofficial character. They were rather isolated incidents and actions taken on the individual's own initiative, without the official approval of the state institution.

A good comparison with the way that state institutions generally keep away from any connection with the occult and with things not recognized by science can be seen in the legal separation between religion and state. The reason behind both principles is the same: Religion and the paranormal cannot be demonstrated scientifically, therefore the government cannot accept either one of them, much less to use them for its benefit.

Even though it happens isolated and it has an unofficial character, the phenomenon still fascinates enough people or at least is able to cause curiosity to such an extent that it justified the publication for the general public of results from multiple scientific studies. Some appeared in video format on the television channels dedicated to documentaries on this topic.

Science already had thoroughly documented studies from the last three centuries to demonstrate that all supposed paranormal phenomenon are just fakes, illusions, unwarranted. This is also the reason why the Justice system does not recognize them and society, in general, and the industry also ignore them. But scientific investigations have been done again specifically for the particular cases where it was heard that Police asked for help from spirit mediums in order to solve a number of official criminal cases.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

Something similar to the documentaries on the subject of UFO's. It is already well-known by science that these do not exist, in principle, but still some scientific investigations have been done for particular cases reported by amateur observers that succeeded in making sensation. The result is always the same: Science consistently declares them fakes, unwarranted, illusions.

The conclusions of these investigations about spirit mediums have been as following:

The statistics used to give the impression of successful predictions were incorrect. Properly analyzed, they do not indicate any difference from a common person making random suppositions about daily events. The ones receiving the bad statistics have been presented only with some examples and only from one perspective. In other words, out of 100 trials, 50 were successes and 50 failures. And when it was pretended that a prediction was successful, the scenario was interpreted subjectively, after the facts became known, only to fit them with reality.

The reason why some Police officers felt tempted to cross the barrier imposed by scientific conclusions is the same why some people are willing to risk and ignore the barrier of recommendations coming from the department of Food and Drugs Administration and are willing to do almost "anything" for their health or for beauty. Thus they try improbable, untested methods which then they feel ashamed to admit publicly that they did, medication and treatments not officially accredited. These people gave in to temptation during moments of desperation and decided tacitly to try something based on the self-justifying feeling that if we don't lose anything and the method is available, why not try it?

What is the significance of the fact that in our time consulting spirit mediums has been officially and completely abandoned? First, this was a decision against their own interests, which makes it even more relevant. Police needs help, but if they still abandoned that help, this can mean only one thing: Such help is not real. In other words, it is only an illusion, they could never count on it.

This is in no way a subjective decision or one influenced by prejudice, but one imposed by the reality of evidence against all those potential parallel motives.

The principle can be defined this way: If someone is not willing to bet his or her money on something, that is already a sign that the cause is not credible or guaranteed.

In an open market economy, in a free society, any opportunity is speculated. If something promises to work, it will be used, but if it doesn't, it is abandoned, ignored.

In the industry too, inventions are not ignored, but rather there is competition between inventors and often there are attempts of stealing one another's inventions. When there are valid clues or good indications that in some geographic area there might be resources or energy potential, it becomes almost impossible to stop a wave of interest from the part of businesses wanting to extract and to take advantage of those opportunities.

Even in the cases when the law prohibits some practices or products, in general, it is hard to stop people who understand that there might be a possibility of gain or the opportunity of satisfying some personal needs. Most of the times, man will look for ways to get to the prohibited things, even if that means breaking the law, so long as the motivation persists and the temptation is real.

Therefore what could stop or what other explanation could there be for the Police refusal to ask for help from spirit mediums, if indeed these proved to be real and useful? Is any other explanation possible besides the fact that these services are not proven to be true and have not brought any real results?

We note a contrast between the tendency in the industry from any field, on the one hand, when they discover something good, to research it, replicate it and then produce it more efficiently for maximum profit. And, on the other hand, the general lack of interest towards supernatural phenomenon. Occult practices, and here I mean any type of connection with the supernatural, are found in all countries on the globe. Today information travels fast and the entire world can have access to it, to verify and study the phenomenon in detail. But now, this type of prac-

tices have no more than an amateur character, they work in the entertainment sector, but are not taken seriously from any other perspective. They are not considered true, guaranteed or exact, but rather are placed together with a sort of gambling or lottery.

Relevant in this regard is also the legal requirement for all those publicly offering this type of services to carry a visible inscription which includes the explanation that it is a “lottery”. Any office practicing such declared activities has to place such an inscription in the window or in other visible place for all to explain clearly that the pretended supernatural abilities and so-called predictions and revelations are not verified, nor guaranteed and cannot be trusted in the case of making decisions in real life. This is a measure with double purpose: On the one hand, to warn potentially interested customers about the true nature of this activity, but on the other hand also to avoid later complains in Court against them, that they have misguided the customers or that their predictions have failed.

The procedure is similar to the signs and inscriptions that the law requires now the producing companies to place on commercially sold cigarettes, that smoking is damaging to health and that it destroys the organism of both active and passive smokers.

Of course the question can be raised: Why does the law even permit spiritual mediums to work, if their predictions are not true and, respectively, why does it allow the selling of cigarettes, since their damaging effect is known? However in this chapter, for our debate, we are interested only in the conclusion regarding the existence of supernatural and the so-called powers of such occult mediums which derives from this decision of legal requirement to display inscriptions carrying messages that warn clients that the methods are not verified and that the results are not guaranteed (in other words that they are false pretences).

Another relevant aspect in this regard is the reaction, or rather lack of reaction from the market, lack of interest from the part of the industry. If the entire list of occult practices represented more than simple amusement or pure treachery, practiced by charlatans, wouldn't they have made sensation by now? Wouldn't they have attracted the attention of the whole world? Wouldn't

they have taken the first page of mass-media, radio, television, internet – wouldn't this have made the biggest news of all? Wouldn't representatives from all research departments from industry, medicine, science, and even the government and law enforcement personnel get together in order to confirm and further investigate the phenomenon? If proven, such phenomenon, no matter how small, would have been studied by all immediately!

It is a normal reaction found in the familiar stories about Spiderman, Superman, Batman and Extra-Terrestrial visitors – if there is something supernatural anywhere on the globe, science is interested and investigates the phenomenon. Today science carefully studies all details of life in order to imitate ingenious processes used by flora and fauna on our planet and then to implement them in modern technology, without pollution and other side effects. From birds it learns how to make air planes and fly, from fish it learns to build submarines. The interest is huge and the resources dedicated to it go beyond man's imagination.

How can we explain, in this context, the total lack of interest to research the supernatural phenomenon? Science studies black holes, black energy, anti-matter and it ignores the supernatural? The conclusion suggested by this chapter, based on the mentioned aspects, is the following: There is no proof of the supernatural => from which implicitly derives the conclusion that the supernatural does not exist.

** Following I quote a response received on this subject and then I comment on it:

“Investigators do well that they no longer use Para-normal methods, because these are in fact occult. The supernatural exists, namely, one of divine type, the other the occult type. The divine type does not let itself be manipulated either by investigators or by spirit mediums. The occult type lets itself be touched, in order to steal souls.”

I start with the first phrase. When a reply is given in a debate, both the receiver and also anyone following the conversation expect arguments. The word “well” in the beginning is usually con-

sidered too generic. But it could be qualified further by expressions like “because ...” or “since ...”. In the above quote the connection is made between “well” and “because these are in fact occult”. The logical question is: “What is the argument?” Something is supposedly good because it is divine and supposedly bad because it is occult.

For the present debate the existence of God is not recognized by both parties. Therefore one cannot say that something is good simply “because it is divine”, because that wouldn’t be accepted by the part who does not believe in God. An argument can work if it contains evidence accepted by both sides.

If one side brings the divine as proof that something is good or bad, that means an attempt *to prove by means of what needs to be proven*. Until the end of the debate, at least for one of the parts involved, God is only a supposition. So proving something by means of the divine means *a supposition supported by another supposition*. In other words: I suppose it is good or bad because it is (supposedly) divine or occult.

Second phrase. This chapter’s title is about supernatural, and it tries to analyze the influence on the subject by the Police decision. To what extent this decision constitutes a proof that the supernatural does not exist. In other words, the chapter discusses one argument against the supernatural. In reply, it is expected that the opposing part believes in the supernatural. But it is also to expected that it would either contest the argument provided here or bring another argument supporting its own side or version.

However, the second phrase of the quoted reply simply states that “the supernatural exists” and it continues to explain that this is of two types. The connection made between the two parts of the sentence is done by the word “namely”. This type of expressing represents an *explanation of the idea, but not a demonstration* of it. In this sentence we learn that “supernatural” is of two types. But we are not presented any reason for “why” that is so.

Third phrase. Again a statement, however not a proof supporting the two previous ones. But a new idea, itself not proven

either. Essentially, this says that the divine does not let itself be “manipulated”. Judging by the context of the topic discussed and also from the next phrase, I suppose the meaning of the term “manipulated” here refers rather to being “touched”. In the sense that the divine cannot be verified, measured and measured objectively.

At this point, the question becomes: “God’s action upon believers cannot be measured in advance, in the sense of being able to *provoke* it?” But neither could it be measured after it has taken place, in the sense of being able to *notice* it?

Scientific investigation could not confirm either type of supernatural intervention, either before or after, either positive or negative.

Fourth phrase. “ ... lets itself be touched, in order to ...” Does this phrase contain any arguments? The scientific investigation has not confirmed the supernatural in occult mediums either. Do we have any proof anywhere else that this lets itself be “touched”?

WE'VE BEEN BORN WITH GOD AND THE BIBLE → WE CANNOT JUDGE TOTALLY IMPARTIAL

Just as we show a natural tendency to support our own nationality, place of birth, race ... etc., the fact that we have been born in a geographical area where Christianity is the dominant religion affects our capacity for an objective analysis of all options, especially the opposite ones. We tend to express ourselves in a "biased" way.

Generally, when someone joins a group made up of representatives coming from multiple different environments and they all express opinions regarding a certain subject currently on public debate, the danger that everyone tends to respond based on prejudices according to the place of their origin is well known.

The phenomenon can be exemplified by the situation of a group which judges a criminal case in Court (with jurors) or judges in a sports, artistic or other types of competition. Or if they have to make decisions in a delegation of a private or state institution.

If it is relatively easy to discuss and identify others' prejudices, but it is always more difficult to identify it and recognize prejudices in ourselves. What chances would we have to be right if we bet on our country in an international contest or if we bet on our city in an urban competition between cities? First, it depends on the number of countries or cities present in the competition, if all other factors remain the same. If let's say, two countries or cities take part in the competition, then the chances can be 2 to 1, or 50%. But when the number of participants is growing, the chances may fall dramatically.

If we have been born in Romania and express our opinion within an international cooking contest, what are the chances that we should be right, if we say that Romanian food is the best? Maybe for our taste, used with the specific menu, it might be

best, we like it most. But is our opinion realistic, objective, worthy to be considered in this case?

How about saying also in case of an international musical contest that Romanian music is better than other countries' music or to say also that Romanian cinema, theatre or literature are all of better quality than the rest of Europe or even of the entire world?

Of course, we cannot exclude completely the possibility that in one of these fields Romanians might be the best. However these chances are very small, and they are even smaller for them to be better in more than one of these fields or even in all. If we express ourselves in favor of our own country in front of an international jury in all competitions, what are the chances that we should be taken seriously? Wouldn't our judgment be looked upon with suspicion and wouldn't we be suspected of subjectivism?

For someone intending to learn which one of all the parts that entered the competition is really the best, giving first chance to his or her own country does not represent the most efficient way. By contrary, this could constitute the most difficult obstacle to overcome.

Is the same true in the case of God and the Bible, do these same principles apply in the field of religion, is it possible that we might have prejudices when discussing these subjects? Should it be an alarm signal when a person supports the religion of his geographical area? At school there are students whose parents belong to different religions and spiritual orientations. Are we surprised if the proportions are reflected among the children? We probably expect that each child should support the orientation of their parents. But would anyone consider that those students are right and that their opinion is based on objective proof supporting the position that each individual takes?

The chances for one of those students or, in general, for anyone to be credible and his / her opinion to be taken seriously by someone looking for the solution supported by objective arguments grow especially when the person does *not* support the same idea that his / her parents do or that of the same city or country. Because this eliminates the risk of prejudice.

Always, when the situation is reversed, when we identify that which ethics calls a “conflict of interests”, a balanced mind will sense an alarm signal. A company tells me that its products are better than its competitors. A practicing Muslim who inherited that religion from his or her parents talks to me about the value of Islam. A child from a Buddhist family shows me the superiority of Buddhism. Or, an example closer to me, a member from a Protestant family presents me the advantages of Protestantism.

We have been born with God and the Bible not because of our conscious choice, but simply because our parents happened to be here. Would there be any chance that the ideas specific to the place where we were born might be the ones proven and true out of all the ideas specific to other areas of the entire world? The possibility is not necessarily excluded or denied entirely. However when we continue to support the Bible’s claims against historical evidence, just because this has been traditionally the opinion shared by people in this part of the world and, if we also continue to support the existence of God and creation despite all contrary discoveries in biology, astronomy and all other branches of modern science, then the suspicion of subjective judgment and one influenced by prejudice is stronger and more convincing.

Because we have been born in an area used to believing in God and the Bible, in most conversations, even when a Christian is trying to convert unreligious people, atheists, or born in other areas with different religions, the existence of God and authenticity of the Bible are always *assumed*. This assumption explains, to some extent, the reactions that an unexpected discussion about the very subject of existence of God and Bible’s authenticity causes.

One of the reactions is manifested in the tendency to avoid. But even when a Christian wants to participate in the conversation, it is generally a difficult discussion, the subject is unpopular, it is perceived as uncomfortable. He or she is not used to it, has the feeling of being on foreign ground, taken by surprise. Does not expect it, is not ready for it – has not learned how a conversation on such a topic could be carried. **The main** difficulty consists in the fact that a Christian’s mind does not seem able to distinguish be-

tween premises and conclusions when they assume or try to support these opinions in a conversation. It is not clear for them what is supposed and what is proven, to what point the discussion is about things heard and from what point start the things that are verified.

A second difficulty is that of a person suffering any type of handicap, who needs to fight more than a “normal” individual, without handicap. A foreigner who comes to a new country usually needs to work more than a local in order to obtain the same results. One representative of a discriminated minority group needs to apply additional efforts in order to do what the majority of the population does and also to fight prejudice.

That is why a born Christian finds him or herself in a position of double difficulty when they talk to a convinced atheist: on the one hand, not being used to support his or her position regarding the existence of God and Bible's authenticity with logical arguments. And, on the other hand, because of the inherited faith, they are forced to provide more than usual reasons and arguments supporting their own position. The initial tendency from the part of the listener is to ignore the arguments in favor of the Bible offered by a Christian (especially one born such). In this regard, it is easy to imagine how different the reaction would be if a Jew or Muslim would talk about the Bible. That person would have the immediate attention just because he or she supports an idea against prejudices, so their reasons are more credible.

By contrast, when people hear a born Christian speaking in favor of the existence of God and the Bible, this triggers an alarm signal to automatically reject, to discriminate against that person, to suspect him or her of a subjective reasoning and one influenced by prejudices.

This alarm signal forces the Christian to greater efforts, to more evidence and stronger and more clear arguments in order to be taken seriously and to be convincing. It is not impossible to succeed, but one thing is for sure: Just like the handicapped, the foreigner or the discriminated minority, that individual has to fight some prejudice, he will have to surpass them and prove that they are not true.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

However, when, in spite these great expectations, the person still does not offer even the minimum evidence, but he or she rather builds a discourse based on flawed reasoning of the type: 1. free assertions or 2. supposition supported by another supposition ... then the suspicions of subjectivism and prejudice, if not fully confirmed, at least they become very probable. And the dialogue fails, has smaller chances of winning the debate and to convince anyone.

The benefits of this analysis is that what naturally constitutes an alarm signal for an atheist, who tends to reject the Christian's message, can be used now, as a result of a conscientious effort, also as an alarm signal for the one who accepted to believe for him or herself or tries to support such faith in front of others based on an incorrect reasoning. Being aware of his or her predisposition, the person is able to see the vulnerabilities and aspects that require special attention. Just like in the case of predisposition to certain physical diseases, when someone matches the criteria that make up the risk factors and learns that he or she is placed in the category of those predisposed to the respective disease, the person needs to visit the doctor more often, to do more analysis, to watch their diet, life style and obviously watch for any sign that might indicate the presence of the disease.

In the same way, the one predisposed to faulty reasoning as described above can watch his or her own way of expression and look for signs that his or her replies and argumentation might indicate manifestations of presupposed faith only because it is popular in the individual's place of birth, and therefore he or she tends to believe that they need no further proof and that it would be enough just to state them. Specifically, the person can look like in a mirror and verify his or her reasoning, asking the question: "What are the basis of my statements?" Are my statements: 1. unwarranted or 2. suppositions based on other suppositions? Can they be suspected that they are based on subjectivism and prejudice?

To this category belong also replies that simply list Bible verses. The one doing so supposes that Bible's authenticity is confirmed. It is of course everyone's right to such suppositions, how-

ever when the supposition is demanded of an atheist during a debate meant to establish that very fact, it can constitute rather an indication of a handicap, a subjective dialogue, the visible mark of prejudice.

It is also the handicap noticed in cases where minorities' human rights are discussed and where representatives of multiple social groups sharing various orientations may participate. People who do not belong to the minority group and who do not share their values can still take part in the conversation. However they have the option to talk in an objective, detached way, accepting the rights of others to choose different paths, so long as those decisions do not affect others, and thus simply comment on the situation in a logical and balanced manner. On the other hand, others often see only their own group, values and personal choices and will show this when they express themselves publicly, when they express only inner feelings and the extent to which they appreciate or condemn the orientation and values of the other group. The latter group obviously shows an inability of sensing what is really being discussed and to distinguish between personal choices and the rights of others to choose something different for themselves.

The general, dedicated term for these groups that do not distinguish between what they personally want and what is found on the table for discussion, in the case of the rights of national, sexual, religious minorities ... etc., is: "extremist". Even in politics it is distinguished, for example, between: a right wing party vs. one of "extreme" right. The differences are manifest during negotiations between multiple groups sharing different views.

For those who identify the difference between a reasoning based on suppositions vs. one based on arguments, between personal wishes vs. objective evidence, the comparison between their way of expression during a debate with the manifestations of the so-called extremist groups in any field can also help them realize that: "Changing the way of expression during a debate does not necessarily mean the change of their position and of their personal options, but rather an improvement of the dialogue, which in turn assures stability, respect, even if their posi-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

tion may remain unchanged.” They will be able to get better results, will be understood better and will be able to comment to the point, and not besides the point.

WE START WITH 10% MYTHS UNEXPLAINED BY SCIENCE → TO US IT SEEMS LIKE A LOT

Today science has explained many things, but there are also things not (yet) explained. If we only look at the present situation, we may be tempted to consider that the ones not explained are “many”. But if we consider the whole history of the scientific progress in the last four centuries, things not (yet) explained prove to be relatively “few”.

The image of science can be manipulated in some cases just like the individual who cannot see the entire forest because of looking too closely at a single tree.

One of the potential factors responsible for an incomplete image is the objective truth that we were born and live in this era. Whether we like it or not, most of the history of science is prior to our life time. That is why, without a conscientious effort to investigate the scientific activity throughout all its existence, there is the risk of being ignorant toward most of this period.

Another factor that contributed to the present perception toward science is the way that religion reacted during the conflict: against all discoveries and scientific explanations. One by one, the work of science has overturned most important religious conceptions. But religion started by initially opposing it with all its force, and when science gained acceptance, so that there seemed no chance of turning back, religion changed its mind: It decided to accept the scientific truth and to simply wipe clean the conflict, without leaving any traces. It even pretended to have always held the same opinion. That is why the present religious perspective tends to cover up the entire list of major scientific discoveries as if they never occurred.

On the other hand, science itself did not invest much in publicity, in order to remind the public of all its successes and to show

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

its own merits. First, this is because it does not consider itself at war with anyone, nor being threatened by anything. That part of religious community who contests it is decreasing numerically and is relatively insignificant for the scientific debate.

Obviously the natural concern of today's scientists is not the past successes and gains, but the current progress, to continue to study what is not yet researched and to explain what has not yet been understood. They present their current activities, obstacles that they intend to overcome, problems which they try to solve and the limits that they want to eliminate. In this context, it is possible to see how someone may choose a pessimistic attitude and to view science from the perspective of the present fight, exaggerating the obstacles, problems and limits facing science. And thus to give the impression that this is the whole image, the entire truth. As if it has fought against the same problems from its beginnings, 400 years ago, and it has still not been able to solve them. Clearly this would be an inexact, unrealistic image.

A similar situation, that can easily illustrate the problem of perspectives, is found in the realm of computers. And here, the relatively short history of its existence provides the advantage of being able to remember it completely. The older folks, those who have followed it and have rejoiced at each stage of its development now have the opportunity to be overly excited and even impressed by the performance of latest machines on the market today. By contrast, someone who for any reasons, either because of age or other factors, has not been familiar with the history of technology in this area, but came directly in contact with the newest models on the market today, could show total dissatisfaction. Commenting only on the disadvantages, the limits and functions that the computer is *not* able to fulfill (yet). A sort of comparison between those who see the glass half "full", versus half "empty".

Not far from the example of computers is the situation in the field of robotics. Robots have made their way and are present, in various forms, in most areas of industry and modern daily life. The question can be raised about a certain operation not presently

executed, if robots might be able to execute it at some time in the future. Here we can easily imagine both potential attitudes:

1. One who looks from the perspective of the direction of technology and the progress recorded until now in this field could be confident that robotics will get to the point when it will reproduce the operation in question.
2. By contrast, one may look at things from the other perspective, of the things not (yet) accomplished, ignoring the clues offered by all that has been implemented so far, how we have arrived at the current level and the direction proven by technology and robotics. This person may not allow any chance for robotics to ever come to the point where it will implement the operation in question.

In the case of the confrontation between evolution vs. creation, between science and a part of the religious world (only one part, because a growing part of religion accepts the evolution theory), the perspective from which some look at science, namely of things *not* (yet) explained, can create the pessimistic image that failures are dominant and definitive, that science has no chance of ever explaining them. Also, the number of mysteries not (yet) understood can seem great because of this limited perspective:

1. It does not compare this number against a certain total and
2. it ignores the number of problems already solved by science.

Thus, instead of the image of winner in the conflict against Middle-Ages mythology, science is unfortunately presented as loser and as being incapable.

**Next I will quote a (partial) reply from a declared Christian and will comment on it:

“Church’s faith is not based on what scientists have or have not believed. Some of them believe, others do not. Some say one thing, others another, sometimes their sayings are verified, other times they are not.”

This reply reflects an attitude that lowers the status of science and minimizes its value. Its message is that, from the religious perspective, whatever scientists believe is irrelevant. In the

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

first phrase science is reduced to the value of some human opinions. Then, in the second phrase there are mentioned differences of opinions between scientists, while the third phrase notes that sometimes what science says is not confirmed. All these three statements start from one truth, but the suggested perspective is determined by two factors:

- A. First, the percentage of occurrence compared to the percentage of the other option.
- B. Second, the effect of presenting only one side upon the resulting image of science.

I will illustrate the role of these two factors in the case of each of the three phrases of the above quoted reply:

1. First phrase: Science is reduced to human opinions. It is true that scientific ideas are communicated by humans, but to what extent do they represent human opinions? In order for a theory to be called scientific, it needs to follow a rigorous methodology that eliminates (almost completely) the human subjectivism.

Factors determining the perspective:

- A. Percentage of subjectivism tends to 0%, that of objectivism to 100%.
- B. Attributing science only subjective effects creates an incomplete, one-sided image, and considering the percentages, it is rather an improbable one.

2. Second phrase: Scientists have different opinions. It is true that in the absence of a theory, the unofficial opinions can vary, and every new theory is critically analyzed by the scientific community itself. However to what extent do critical opinions differ *after* the verification stage when it is officially declared a confirmed theory? Opposing views usually cease after that point.

Factors determining the perspective:

- A. The percentage of contradictions is insignificant and acceptance almost unanimous after the official theory.

- B. Associating science only with internal contradictions represents a partial image, and, considering the percentage after that stage, clearly a mistaken image.

3. Third phrase: Their sayings are not confirmed. It is true that scientists can make mistakes, but how does this compare with their success rate? The scale turns obviously in favor of their successes in case of personal opinions and almost totally in case of science official position. Considering also the mistakes of religion, makes the scale turn completely in one direction.

Factors determining the perspective:

- A. Percentage of mistakes is obviously less than that of science's successes.
- B. Mentioning only the few mistakes, without placing them in the context of the more numerous successes, induces the wrong image of science. Even more so when this is meant to be compared against religion's image in this regard.

IN CONCLUSION: The three phrases of the above quoted reply, they all manipulate the image of science from the perspective of both mentioned factors. The consistently suggested perspective by these phrases is neither the only possible, nor the most plausible of the two.

CREATION IS BASED ON THE 10% UNEXPLAINED BY SCIENCE → CALLED GOD OF 'VOIDS'

Creationists often accuse “evolution” of being ridiculous since it claims that intelligent things originated from non-intelligent things. However creation has always been based only on the lack of explanations, which “conveniently” left room for a Creator. And when science reduces the list of unexplained phenomenon, creation comes to support a God of voids.

The expression “God of voids” occurs in circles where the subject of evolution vs. creation is debated. However does this represent just a denigrating accusation or does it also have real significance, supported by verifiable observations? To what extent is such an accusation justified?

The immediate meaning of the expression is easily understood when it is compared against its opposite, namely: “God of wholes”, which suggests that the expression refers primarily to some “missing” things. In other words, the same meaning is represented if we say that an idea is supported by “pluses” (things that exist) vs. “minuses” (things that do not exist) or that the idea is derived from the things found vs. things not (yet) found.

In case of criminal investigations both methods can be used: A thief can be identified on the basis of (wholes) things discovered upon him, but that do not belong to him and should not have been found upon him. Or on the basis of (voids) missing things from multiple apartments visited by the same individual.

In the field of archeology there are theories: based either on (wholes) things excavated, relics, inscriptions, old documents and objects made during an ancient era, or based on (voids) missing parts from various statues and old sculptures, due to vandalism from the part of invading peoples who attacked the sites, or jew-

elry and other personal goods stolen from the tombs of ancient Egypt pharos. And there can be other examples like these.

The Bible is not confirmed, generally, by history. And, if some events described in it are contradicted directly by historical discoveries, other aspects of its text are neither confirmed, nor contradicted by them. The main reason being that miracles often refer to immaterial and unverifiable aspects. There are some events that history simply does not say anything about them, most likely because there is not enough material evidence discovered to date in order to allow a fully justified conclusion regarding them. If the Bible however claims that the events have taken place, then any supposed certainty in this regard may be called a certainty of “voids”. Meaning that it is based on the lack of a historical argument against it.

This expression is found almost exclusively with reference to the belief in creation. The accusation is that it is based on “voids”. Generally the discussion happens as follows: The evolution of species consists of a chain of many discovered elements. But there are also some missing links. Belief in creation is based on the very links that are missing and only on those. Namely, it assumes God’s hand in those particular places. And, thus, those missing links come to support a God of voids. Science arrived to its modern form as a serious endeavor, respected and stabile relatively recently – about 400 years ago. And the balance between the number of discovered links vs. the missing links went from a small percentage of discovered and majority missing, to the reverse situation of majority discovered and very few missing today. The continuous battle between science and religion revealed two components: 1. When science did not have an explanation for a natural phenomenon, in other words, it did not know its causes, then religion could assume God’s hand in that case, that God is behind it as the cause of that phenomenon. 2. Then, as science started to discover explanations and was able to identify their material causes, religion’s reply, instead of accepting the logical conclusion, to give up the position supported by such lost argument, was to chose to keep that position. But now it just moved the focus to other phenomenon not (yet) explained, where it as-

sumed the divine intervention (which also meant a reduction of potential “voids” supporting it).

The constant moving of the border between processes (already) understood and those not (yet) understood, and consequently the re-orientation of religion, which hunts the fields unexplored and not yet fully understood by science, has come to be compared with a game of “Tom and Jerry”. The point is not only that the number of phenomenon without an identified material cause has been reduced, but all those used by religion as basis for the belief in the existence of God and creation for millenniums have been exhausted. The basis of ancient faith has disappeared completely. Religion today is searching for a basis which is no longer the same, religion looks for support for creation in other places and areas.

So, in principle, creation has never been based on pluses, wholes, discovered things. But it was based only on minuses, voids, causes not (yet) discovered by science, both now and in the past. And the number of scientific discoveries has grown constantly, while the tendency of voids was to decrease.

Specifically, during the era when belief in the existence of God and creation originated, none of the explanations of natural phenomenon were known. Now we understand most of them: We know how planets rotate and why stars keep their positions in the sky, we know how rain happens, storms, the wind, lightning, volcanoes, earthquakes ... etc. We know the composition of air, solar energy, soil’s resources, photosynthesis in plants, digestion in animals. The details not (yet) known today are insignificant (compared with those of the past).

There are aspects of meteorology that are not known at the level of detail that would allow all gathered data to predict the weather with absolute precision. If religion uses the opportunity to suggest the possibility of divine intervention on this basis, then here scientists accuse an attempt of proving a God of voids. Since it speculates only minor and temporary imperfections of science.

Additionally, it is significant to note that a reasoning supporting the presence of God where things are not totally clear not only means that its argument uses “voids”, but that it uses even un-

known voids. So the reasoning does not name a specific element, it does not point to the exact place where it is found, showing which void it is, but it is based on the unpredictability of the final results. It is a vague formulation. It supposes that somewhere in the process there must have been a supernatural intervention. Why is it significant that the formulation is vague? First, the proposed conclusion is not unique, not exclusive, there are other possible conclusions when we do not know all responsible factors. If all options were exhausted, then it could have been a possible logical conclusion.

A vague, undefined, imprecise reasoning equates to an incomplete statement. And the main problem is the same: The conclusion fails the rules of logic. In other words, not knowing exactly its basis, the conclusion cannot be certain, exclusive. This can constitute an alarm signal for those who want to verify that what they believe (in our case: faith) is based on logical reasoning. The question can be raised: Do I use unfinished phrases, undefined terms, unclear ideas or, in general, do I use the pretext of not knowing in order to support something that does not derive from known evidence?

Another specific example is the world of plants and animals. Today we generally know their entire life cycle. And if a new species appears that we do not (yet) fully understand all its processes and functions, then we conclude that it seems strongly possible, from what we already know about the other studied processes and also based on the constant proven trend of scientific progress seen so far, that an explanation exists and that the causes should be material. Whereas supposing a divine intervention in the unexplained places would contradict the direction supported by the scientific experience and it would be an arbitrary choice, especially since not all other options are exhausted, which although not proven, are yet more probable.

Saying that a certain idea is ridiculous may be interpreted as rude by the person who supports the idea. However saying that a certain number represents a ridiculously small percentage compared to the whole can no longer be interpreted as rude, but it is simply a justified observation, mathematically proven.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

We see both claims: Believers of creation accuse the scientific explanation of life's origin by evolution as being ridiculous, while unbelievers reply with the same accusation. However, ridiculousness depends on the reference used, as the example of the glass half full or half empty well illustrates this issue of perspective. The concept of ridiculous refers to an unexpected situation, totally unusual, that goes beyond a certain level of conflict. Essentially, someone needs a ladder in order to reach at a certain height. When the ladder is missing, the claim that a person was able to climb empty-handed may sound ridiculous. However when the ladder is back again, the same statement is not ridiculous anymore. In reality, the critics of evolution do exactly that, they present some extreme moments throughout the evolutionary process without mentioning the intermediary stages (or steps of the ladder) that science uses as an explanation for those transformations.

The accusation of ridiculous used against creation is based, in principle, on the existence of the ladder. Out of 100 steps of the ladder, science has identified 90. And faith supposes that the 10 not (yet) identified justify the existence of God and creation.

CONCLUSION:

- percentage of 10% is ridiculously small
- choosing the 10 is a suspect coincidence with the same 10 not identified today
- the number has not been stable, in fact it was greater and now it gets ever smaller
- religion changed its mind: for millenniums it has accepted the Bible mythological vision of the world, but now it accepts modern scientific cosmology
- religion's "proof" is a minus (void), not a plus (whole) or more
- when an amateur uses scientific data to give an interpretation contrary to the one given by scientists => this means ridiculous. Everyone can be right in his or her own field of expertise, however claiming to correct the scientist in his field ... is unacceptable.

When the evidence used to support a theory disappears, but the adherents to that theory refuse to let go of it, and they suppose that there might be other yet unknown evidence ... Then can there be any other reason for supporting that theory, besides familiarity, their being used to it for a long time, and the personal investments in it that make it so hard to give it up?

When, for millenniums, religion has interpreted heaven as God's place, spatially far and vertically above the Earth. And, after initially fighting against modern cosmology, it now accepts it and turns to the Bible text introducing the modern sense of the terms in it, even though this was not the one originally intended by the author... Can there be any other reason for supporting that text, besides simply subjectivism?

SECTION II

RELIGION

The success of science has meant the defeat of religion. All erroneous ideas that were supported by religion in antiquity have been corrected now by science. At first, religion has opposed the scientific discoveries. But with the universal confirmation of science in our time, it was forced to give up the fight. It was never supported by evidence, since it reflects the mentality of the time when it originated, when the evidence was yet unknown.

- 8 The East converts to Christianity
while the West loses faith => it's a cycle 71
- 9 Authenticity of Bible stories is confirmed
only by the authors of the Biblical text 76
- 10 Diet: fruits only (in Eden) => not
recommended by nutrition specialists 83
- 11 Avoidance, self-justification, personal
attacks => signal the lack of arguments 92
- 12 A guilty person hiding something avoids
verification (Bible demands: "faith") 101

THE EAST CONVERTS TO CHRISTIANITY WHILE THE WEST LOSES FAITH → IT'S A CYCLE

New conversions have given some the impression that modern society might be recognizing the truth of religion. However the level where the East finds itself now was experimented by the West already long before, and so this conversion to Christianity can be associated rather with a beginning stage in the development of a society.

Orient's conversion to Christianity has come as a surprise, and the news has been used as such by Christians around the world.

Globally, religion in general is in decline, while science is gaining ground. And the balance is turning irreversibly: When it started 400 years ago, science has been looked upon with skepticism and it had to fight its way in order to survive in a world traditionally dominated by religion. But, gradually, religion has lost its influence (dare we say, it is an indication of its weakness?) in society's structures, and its influence diminishes at the individual level too. Religion is ever more aware of this trend and it feels the pressure of the majority, who at all levels of life rely more and more on science, which establishes its definite position apparently without any *real* threat.

In the context of this reality, any confirmation of religion is welcomed and it is received as a breath of fresh air. And the arrival of new converts is felt by the community as water for a dry land and their example is always used as good news for the encouragement of the other believers. Following the fall of communism, in Eastern European countries there has been recorded a high interest in religion, which was already higher than the one in the West even before the fall of communism. But now, this could be expressed and be recognized.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

For believers, the phenomenon raised questions: Does this represent an awakening of mankind to reality, a sign that the truth has been recognized in the last hour, a final test of Christian values? The limits of the phenomenon to a relatively small geographic area, its connections with the historical context and also the relatively short period of manifestation, all provide reasons to be reserved regarding a positive answer to these questions. No matter how desired by some and needed for the cause they might be.

And regarding the question about the phenomenon's historical significance, of possible changes in the near future or of mass conversions, the realistic measures of the exact number of the converts, as opposed to the wished or anticipated one, and also the lack of stability of those existing ones, who have "cooled off" in a few (approximately 5) years, rather seem to reduce the enthusiasm in this regard.

A more recent example, but which repeats the same process, is the interest shown by the Chinese towards Christianity. Some have announced the event as "China's conversion" and started to envision the same thing for the rest of Asian countries. And many, some amongst which are even members of my immediate family, learn the Chinese language in order to dedicate themselves to the missionary work in that country. Even if we would ignore the immediate reason, that their access and the right to practice foreign religions had been prohibited before, and that they also show an interest in other religions and foreign ideas that they have come in contact with for the first time, it is relevant to note in this regard the comparison with the stages experienced by the modern Western civilization.

This step toward freedom of thought was experimented by Western countries some centuries ago. And the scientific revolution has caused also a religious revolution, which at first meant a diversifying and concern for refining it, but in time has turned into their abandoning it to an ever greater extent.

Rather than being a new direction globally, the experience of these countries is new only for themselves. And this reminds us that where the ex-communist countries are now, the West has

also been before. The situation meets all the conditions for the comparison with a natural cycle of human societies in general and in which China's recent example also follows with predictable steps.

The comparison between these parallel stages rightly raises questions regarding the timing of when a society shows interest in religion. Is this interest present in the initial or the later stages, at the beginning or later during its development, when it is less or more advanced? When people know less, are immature and without experience or when they reached a high level of knowledge, are mature and achieved a comprehensive life experience?

It is impossible for this sort of questions not to concern also some of the Christian missionaries themselves, who know full-well the situation in their own countries, both present and past, and are familiar with the inevitable decrease in religious interest there. Some may ask themselves about the stability of the results of their work and they can even experiment a confusing feeling of a simulated activity, the impression that the recorded results do not necessarily reflect the whole truth. I count myself in this category too. I've asked myself similar questions, together with others that I was in contact with at the time, even if the feeling was not clearly defined and I was not fully aware of it, in no way permanent. I needed a long time and a detachment from the situation, which always favors an objective analysis, in order to recognize and articulate it now.

Society in general can be compared with the stages in a man's development towards maturity. That is why we may ask: Could there be other factors involved, besides real conviction about the truth of faith? Can an adult, for example, influence an adolescent in a direction which his natural development would not direct him to or that he accepts only because of being young, however that he would reject later as an adult? Is it possible that an oppressed society might feel attracted to the brightness of an advanced civilization and that it might confuse things coming from that civilization, so that they do not distinguish easily and immediately to what extent some aspects, religion in our case, are rep-

representative of that civilization? Is a degree of manipulation possible, too, both from the part of the one called and also from the one calling, no matter what the intention or the level of awareness of all the involved parties?

The rate of conversion of new recruits seems to demonstrate a verifiable influence from external factors. A correlation is documented between the number of new converts and the condition of a society. The individual's suffering has been proven especially to be linked to his disposition toward faith. There have been identified geographic limits as well as chronological marks related to changes in the response toward the religious call. People have been more receptive to faith in a region than in another region, while increase and decrease in the interest in all regions have been recorded in relation to some historical dates.

These observations can raise questions about the traditional understanding according to which the decision in favor or against religion depends exclusively on the value of faith, on the one hand, and on the moral purity of the individual called, on the other hand. And that the new convert proved to have made the obvious choice and the only logical one, whereas the one not converted supposedly had been influenced by external or internal factors to make a decision simply against common sense and against all that is right.

Because of these reasons, we can finally ask if the argument of recent conversions, selectively chosen, only from several geographical areas which have known a religious awakening, is simply continuing the artificially constructed impression, but in reality is doing nothing but delay the inevitable confrontation with the proven reality of the sealed direction of the path on which religion finds itself at this stage in the course of history.

The example of the totalitarian countries can illustrate the situation well. The sheer poverty of the country was contrasted by images and video recordings in mass-media that showed prosperity and simulated wealth. The prosperity and wealth appeared because of special preparations around certain known events, and things were often artificially arranged at the specific time and location. The press came when everything was ready and it would

take pictures and video recordings, then presented them to the public. Thus a false image was transmitted which only continued the illusion and delayed the inevitable confrontation of the reality confirmed by clues at all levels in that country.

AUTHENTICITY OF BIBLE STORIES IF CONFIRMED ONLY BY THE AUTHORS OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT

In the absence of historical confirmations, their authenticity is supported by a circular reasoning: 1. NT describes some important personalities, 2. these personalities guarantee with their name and reputation the value of the text, 3. but that very text gave them authority.

No historical document confirms the miraculous events described in the Gospels of the New Testament. The only writings outside the New Testament confirming the events are using also the New Testament text itself as proof for their authenticity or are based on other writings which, in turn, use the New Testament as direct evidence. However there is no confirmation coming from a separate, independent source with historical value.

Because of this reason and other similar ones, faith in the New Testament has been suspected of being based on a “circular reasoning”. Is this accusation justified, is “faith” based on such faulty reasoning?

Circular reasoning works this way: 1. I hear about a historical person. But who tells me about him? => 2. An eye witness does. How do I know that the witness is reliable? => 3. The historical person himself guarantees for this witness. And how do I know that the historical person tells the truth? => Again, back to where we started: They testify for one another.

Do we find this situation in the New Testament, is faith in the New Testament based on such circular reasoning?

For many Christians today, Jesus Christ is as real a person as any one member of his family, that he can see and talk to every day. They would laugh at the very idea of questioning the existence or activity of Jesus. They would answer right away something like this:

1. How could one possibly deny his existence, when the whole world counts the years from him, “before Christ” and “after Christ”?
2. How could one ever doubt his existence, considering the huge number of his followers, who make up the largest religion in the world today?
3. We have the holy books (Gospels) from him and some unequalled teachings, so it would be absurd that someone even try to deny him.

ANSWER (to the three arguments presented above):

1. Current calendar came much later than the events and was not based on historical considerations. This is an *indirect* confirmation, based on the New Testament itself.
2. All this crowd of followers lives much later than the events and none was contemporary with Jesus, nor have they verified the historical truth of the events.
3. The New Testament was written many decades after the events, the descriptions are not historical and they do not use historical evidence to prove its authenticity.

For many, who never tried to verify the situation personally, it might be surprising to find out that the New Testament is the only *independent* ancient document describing Jesus’ activity. However, some might ask: Even if the New Testament is the only one, is that not enough? And if the New Testament alone does not provide the necessary confirmation, isn’t it enough that the apostles contemporary with him have seen everything? And since they were, on the one hand, honest individuals and, on the other hand, were willing to sacrifice their own lives to talk to others about Jesus, doesn’t this in itself mean that we can rely on their testimony?

In short, the above proposal indicates two separate sources that supposedly confirm Jesus’ activity: First is the New Testament and second are the apostles. Let us remember now the difference between a logical reasoning and a circular one. Logical reasoning uses *verified* and *accepted* evidence in order to refer to unverified, unaccepted things. Circular reasoning explains unverified things on the basis of other unverified things. Now, back to the

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

two proposed sources, the attempt of confirming Jesus' existence and activity on the basis of New Testament and the apostles:

First source: New Testament. Of course we can use this source, if, in turn, itself were "verifiable". It claims that its own text is "inspired by God". However this claim is not verifiable. Using such source is equivalent with confirming the New Testament on the basis of New Testament itself. The very accusation found in the Gospel, that Jesus testifies about himself (John 8:13). Therefore, it proves to be a circular reasoning.

Second source: The apostles. The same thing applies here as well. If someone or something confirms their authority or the evidence provided by them, then it becomes a verified, accepted source and the reasoning can be considered valid. But if they write about Jesus, while their own authority is guaranteed by what they themselves say that Jesus had said, then we have one person testifying about himself. And, like the first source above, it is unverified. So using it leads to a circular reasoning.

Another relevant aspect about the above two sources reporting on Jesus' activity and miracles refers to the significant difference between our modern era and the first century period. Between the current mentality of people today and the one back then, between the thought process, the methods used to arrive at a conclusion now vs. the basis commonly used then. Today, when we receive some news, we can ask for details and, in general, we use the same references and interpret things according to same standards. So, if the person reporting the information was him or herself present there and has experimented the details of the event directly, not through the testimony of third parties, then we understand, imagine the situation and rely on the report of that individual. *Because we experience the world in the same way, we interpret what we see, hear or feel by the same means.* In other words, it is not necessary for us to go to the same place and experiment the same conditions in order to verify them. We consider the person's sayings true, and that testimony is enough for us.

However the situation is very different when trying to confirm messages recorded by the New Testament authors. The world image and way of interpreting reality were very different in

that time. During the New Testament era, the world around was understood on the basis of supernatural forces: Natural phenomenon, daily events, diseases, healing, including birth and death and official positions held by political and religious leaders were attributed to some decisions made in the spiritual realm, beyond our world. Everything was attributed to the miraculous intervention of God (or of Satan) into the material world.

In such a context, they accepted the New Testament stories literally. And when the New Testament authors described Jesus' life and activity, it is expected that their report must be different than that of a journalist today who would describe the same person, Jesus, and the events in his life. Our experiences are determined by the level of knowledge and progress that science reached in all fields of research today. What would convince us to be a "divine" intervention in the material world is in no way similar to the basis used then for establishing the divine intervention. What for them constituted works of spirits from another world, for us generally has a different meaning and usually has a scientific explanation.

In conclusion, for the modern reader, the New Testament text does not contain an objective description of verifiable historical facts, but rather ***the subjective opinion of its authors***, the interpretation given by them, the value that they attributed to those respective events. A reality seen through the eyes of those individuals.

Considering this profound difference between us and the people who recorded the information regarding Jesus' miracles, the New Testament authors, if they were of good faith and were "convinced" of what they wrote does not automatically mean a sufficient argument for our requirements. This does not constitute proof that the miracles actually happened. Even if those persons were present and say that the events did happen.

What about the argument that the apostles accepted Jesus' resurrection, that they sacrificed their lives for their faith in his resurrection, and that it proves the certainty of that faith (if it were not true, they would not have been willing to guarantee it with their lives)? We may get a larger perspective if we consider

the following three factors: 1. Who ordered Christians' persecution (Jewish or Roman authorities); 2. The place where it was reported (Jerusalem, Rome or other provinces); and 3. The time period (before or after 70 CE).

If someone died for his faith in Jesus or his resurrection, does that automatically mean that Jesus' resurrection is certain? Maybe the person sincerely believed so, therefore for that individual it was certain. But does that mean the same for us? What was the basis of that person's faith? Do those reasons constitute verifiable proof so that we can use them to base our convictions on them today?

- Many Christians today claim to be certain of Jesus' resurrection and some may even be willing to give their lives for that faith. However these people: 1. Did not verify personally and 2. Do not have evidence confirming the event of Jesus' resurrection. They simply heard it from others, who, like them, did not verify and do not have any historical evidence for it. Consequently, if some Christians are offering their lives for their faith, it does not necessarily constitute a guarantee for us. They can offer us no proof because they themselves do not have any to verify the truth of their beliefs.
- In the first century, the apostle Paul admitted that he was not present as witness at the event, but believed it because: 1. Others have told him so and also 2. Because of a vision that he experienced personally.

Therefore it is possible that some in the first century indeed lost their lives for Christ.

However I'd like to mention six points regarding this experience:

1. Maybe these martyrs have been converted to Christianity by other Christians. They themselves did not meet Jesus personally and have never seen any evidence. However they have only heard the message from others. In this case, their martyr death does not represent any valid proof for us.
2. Others may have converted because of own personal experiences. However personal experiences can be subjective, they do not constitute an objective proof. Those people

could be wrong because of an erroneous interpretation of their experience.

3. Or maybe these Christians came to believe in Jesus because of some interpretation of the Old Testament, without additional objective material proof. And, since they accepted one aspect of Jesus life, they came to accept the rest, including his resurrection.
4. Some have died because of being Christians, but not necessarily for evidence of Jesus' resurrection. For example, the Roman emperor Nero persecuted Christians because of an accusation of putting the city on fire. Their death was not due to their faith in his resurrection.
5. The apostles and first Christians also believed other unverified things, like claiming that God gives and stops rain, or that Jesus existed before Abraham was born.
6. Others at that time used to give their lives for pagan beliefs, all religions had their own martyrs. Because those people were steadfast and accepted death, it does not constitute a guarantee that what each one of them believed was also true.

The opinion of scientists and theologians is relevant in this regard. The technical details established by them suggest a different picture of the events written in the New Testament and that was perpetuated in the minds of Christians over the centuries. These sources suggest the following version in summary:

“Today we cannot be certain of how the belief in Jesus' resurrection originated, why or on what basis did the first followers of Jesus believe it. However we note the following about the stories of his ascension to heaven, described at the end of all the four Gospels:

1. They were written at least half a century after the supposed event.
2. The authors were not eye witnesses of the event, but wrote in the authors' names.
3. The type of narrative corresponds to the religious, allegorical genre of the time.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

4. The details are contradictory, and incompatible with reality, not historical.

The most likely conclusion is that the idea originated from subjective interpretations of the event by some close followers present at his crucifixion. Then, once spread, the idea continued to grow stronger and, at least in part, everyone assumed that others before them had verified or seen convincing proof. Thus, it is very possible that those hearing it later at second and third generation might have started to believe it more (or in modified version) than those who invented it or who were present when it started.”

DIET: FRUITS ONLY (IN EDEN) → NOT RECOMMENDED BY NUTRITION SPECIALISTS

Today there is debate among nutritionists regarding percentages and quantities of food. Some recommend a more or less vegetarian diet, however none would recommend a diet based exclusively on fresh fruits from trees. Even though food is not related to spirituality, it is to be expected however that a book from God would be exact in every aspect that it touches on.

A couple of months ago, by chance, I happened to listen to a television program which said that a diet based *exclusively* on fruits would not be good. Doctors do not recommend such diet – it would mean an excess of sugars, while at the same time a deficit of other necessary elements for the human organism. It would be an unhealthy, unsustainable menu. Here we are not talking about the vegetarian diet, which includes all vegetables and other natural elements prepared in various ways, but we talk about a more restrictive diet, consisting in fruits from trees only. This is the description about Eden in the book of Genesis: Man was to eat nothing else but fruits from the trees of the garden.

Then I remembered the status that religion attributes the Bible. They consider it to be: “God’s Word”. And interpret it as direct communication from the supreme being of the Universe, an established connection between our imperfect world in search of solutions and answers on the one hand, and the absolute source of truth, the ideal, perfection – the highest level of knowledge, understanding, experience, standards of morality – superlative in every field and at all levels, on the other hand.

This idea takes us to the comparable situation of the supposed signs of extra terrestrial visits on our planet. Naturally, any supposed remains from such a visit make sensation and generate

interest from all to investigate with our entire available technologies.

Returning to the Bible, if its claims were true, this book should be even more impressive. It should never become outdated, because no matter how much mankind advances, we would have here a source which is always superior to man. God will always be superior to man in any field of activity and research.

Initially the Bible was presented to me, like many in the religious world, as having a special status: "holy". And I was given many examples that were supposed to confirm this status, namely: its "good" moral teachings. And it was explained that this is the proof that the Bible came from God. Namely that the real author was behind the people who wrote the text in ancient times. In other words, those people wrote down not their own thoughts, but God's thoughts. Thus he transmitted them to us by means of those human writers. The idea sounds interesting and it is something desirable for man to know that he can rely on a guaranteed source of useful and exact information from a superior intelligence. And access to this is available through the Bible at any time and as often as we want it.

However, can this tempting idea be verified? Here's a question that may seem odd from the perspective of members of a community that suppose unanimously that it is true. All of them consider the Bible as the supreme source of wisdom and advice, and this common opinion is one accepted for a very long time. They use examples of so-called "good" teachings to give the impression that verification has already been done, thus closing a circular reasoning which excludes any further verifications now.

Though each writing carries the very personal mark of the human authors who wrote it, the members of the Christian community generally consider unjustified any doubt regarding the pretended source of its message or about its validity and do not consider verification of any such questions as opportune. However science has done independent research where the pretence of supernatural has been supposed by religion, as it has done consistently in all other fields – science is defined by the very principle of research. Science's effort can be universal and convincing every

time. However it does not seem to penetrate and to come to be known inside the religious communities. That is why it remains an interesting test for the members of such communities, who agree with research, in principle, and are open to compare new arguments when they have the chance, to confront the results of existing research done by science systematically and to a scale much larger than any individual investigation attempted by someone in the religious world.

Just as in the past, all aspects of life were determined by religion, following the evident progress of science in all fields, almost no aspect remains in which the two endeavors do not touch each other. Religion dealt with all of reality, and now science again studies the entire reality. Each opinion expressed by religion has a correspondent and can now be compared with the results of scientific research in any field. Just as we've mentioned, one can compare opinions starting from the field of proper nutrition: composition, quantity, but also personal feeding habits like frequency, order, conditions and other factors involved. Then continue to the fields of hygiene rules, explanations for disease and their treatment, types, causes, risks associated with it, specific recommendations. And in general all the fields of life: political systems have evolved, social norms have changed, Justice has matured, personal development, modern standards of ethics and morality, all are superior today. The world has advanced and the present status is reflected in the level of personal liberties and values shared by society. Our entire present mentality is different than the one in Bible times.

The Bible was written during an ancient era of slavery. Today its methods are considered barbaric for us. The procedures written in it are based on mystical rituals instead of scientific demonstrations. The Bible interprets all events in the world as either blessing or curse from above, while all that man can do is to try to appease the wrath of God. It did not abandon the most profound racism, nationalism, nepotism – both in case of relations inside the country led by God, as well as with other countries. Public administration and the individual value are defined based on belonging to genealogy instead of the modern principles of proven

merits, transparency and objectivity. In the Bible, punishment and reward extend arbitrarily to more people, besides the ones responsible. And holy numbers, like 12 or 7, as well as numerous other superstitions are found in practices of day to day life. They all reflect an old mentality, not emancipated, ignorant toward the demonstrated principles of modern science.

After verification, science has not been able to identify the smallest clue of an advanced understanding, much less a divine revelation. All claims in this regard remain unverified statements. Scientific methods are known and are relatively simple: 1. observation 2. hypothesis 3. demonstration 4. critical verification. And if science could not prove any sign of help, guidance or illumination “from above” in the case of the Bible using these known methods, can someone still claim that he owns proof in this regard? If the Bible is superior and there is evidence of its supernatural origin, science is always interested and waits to receive it with open arms. Can there be any justified and credible reason for the lack of such evidence? For someone to hold such convincing evidence in favor of the extraordinary claims of the Bible and to be hesitant to share it, not be willing to provide it for an objective scientific investigation?

The opinion of theologians who studied the description of Eden in the book of Genesis and compared it with similar descriptions found in other ancient holy writings outside the Bible is that the nature of the story matches rather the religious literary style with artistic value, allegorical in which the elements described are symbolic in nature. The opinion of these scholars is that the description does not belong to the historical genre of reporting reality, which intends simply to present specific historical events. But the population who later read or heard the described scenes in these holy writings tended to apply them “literally” and to transform them into advice and teachings fitted for their daily lives. Later these became part of a tradition, as stabile reference elements. And came to be accepted as established facts.

Some could still ask if the diet suggested by the description of Eden is not sustainable (clearly no one today lives on a diet *exclusively* of fruits) only for us *today* and if the conditions could have

been different in the beginning, so that this diet might have been suited for man *then*.

ANSWER: It is not necessarily impossible that the conditions might have been different and at least theoretically we could accept the possibility that in such conditions, that menu might have been ideal. However, considering the motivation of this question, the supposition looks rather like a typical circular reasoning. Especially since the idea comes as a result of the recent scientific research, which contradict the first supposition. The reasoning contains two suppositions meant to support each other, without either one being verifiable separately.

In the debate about “evolution vs. creation” and religion vs. science, one of the debated ideas has its origin in ancient times, while the other is a recent modern idea. The first was simply transmitted over the centuries, without someone verifying it. The second resulted from the systematic research of many scientists and has been transparently demonstrated on the basis of verifiable evidence. And the research activity has not ceased.

In order for an ancient idea to successfully compete against one recently discovered in our modern time, it is difficult. It is unexpected and improbable. Not necessarily impossible, so the option is not to be excluded entirely. However for it to succeed, it needs a strong motivation. For the ancient idea to be true and be able to successfully contradict the modern one, that miraculous idea would have to at least be in stark contrast with the period of its origin and the contemporary ideas of the time.

If we accept this at least as a possible option theoretically, it means that we do not discriminate against old ideas and do not follow the prejudice that an ancient idea would be wrong for the simple and only reason that it is old. But we allow the same chance to an old as to a new idea. We look at both sides. And the verdict comes based on the result of the analysis, based on their own merits, regardless of the context and time of their origin.

If we want to consistently apply an equal treatment for both sides involved in the debate, we’ll have to not only allow them equal rights, but also expect that both sides answer to the same norms of verification of their claims and that each of their state-

ments be based on evidence. Otherwise we could have a case of reverse discrimination. For example, if we demand proof only from the recent ideas, but not from the ancient one. This is how Justice guarantees equal treatment before the law for all citizens, which implies, of course, both common rights but also common obligations.

This is the reason why we expect a claim of divine revelation from another world to place this book in stark contrast with any other writings from the same ancient era in which it was written. For the same reason an analysis of the details about the “diet only from fruits of the trees in the Garden of Eden” is appropriate. In order to match the claim that God is its author, and that the All-knowing, who understands human needs better than any nutritionist, has established such a diet when he designed the life of the first human pair, the story would have to at least be compatible with the natural reality, so that it may have any chance in the debate of the rest of its aspects. The story itself has to be valid in order for its truth to be verified. If it does not pass the first test, it’s obvious what its further chances might be.

Children have higher expectations from their parents or from school teachers and from an adult, generally, than from other children their age. Similarly, in a public institution, more is expected from someone in a superior position or in an important role with greater responsibilities and remuneration. From someone with diplomas and high title, than from a beginner or one hired for a lower position, simple and low paid. At the government level, people have special expectations from the part of public individuals, those with leading positions. Mass-media watches carefully every gesture or word uttered and any behavior of the politicians is measured according to higher standards than for the regular citizens.

At first, we all recognize someone’s status because that is how it was communicated to us and because we see others around us recognizing that person’s same status. Then we notice the individual’s behavior ourselves. Some of the person’s actions fit the given status, at other times we are conditioned to believe that they fit or maybe we agree to tolerate them. However, in

time, it is possible that we may find evidence of a behavior that contradicts the given or claimed status of such person.

When such conflicts appear we generally have the opportunity to investigate, both the ones noticed by ourselves, but also others, including the ones overlooked or that we supposed that were already investigated before. Thus we can gain a realistic perspective and one that we know what it is based on.

The same thing happens in the case of the Bible. This book enjoys a high status recognized by many people, and the situation has been so for a very long time. Most of us, if not all, have accepted this status given to the Bible initially because that is how it was presented to us and, also, because we've seen everyone, including close ones and family members or people who we respected, that they recognized the same status. Almost nobody starts by following an objective process of verification of the evidence, and then to conclude that the respective status is justified. However it is possible that later we notice elements related to this book that seem to contradict the traditional view and its supposed status. Then we have the opportunity to verify its claims accepted up to that point, which verification I mentioned already almost nobody does *before*, and very few do it *after*.

With the impressive progress of science in all fields in recent times, the comparison of the two endeavors becomes ever more available. They come in touch with each other in ever more areas and it is easier now to focus our eyes on the Bible text and on the religious suppositions in general. The example of diet (in the title of this chapter) represents just one such signal, it is only one relevant element, representative of a much more extensive principle. This is only a starting point, an incident that I chose to discuss because, by chance, I happened to hear a comment on television about it.

**Following I quote a response received to this subject and I comment on it:

“So, why do we care about diets? Some doctors recommend it, others don't. Advantages and disadvantages. ...

Anyway, you wanted to say that an unhealthy diet was recommended in Eden. Like I said, some specialists praise it, others detest it."

ANSWER: If indeed some specialists recommended the diet based exclusively on fruits from trees mentioned in Eden and only some contradicted it, then we could discuss the chances that one part of the specialists, who agree with it, might be right and the others maybe wrong. However if *none* of the specialists supports such a strict diet, then the only chance that remains to discuss is that the current level of scientific understanding maybe still fundamentally wrong and left behind, and the Genesis description has gained access to information that none today has yet discovered. In short: The book of Genesis would reflect a level of understanding in the field which is more advanced than that of modern medicine.

However, if we observe carefully what that diet consisted of and realize that it is not at all a general vegetarian diet, but a much stricter one, Genesis chapter 2 mentions only fruits from trees, the verdict becomes clear. The comparison with modern science is no longer so confusing. We are not dealing with a waving between conflicting views, but the balance turns completely in the direction of the second option, that none of the specialists recommends.

P.S. Although Genesis chapter 1 contains a parallel description of creation which includes many more eatable plants as possible diet for man, most Christians claim, based on Genesis chapter 2, that in Eden people used to feed exclusively on fruits from trees.

During the dialogue of this current chapter, the attitude is significant, how we approach the subject: Any type of avoidance, self-justification or accusations can constitute signs of counter-productive behavior. At first look, things may appear confusing and the opinions indecisive. But the way in which we approach the conversation can show: either the intention of maintaining a personal opinion with the price of manipulating the evidence, or the intention to listen and understand what the results of objective research are trying to tell us. Do we make use of an insignifi-

cant minority who share extremist views in order to avoid confrontation with the direction supported by majority of accredited representatives of the scientific community?

Are we justified to close our eyes toward science because at some levels there are individual scientists who express contrary personal views? Do we deny all value for a field of study just because there is not always absolute unanimity of views among those commenting?

Anyone has the right to ignore certain avenue of scientific research, if that is what the person decides for him or herself. However the analysis of the reasons that lead to such decision can be relevant in establishing the objectivity of that decision and the extent to which it can constitute a basis for others to decide the same way.

AVOIDANCE, SELF-JUSTIFICATION, PERSONAL ATTACKS → SIGNAL THE LACK OF ARGUMENTS

The talk about God is not easy, people do not discuss this subject in a calm, normal way. Comparing a regular conversation with this discussion, we'll be able to see right away the difference of attitude. Any change in the tone of voice, gestures, personal manifestations indicates fear, which in turn is a sure sign of the lack of arguments.

Things related to ourselves can be the ones most difficult to notice. Because, generally, we tend to be subjective when analyzing ourselves and our own actions. If it is hard to analyze ourselves in a correct and objective manner, then we can try to verify the presence of simple manifestations in us of known attitudes that we are interested in identifying. The greatest surprise is when we discover in us some symptoms that describe not positive attitudes, that we wished, but when we discover to a smaller or greater extent the symptoms of an attitude that we did not think we might have, do not wish and claim not to be characterized by it.

The current debate, “*evolution vs. creation*”, involves deep religious feelings and that is why, during the course of time, these discussions have been mostly subjective. And the sides involved in the dialogue have manifested the most undesirable attitudes. That is why, in this debate, the manner in which the discussion takes place forms an important component, as it reveals a relevant element about the human side of those involved, which, along with the specific arguments expressed in words, belongs to the debate itself. Because of the attitude identified in the parts involved in the dialogue, we can draw conclusions regarding the basis of their argumentation: If it is based on objective proof or it is influenced by the force of other motives.

When man has the truth, knows it and wants to communicate it, he will do this in a harmonious manner, without conflicts between what he thinks and what he expresses in words. However when he does not have the truth, either knowing or unknowing, there can be identified a conflict between what he feels and what he says. That is why examination of the manifestations is important, in order to verify to what extent what he says matches what the manifestations reveal besides his words. This analysis offers clues about the validity of the reasoning and can reveal what words alone do not reveal.

As mentioned above, the surprising effect is not so great when we discover signals identified at our dialogue partner, but the greatest surprise is when we notice such signals that reflect an undesirable behavior in our own person.

One of the attitudes determined by a flawed reasoning of one part involved is “avoidance”. But do people realize how easy it is to identify an attitude of avoidance? For the part receiving this treatment, the signal is clear, it is identified right away and it is felt acutely. When someone is being avoided, the feeling is unmistakable. The more severe the sensation is for the one being avoided than for the one avoiding, as the awaiting is more difficult for the one who waits than for the one letting himself being waited for. In reality, avoidance of a discussion is not so different from awaiting. Because in this case someone asks a question and waits for an answer, and the one avoiding the answer leaves the one asking the question waiting. It is harder for the one avoiding to realize that he does this, especially when the admittance would carry implications that raise suspicions that he might not have the right answer to the question. In that case he can mask the avoidance so that he himself is convinced at some level of conscience that what he does is in fact not avoidance.

One way in which the person can try to mask the avoidance is to talk about many things, about anything else actually, but not the subject being debated. Fear can concern the conscious in such measure that the person does not even realize what message is transmitted by his own manifestations. And just like it is said about animals, that they feel when we are afraid, in other words

they are able to interpret the signals that we transmit without realizing it, also for the ones around us, for our dialogue partner, avoidance can be more obvious than for the person practicing it. Sometimes the mask does not hide the individual from the ones around him, but only gives that impression and in reality only misleads himself. (Like the ostrich hiding its head in the sand.)

Another way of masking avoidance is the use of unfinished phrases, half replies, incomplete messages, partial ideas, which do not contain all components of reasoning: introduction, content, conclusion. This practice can create the false impression that it is in fact not avoidance, because in reality the person does not physically depart, nor does he remain completely quiet or change the subject or declare it closed. By contrary, the person takes part in the discussion, answers to the point, but expresses himself in an incomplete manner. Sometimes the expression is very short, even mono-syllabic literally.

But why not allow people to avoid discussions? If the person does not agree with the subject, shouldn't he or she be allowed to avoid it? Doesn't this represent one of the fundamental human rights, freedom of expression, the ability to choose if and what he or she wants to talk or not, a right that should be respected by everyone around? Obviously everyone has this right and no one should try to put pressure or try to force it in some way that the individual should talk or not talk. Even in criminal cases, the Justice system recognizes the defendant's right to silence, to avoid, to say nothing.

The above discussion about avoidance does not suggest prohibiting such an attitude. But it only asks if there can be explanations established and motives identified when this attitude is chosen during the course of the present debate and to what extent the conclusions are relevant for our debate. It is a personal benefit also for the one interpreting correctly the signals displayed by his own behavior, because that person will be able to identify his own attitude and to understand how certain is the basis on which the supported position relies on. But it is also beneficial to be able to identify this attitude in others, for example in the opposite side during the debate. Or, if I noticed this attitude in myself, I will be

aware also of the weakness of my argumentation and the lack of evidence supporting my position. And in that case, I ask myself if it is not just by pure chance that I do not have proof, but perhaps my position could still be true and maybe the evidence exists, and maybe others may know it. Then I try to search and ask for help from someone better prepared than myself. And it is a key moment when I meet the so-called better prepared individual, if I notice the same attitude displayed: The person is better prepared in using techniques of intimidation and masking the real attitude, which for the educated individual, who has experimented the same steps of identifying the manifestations of his own behavior correctly, will be obvious. When I do not have proof and then nor does the one from whom I expected to have it, then I have reasons to start asking seriously if perhaps the evidence does not exist. And I try to discover what caused me to adopt and defend the current position in the first place, a position that cannot be defended. Then I will be able to look objectively on the evidence provided by the opposite side and will be open to analyze the other option without prejudice.

If we compare avoidance in other fields of life, we can ask logically: When is someone generally tempted to display a hesitant behavior: when he is invited to participate in a game or sports competition where he has the certainty of the real chances of winning or rather when the risk of losing is dominant? In the case of the present debate, who will tremble harder and deeper at the perspective of losing the argument: the atheist, who is not tied emotionally and who has not invested anything personal in this subject, or rather the Christian, who defined his person's essence, values, behavior and life's hopes around and on the basis of this subject? The Christian makes a division of the world in his mind depending on the option regarding this subject: *believers* and *unbelievers*. He relates to the unbelievers regularly as to the opposite side. And considers that these are not only missing some abilities, information and experiences, but that they are of a different *moral* category. It is easy to understand that the one risking greater losses will feel more reasons to avoid the risk or any confrontation which could bring that risk closer to him or her.

To an atheist, avoiding the current debate does not draw so much attention, since the atheist, by definition, never had a strong motivation to discuss this subject. Much less to have a justification to convince others to adopt a position or another regarding this subject. However, in the case of a Christian, for which, due to his convictions, the motivation to discuss, draw attention to and spread the message constitutes a principal component of his purpose in life, avoiding the current debate represents a visible contrast compared to his declared attitude and values that define his ideology. When the debate is proposed in a civilized manner, with a sincere interest for the truth and without insults or value judgments, then the unnatural refusal is significant and it reveals a contradiction in the behavior of the individual.

A third way by which those choosing to mask avoidance of an objective discussion based on the ideas themselves and the relevant arguments is the well-known strategy mentioned in the title of this chapter, namely: attacking *the person* who communicates the idea. Aside from the religious debate, we see this phenomenon frequently on television around the time of elections and during election campaigns of various politicians who enter the competition. For the specific behavior and the way of expression in these situations there is a dedicated term. Namely, the statements are called significantly: “political statements”. This is the name for the statements of politicians which are not accompanied by arguments and a transparent reasoning on which the expressed conclusions of those statements are based. To them it is allowed, in this context, to utter “free” statements, accusations with no backing. They are not officially called to account for statements belonging to this category. What they do in this situation represents simply an expression in one way or another of their own options, however without a complete argumentation, so there is no “why” associated with that option. They simply express the support or rejection of one option and more often toward the person or group identified with the respective option.

At close analysis there can be noticed a contrast between the politicians language, which consists of the frequent and liberal use of subjective terms and relative moral descriptions in order to

build *emotional* arguments and the journalists language, which consists of objective reporting of facts and who do not intent any argumentation. Or the technical language of scientists, which consists in verifiable data, transparent procedures for arguments that follow the standards of logic.

In the case of politicians, they expect to receive the same type of replies from the politicians in the opposite side. And so goes the entire television show: One makes value judgments against everything that the opponent says and does and the opponent responds back with the same formula. Thus the program that we watch is reduced to efforts of finding ever stronger accusations, that cut ever deeper and cause ever more serious damage. It is a war against the individuals from the opposite side. The only concern being the discrediting, threatening and destroying of the opponent. The involvement of population watching is reduced to emotional instigation rather than intellectual stimulation.

In contrast with this uncontrolled outbreak of politicians statements, the forums responsible for regulating the mass-media impose rules for the journalists working in the public domain. They promote a complete information, the equidistant presentation of alternative options, inclusion of all existing options and the right of the accused to defend himself. They also promote efficient informing, any quote should be accompanied by the source where it is taken from. Any name or unfamiliar term needs to be explained and, in general, any reasonable effort should be done in order to guarantee the truth of the information, at the same time avoiding a distorted understanding on the part of those reading or listening to them.

Also in the case of scientists and scholars, in general, there are norms that govern their activities and official statements. Their writings face a control mechanism when they are published in specialized magazines and are critically analyzed by their partners in the scientific community. During this critical analysis, the specialists verify every statement, dates, reference works, procedures, reasoning and conclusions. Everything must be exact, correct and trustworthy.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

In the case of the religious debate, we can relate to the examples of the above given models: 1. politicians 2. journalists 3. scholars. In these models we have both good and bad examples. We can learn which ones to imitate and which ones to avoid. The signals identified in various types of manifestations reflect an attitude behind the respective manifestation. However, instead of listing a number of signals, the most efficient way is to discuss the general attitude itself that is transmitted by those signals.

When a person's actions are evaluated, for example, a common term used to describe a positive attitude may be that he is "of good faith". In case of sports competitions the same meaning is rendered by the expression "fair play". And at school the general positive attitude of the student can be described by saying that he "cooperates with the teacher".

The method would prove efficient also in the case of the current debate. Regarding the manner in which the conversation takes place, we can ask about the manifestations of the parts involved and the personal attitude reflected by these: Do I prove by what I say and not say and generally my participation at this debate shows that: 1. I am of good faith 2. I use fair play 3. In short, that I want to cooperate for the best and clear understanding of the ideas, the easiest exchange of messages and for reaching the correct goal of the debate?

A positive, constructive attitude is different from a damaging attitude first because it wants to find the truth, not to win the battle. Therefore: 1. the purpose => determines 2. attitude => which is seen in 3. personal manifestations => and identified by 4. observed signals.

Our debate can be compared with the above domains, where we borrowed various descriptive terms by means of which we can define a positive attitude. But it can also be compared with any other project that requires team work, and where the same attitude can be identified. Let's say that a team of workers work at the construction of a wall. One of them needs help and asks one of his colleagues for some materials or certain tools. The colleague can reply either with a positive attitude, or a negative one. He can say that he does not understand what is asked of him,

does not know the name of the materials or of the tools requested, or he does not know which one from a list of many or where it is found. Or by contrary, he could listen carefully what is asked of him, try to remember if his past experience can be of any help in any way in this situation. If he does not know something, maybe he can try to solve it by himself, then he could ask additional questions to better understand how he can be of better help. Even if the statements are true in both cases, what makes the difference is: his attitude. In English there is a saying: "When there is a will, there is a way." So the desire to help will be reflected in a cooperative attitude, and the statements will be selected, it is not enough that they are true, but they need also to be said in good faith. Many details of the conversation between these coworkers and their possible attitudes and the effects involved find a correspondent in the situation of the religious debate too.

The mission is not hard, the subject is not difficult, and the problem is not too complicated to be resolved. This debate lasts for a long time, it caused deep conflicts, and the parts involved often give no sign of agreement. That is why, it is no wonder that some feel that the problem must be due to the difficulty of the subject itself. Consequently, some consider it: taboo. However a comparison with other fields of life can easily prove the role of external factors that can influence the manner in which the discussion is held. In any field and on any subject the approach can be of different types: Even if at some level things are clear and fully understood by scientists, at a different level, the discussion can be chaotic, far from the truth and seemingly with no end in site when they are discussed among amateurs.

The same way as the wall constructed by workers: The construction can be realized and even realized easily, in a short time, simple, with minimum resources. Or by contrary, it could seem undoable, that it is hard to realize, would take long time, that it is complicated, and many resources are needed. It all depends on the correct method and positive attitude: both in the case of the wall and also in the case of a debate.

It is often the case that the debate starts well, in a calm climate and with both parts showing a sincere interest in solving the

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

problem. However, in time, things go bad, when one part either feels in disadvantage, that its position is losing ground, or feels threatened in the subconscious. Then that side starts making suppositions regarding the other one's *motives* and to make value judgments. This attitude is damaging for all: both for the conversation, for the partner and for himself.

**Next I quote an example of a specific reply received to this debate and comment on it:

"The problem is much greater and is found behind the discussion." And

"Some want to admit a superior authority that leads us for good, while others consider that they are the center of the Universe, the maximum level of intelligence and will that can be achieved and do not want to admit a superior authority to which to relate."

ANSWER: The idea in the first phrase that the problem is found "behind the discussion" represents a reference to the personal motives of the ones involved.

The ideas in the second phrase, that "some want ..." and "others consider ... and do not want ..." represent an interpretation of the motives and constitute value judgments of the ones involved.

Avoiding the ideas and arguments supporting them but instead choosing to make personal attacks represents a method discussed in this chapter. And now we can analyze (and the reader can do it for him or herself) the example of the specific reply quoted above in order to verify to what extent the aspects discussed during this chapter are found in this reply.

A GUILTY PERSON HIDING SOMETHING AVOIDS VERIFICATION (BIBLE DEMANDS: "FAITH")

Just as respect is earned as a result of a proper behavior, also trust can be strengthened as a result of proper evidence being presented. However the New Testament does not insist upon the evidence at all, but jumps directly to the result. It over-emphasizes, suspiciously and contrary to the natural course the need for "faith".

When a person avoids the answer to a question, is not sure, alternates between conflicting answers, this is a sign that something is wrong. He either does not have the answer, or he has the answer, but it is not a beneficial one and he tries to hide it.

There are a few types of questions to which religion gives alternating responses, and the one regarding faith without proof is one of them. It does not have a simple, unitary, consistent answer to the questions of the following type: What is "faith", how does it work, on what basis and if the evidence matters? The answers received here are unpredictable. If, in the beginning, there is one answer given, but one asks for clarification, trying to follow the line of reasoning and verify the implications, the second time a different and contrary answer is often received.

The term faith involves the idea of conviction. However what is that conviction based on? During the first years of my religious experience I thought that faith was based entirely on evidence. That it came as a result of evidence and it was supported directly by it, in the sense that stronger evidence determines a correspondingly stronger faith. More proof means a more certain faith. I thought that it is like the relationship between two people who know each other well and throughout time they have manifested consistently in a certain manner. Thus the level of trust grows between the two in the sense that each one is certain enough

about the behavior of the other. So far, the definition of faith seemed very normal. I could very well call it intuition, meaning that based on the long experience, when we have seen the behavior of a certain person, we could make the supposition that some actions are predictable in the future. This means nothing more than evaluating a risk factor: The more data I have available, the more measured scenarios I know, that gains me a higher level of trust in a certain prediction. The indicator for measuring historical data corresponds to the indicator for the level of trust in the given prediction. Such evaluations of the risk factors are found ever more frequently and are already perfected in some automated systems in the industry, the military, health care ... etc. This process takes place naturally in humans, and in this regard things are no different between a religious person and a non-religious one. Actually the ingredients of faith do not contain anything foreign, mystic, discriminating – it is not something specific religious, but in reality it is a universal principle for any healthy normal person. This means the logical choice. Faith is also present in unbelievers to the extent that they develop a level of trust during their relationships with the outside world: With the family members, society, certain institutions, the natural forces, including animals. It is not by chance that the term “faithful” is also used in reference to dogs. This derives from the same ingredients: Knowledge, consistent behavior and a certain length of time for observation.

In the case of religion, the principle worked in the following manner (according to my understanding at that time): The Bible contains many promises made by God in the past, and until now they have all been fulfilled. Faith means that we look at and trust the future promises contained in the Bible and be certain that they will also be fulfilled. The guarantee consists of the past proof of the ones already fulfilled until now, none of them failed. Everything seemed OK, especially since the fulfilled promises happened in the past, so they do not go anywhere, but remain and are available for us to be able to verify them any time at length. To be able to turn them on all sides and strengthen our faith by these palpable proofs. The assumption was that history would advance and as it extended its investigations by chance or by purpose upon the

areas mentioned in the Bible, the result will unmistakably confirm the supposed truth of all details of the fulfilled promises of God in the past.

Later, and now I regret that this took so long and it did not happen sooner, I discovered that in reality this is not the case at all. The scenarios of faith supposed in my mind were made from the position in which I found myself at the time, namely from the perspective of one who did not know history. I received information about this field of research from those in the camp of religion. The perspective was very different when people in the religious camp spoke about a field like history, which belongs outside their camp. What I did not know, and most Christians still do not know, in general, was that history as a modern scientific field of research only started to develop since about four centuries ago. And the entire history of miraculous stories written in the Bible text have never been confirmed. By contrary, when modern science (recognized history) started to investigate these stories, it has discovered the opposite: They are not sustained. More investigations meant more contradictions of the suppositions of religion.

Then there followed a new stage on the road of my religious experience. Out of reflex, I continued to value and be attached to the New Testament and faith in God. But at the same time the historic perspective has consolidated and the emerging evidence contradicted ever stronger the religious claims. I have solved that “tension” through a new understanding of the New Testament’s faith, one which was not based on evidence, which meant that it was not dependant on it. The relevant arguments came from two directions to support this new definition of faith: 1. First, faith was saved, there was no more tension, it was no longer threatened, attacked, limited, but it was able to develop freely since all conflicts with evidence and the results of scientific research have been removed. 2. Second, a careful study of the text reveals that the same understanding is promoted by the New Testament itself. These two lines of reasoning confirmed each other and supported inevitably the conclusion that my previous understanding of faith based on evidence was wrong. Although I accepted the New Tes-

tament for many years before, I did not sense the correct definition of faith described and promoted by the New Testament itself. I started from a preconceived idea, even if that idea was logical and acceptable in the modern society. And I induced that idea into the text I was reading. I did not allow the New Testament to express itself, and to be ready to hear what version it wants to tell me.

Also, unknown for most is the direction covered by the dedicated field of theology. What is theology? This word refers to the group of scholars who study religion. This group of people was more connected to the masses of ordinary Christians for over a millennium and a half until modern science came up. They existed and acted in the context of the historical period in which they lived (Church fathers in the first centuries, that everyone in the Christian world knows today, were theologians), when the entire world was dominated by the religious understanding of reality. During that time theologian's ideas were popular and therefore they were known by the people. When the balance has changed, and scientific ideas started to be contrary to the religious views, theologians gradually accepted the scientific explanations, have offered a modified interpretation of the sacred text. They gave up on the literal interpretation of New Testament and have kept only the internal attitude experienced by the people in the first century, and now try to repeat it in our modern era, but in a different context. Because of this ideological conflict, theologians are no longer known by the large majority of ordinary practicing Christians. In short, theologians of our time support faith without evidence, they understand that the scientific evidence contradicts faith in the literal descriptions contained in the New Testament text.

However, now I gave up religion completely, that means including the type of faith without evidence promoted by the New Testament. Why? It is true that we can save faith, and the New Testament contains the solution to the problem. However I came to ask myself: What problem does this solve, is it not the case that the New Testament solves a problem it itself created in the first place? The solution offered by the New Testament is a suspicious-

ly incomplete one. Faith is saved from (lack of) evidence because we stop searching for evidence, it is saved from critics because we ignore those who criticize it.

This entire effort brings peace indeed, it gets rid of doubts and eliminates enemies of faith. It would not be a bad thing, if that is what we want, what we are aiming at, if that is necessary... But no one asks: Why is this the desired objective, to save faith? What and who really brought us faith and why have we decided to accept it in the first place? Looking more carefully at the answer given by the New Testament text itself, choosing to be “crazy” in the eyes of the world, in order to be “wise” in the eyes of God, made me wonder if this does not carry the marks of a “circular reasoning”. Is the reasoning not reduced essentially to: NT supports faith, and faith supports NT? In that case neither faith, nor NT are based on something verifiable. This is the reason why I felt obligated to abandon faith altogether. It is not guaranteed by anything, but only supported by itself (artificially).

Now I turn upon the text and discover different aspects from a new perspective. And I ask myself if indeed there proves to be a suspicious connection between the recognized lack of evidence and the special emphasis that NT places on the need for faith. There is a correspondence: The lack of evidence is absolute. But is this reflected in a maximum value attributed to faith? More than just the concept of faith itself, I am interested in the aspect of its being presented as a necessity and the level or degree of importance attributed to this necessity in relation to other demands and values. Is faith emphasized, and if so, is that done to an unusual degree, exaggerated even?

Both aspects are relevant: Necessity of faith and its emphasis. I will start by illustrating the first aspect by using three examples:

First example: The illustration of the known principle that “respect is not demanded, but it is earned”. The idea that respect is not “demanded” is almost equivalent with saying that normally there is no such thing as a “necessity” for respect, much less an emphasis on such necessity. To better understand this, let us take the particular case when respect is missing. Where is most likely the problem, at the one not offering respect or at the one not

receiving it? In accord with the principle that we started with, namely that this is not demanded, but earned, the conclusion would be that to a greater extent the problem is at the one waiting and not receiving it. And less at the one not offering it. The case of faith in the New Testament, which provides no proof, but presents faith as a necessity, looks like the case in which no attempt of earning the respect is proven, but it is nevertheless expected. And in the case when it is lacking, the blame is placed (suspiciously) upon the one not offering it.

The case of one person's attitude causing a reaction from another: One behaves honestly, and the other responds by attributing him trust; One says a joke, and the other laughs; One makes a show, and the other responds by applauding him. What the first does represents the cause, and what the other does is the effect. If it is normal to present the cause as a necessity, it becomes suspect to hear the reverse, in the lack of the cause to talk of the necessity of the effect.

Second example: A conclusion comes as a result of an argumentation. In this case, the conclusion represents the effect, and the argumentation is the cause. After an argumentation is presented to a group, then that group can be asked to formulate a conclusion based on the things heard. But the order cannot be reversed, and to ask for a conclusion from someone before presenting the argumentation to him. Like in the previous example about respect, after we presented the cause, after it has done its job, the effect comes almost naturally, by itself. That is why the idea of necessity is expected to be associated with the cause, and associating it with the effect becomes suspect.

Third example: In any field of activity, the repeated exercise leads to learning a new ability. First comes the exercise, then the learning: Either in the case of learning a foreign language, or working skills, or how to play a game, in sports or other activities. Normally the cause is the one emphasized, and in this case learning comes naturally as a result of the cause. It is normal to hear about the necessity of exercise and we would not be surprised if this necessity was repeated and emphasized. But it would seem incredibly suspect to be the other way, in the absence of any

mention of exercise, without any recognition of the value of exercise, to hear that the result is presented as a necessity and this be demanded and even emphasized.

In order to illustrate the reason behind a suspect demand we can use the example of a seller on the free market. If the seller refuses to provide verifiable details about the merchandise, but pretends that we, as buyers, believe every word he says, is unhappy when we ask questions, when we look for guarantees or want to verify his promises, and he urges us to buy in a haste, and after we bought the products, he disappears without trace – wouldn't this behavior seem dubious on his part? Would we not be justified to suspect him of hiding something, that his sayings are not sustainable and perhaps they are not true?

In the context of the perspective offered by the above examples, we can say that the presentation of faith found in the New Testament is unexpected. In this context it would sound very suspect if faith were applauded and would be incredible if it were considered a virtue or would be even impossible for it to be a necessity.

The New Testament not only considers faith this way, but the need for faith is emphasized repeatedly. As its volume of occurrences, faith is mentioned in all books of the New Testament and almost every chapter of everyone of its books discusses the same theme of faith. It is the most emphasized idea, it is placed on the first place, it represents the purpose of every book. The Gospel was written in order for us "to believe" (John 20:31). The New Testament language refers to man from the perspective of faith, and the world is divided on this basis in: "faithful and unfaithful". The Gospel offers everlasting life on the one condition necessary: To "everyone who believes". (John 3:16) Forgiveness of any and all sins is given not in exchange for actions, obedience to the Law or some other compensation, but to "faith". A relevant event related to the definition of faith is described in the Gospel when Thomas asked to verify proofs in order to believe. And Jesus responds: "... happy are those who do not see and yet believe".

EVOLUTION

All objective observation of the world around us shows that: 1. The Universe is transforming itself, 2. the causes have a natural basis and 3. the laws of nature are determined by the properties of matter. In other words, this means there was no foreign intervention from God, but the reality of today's material world represents the effect of an evolutionary process which continued from the beginning (and continues even today).

- 13 Darwin didn't prove the evolution completely,
but offered a very probable hypothesis 109
- 14 90% of eco-system's causes are explained
=> we can expect the rest 10% will be too 120
- 15 Life appeared too late and slow
to be the result of divine intervention 144
- 16 Comet ISON 23.11.2013 contains
water => so the Earth is not unique 149
- 17 Instinct not understood suggested a purpose,
now it's explained (without a Creator) 156
- 18 DNA shared between man-primates,
or cats species => is a determining factor 164
- 19 Africans appeared first, but they also
resemble primates (most of all races) 167

DARWIN DIDN'T PROVE THE EVOLUTION COMPLETELY, BUT OFFERED A VERY PROBABLE HYPOTHESIS

The theory of evolution has developed in stages, and the evidence was discovered over time. Critics have often attacked the man Charles Darwin and his ideas. However Darwin never claimed to have demonstrated it completely. Thus he is being accused of something he did not even claim. The theory just started with him, so it would be unfair to attack its beginnings.

During the debate on evolution vs. creation often times there are given incorrect arguments or improper replies because of a lack of thorough understanding of the opponent's position, language or the context in which the statements in the opposing side are uttered.

Thus it happens that many supporters of creation present various references to the initiator of this theory, namely the author Charles Darwin, as arguments against the evolution. Why? Since they do not know the exact activity of Darwin nor his specific contribution to the development of the theory, some attribute him a role that he actually did not play, accuse him of statements that do not actually belong to him and judge him for situations that he is not responsible for.

Placing things in the right perspective is beneficial for all parties involved, including for the debated subject itself: Clarifying what is perceived confusingly, reformulating what is not fully understood, specifying the actual positions from which each one starts, to make sure that we understand exactly what is the subject discussed, that we do not accuse things that no one claims anyway.

Obviously clarifying the position of each side does not at all mean that we agree with either one of the respective sides or

accept what they say. But it simply means that we better know what the options are. The decision remains with each one, not influenced by anything from the outside, but we will know more exactly the options between which we choose.

Even the apostle Paul in the New Testament says that: He hits with his fist, but not like one hitting "in the air". (1Cor 9:26) If a Christian accuses Darwin of things which he did not actually say or did not do, could this not be like a person "hitting in the air"? Or if one presents today's theory of evolution through the eyes of its initiator, 200 years ago, does not that person present rather an imprecise, confusing image, like the confusing sound of the trumpet transmitting an unclear message, just like the same apostle Paul explains in that same Letter? (1Cor 14:8)

The situation is delicate, however patience and balance manifested in the course of the debate represent necessary and important virtues that can help eliminate prejudice and the obstacles that appear. And, at the same time, these would win the respect and appreciation of all participants in the conversation. Personally, I am generally of the opinion that successfully passing any one single obstacle is significant from the perspective of the personal attitude and the openness of the person and also of the potential chance that other obstacles may be solved too. In our case, if the person is able to gain a clearer understanding of the opponent's position, namely to realize the difference between prior suppositions based on what others have to say and the sense determined by the context itself, namely the version from the author himself, and following this process he accepts the adjustment of a wrong perspective, this constitutes a true test of attitude and implicitly of motivation, that can guarantee the success or failure of the entire debate.

At the same time, the failure of one single argument can signal the anticipated failure of the entire debate. This blockage can be enough to determine other participants as well to give up on later attempts. The position of the person demonstrating a problem of attitude what prevents him from solving an argument risks to be compromised entirely. Since he can be suspected of the same motivation, which prevents him from looking objectively at

an argument, may have prevented him also from a correct reasoning regarding other points on his agenda, which he supports and thus others loose trust in his abilities and the value of his position in general.

A relevant example in this regard represents any election campaign, where people choose their favorite candidate, most of the times already from the beginning of the period and not as it would be expected, at the end, in order to justify the entire effort of the campaign effort. People react to the first argument and position themselves already on one side or the other. So the later arguments are simply looked at through the already adopted perspective. That is why one argument is significant. Returning to the topic of this chapter, evolution's opponents refer to many details about the person of Darwin: What he said or believed. Since they imagine that Darwin matters and that he is important for the evolution theory even today. That a successful attack against him means a successful attack against the evolution.

However understanding the relation between Darwin and this theory, between his contribution and the way science works will reveal if and to what extent the references to him personally are relevant in the case of the current debate.

In this regard, the model in which religion works is different than the one in which science works. In the case of religion, if its founder, Jesus, can be criticized successfully, at least in a few areas, or even in a single one, then his message will be affected. And by this, the entire Christianity suffers. That is why it is very possible that those supporters of creation believe that the same applies also in Darwin's case. Being influenced by the experience of the Christian model, they look at science through the same perspective.

One example of an area where such model works is politics. Here the individual matters, if he is discredited in any form, he could lose his position. Or in the election campaign, if the opponents are able to discover some compromising information about a candidate, they could use that detail in order to denigrate and therefore to prevent him from winning the election. Thus, be-

cause of one problem of the main candidate, the entire team suffers and also the cause that these supported.

Unlike these cases, science is a technical domain, and the model described above is not to be found here. Science is defined by fundamentally different principles. As I explained in chapter 1: Science is based on observation (objective), religion on experience (subjective). Here we have a totally different model. How can we imagine today that someone would speak about the first individuals who discovered: gravity, electricity, photo camera ... etc.? Next I will list four implications of this reality for our topic:

1. Science is based on observations. The immediate implication is that it is not based on the humans making those observations. The idea is also illustrated by the proverb: "If you do not like the message, do not kill the messenger." Darwin is the messenger, his observations are the message. The theory of evolution has detached itself from Darwin as a person, and it is based exclusively on his message.

2. The observations are objective. Science only accepts them if others can also verify them. The immediate implication is that the first observer is just as irrelevant as anyone else after him. In this process the person does not matter, nor who was the first person, as long as his observations can be replicated by others.

3. Darwin started his investigations, however the context and length of time available only allowed him a limited level of understanding of the subject and of developing the theory. Obviously, science in general and the theory of evolution in particular have progressed much from the time of their beginnings. Any attack against the person of Darwin and his activities means an attack against a period and a level of development of the theory which is now passed and not recognized any more even by the camp of modern supporters of evolution themselves. Is such an attack justified if it avoids confrontation with the current position of this theory in order to confront rather its beginnings stage?

4. If Darwin believed in the existence of God and even in a divine intervention at some level in creation, as the opponents of evolution point out, while modern evolutionists prefer rather atheism is also irrelevant. Since the theory of evolution is con-

cerned only with the variety of species and it claims that God is not responsible for that. It claims that these did not appear separately, but are related to each other and have transformed from one another as a result of the factors of the environment. However, if outside this evolutionary process, God exists and he has created the first living cell, out of which all the rest have come up without further direct intervention from his part, that is no longer relevant for evolution itself. It remains unchanged, regardless of the condition if God exists or not.

However, if science did not take over from Darwin anything related to his faith in the existence of God, and Darwin himself knew a very small percentage of the discoveries that current science has gathered, and the world in which he lived shared convictions very different than our current society, this almost explains why. If one wants to use the example of that person in order to support the existence of God today, it would mean choosing an outdated time and level of development instead of the competence of the advanced modern scientific community.

Besides the element of time and outdated level of development, how relevant is it or how strong can this argument be that one man, no matter who that person is, believes and thus we choose to believe as well? Does not this look rather like an emotional argument and wouldn't it be more logic to base our convictions on evidence instead? Finally, if we still want to use the example of one person, we should use it from the perspective of the evidence available and on which he himself based his conclusions or the evidence that he provides us.

If we consider the suspect connection between the low level of research of the time and the belief in the existence of God, we will have reason to ask if Darwin's belief in God presented in the context of a reduced level of understanding and the respective absence of today's scientific community lack of faith in the context of a significantly greater level of understanding is not the determining factor. And consequently ask if in the case of Darwin, his faith cannot be considered rather as a: "reflex". Out of the entire ideological inheritance, what he investigated out of them all made him change his views. Today all investigation led to a

change of all inherited views. Therefore, we ask: If Darwin lived today, if he had access to all the information available today, would this not perhaps lead him to give up his belief in God?

Regarding Darwin's specific contribution, let us ask: What exactly did he say and not say? We can say that as great as the effect of the theory became, so small the cause presented by Darwin was initially. We could compare this with a telescope that someone moves a little, no matter who that person might be, and the change of the position viewed is respectively an infinitely greater one. The cause is very small, however the effect is very big. Just as the title of this chapter states, Darwin has not demonstrated completely the theory of evolution, and he did not even pretend that he demonstrated all its details. This is the main reason why the accusations against him first have to take into account what his contribution to this theory was exactly. In order to avoid the risk of criticizing something that he did not even pretend. If someone today tries to show that Darwin did not demonstrate the theory of evolution, this would mean a waste of energy. And it would even be irrelevant, exactly because it starts from an unverified premise. In reality, Darwin has presented his own discoveries relevant to one (or very few) aspect of this theory.

He only created a spark which eventually became a big consuming fire. He only draw attention upon the tip of the iceberg, which proved much larger under the water. He himself only conceived a small fraction of the size of the theory and was not aware of the later implications of his modest activity. He only scratched the surface of the phenomenon and did not know himself how great the whole was to become.

Darwin's experience did not constitute an active effort, but a reactive one. This in the sense that he did not propose himself to support the theory that we know today. He did not start with the idea of this theory in his mind and neither heard it somewhere else, or from someone else. His effort did not have the goal of demonstrating a theory to others. He did not represent a cause, did not start like Jesus or any other prophet, who needed to fulfill a mission that was defined and known in advance.

In one word, he studied carefully the nature and was impressed by its diversity. This determined him to ask himself regarding the source and the cause of such amazing diversity. For example, in the beginning he noticed some extremely small differences between species found in different geographical areas. This made him ask himself if they were different species or perhaps it could be one and the same specie. Then he also noticed corresponding variations of the environment where those species lived. Specifically he noticed one sort of butterflies that seemed to belong to the same specie found in two different places. The only thing different was their color: In one place the butterflies were of gray color, while in the other location they were of live colors. This difference in color was correlated with a difference of the natural environment of the areas in which the butterflies found themselves: The environment of the area where the gray butterflies were found was also of gray color, while the environment of the area where the live colored butterflies were found also had live colors. This determined him naturally to ask himself if perhaps there might be a causal relation between the variety in the natural environment and the variety of the butterflies living in those respective environments. It was simply a normal reaction to the observations that he made about the world around him.

As simple and natural Darwin's question might seem today, at that time it questioned and proposed a view contrary to the generally accepted understanding – not only of the entire society of his time, but also the only option presented for millenniums, since the existence of the human specie. Until then, it was thought that God created everything separately, so each variety was created separately: both varieties of flora and fauna. And if some live in one place, while others in another place, this was thought to be because of the well established plan of God. Now Darwin proposed the possibility of some natural variations inside the same species. Even if the specie was initially created by God, he was talking only about minor variations inside one single specie, that these could happen without God's direct intervention.

And regarding the choice of the variations depending of the environment, he suggested that the selection could take place

naturally. Meaning that, instead of them being placed there by some person, all gray colored butterflies in one location and the ones live colored in another place, the correlation with the difference in color of the respective environments of the two places, made him ask if maybe initially the butterflies of both colors were present in the same location. The ones of the same color as the environment had a natural advantage because they were better camouflaged, and the predators hunting butterflies were able to find the other not camouflaged ones easier. Because of this factor in the relation between pray and predator, the camouflaged ones were able to survive in that place, while the rest disappeared. Today we call this process by a dedicated term: “Natural selection”.

Of course, the two versions, evolution vs. creation, are diametrically opposed, and the conclusions of this debate have correspondingly conflicting implications at all levels. Throughout generations there have been developed explanations for all aspects. However Darwin at that time limited himself to the perspective of this single principle described.

The current chapter’s title states that Darwin presented a “very probable hypothesis”. What is it based on and how probable is this hypothesis? The basis are the specific observations that Darwin made, like the one example mentioned above about the varieties of butterflies discovered in correspondingly different environments. Does this represent a solid basis, are these observations enough to be convincing and the hypothesis to be considered probable? Of course, in the context of the large volume of critics against the theory from the religious community who fought against it in the last one hundred years since its origin, the chance that this hypothesis may be probable can be doubted. However, what was the situation at the time of its origin and during the launch of this hypothesis? The balance of probability is determined statistically by the weights placed on each side of the scale. If we place little on one side and more on the other, the balance will turn in the direction which weighs more. However the balance can also turn in the direction where there is little, if

there is even less, or nothing on the other side. (Something is always greater than nothing.)

If the basis offered by Darwin is weak, and the evidence is minimum, but in spite of this fact most structures of society and the scientific community in general accepted relatively quickly the newly proposed theory is very significant. On the one hand, the power lies in the idea itself. The proposed idea is self sustained, it recommends itself. The situation is evidently comparable with the phenomenon of religious revolution caused by Martin Luther's theses presented for debate. What has started the protestant revolution were the ideas themselves, not the evidence supporting them or the debate about them, but it was enough for people to hear the ideas in order to realize that they were true. In the introduction of this chapter I mentioned that in general most ideas need to overcome only one obstacle. If the person accepts one argument, there are good chances that he will accept others too, while the person who does not accept one, the chances that the same person will accept other arguments are minimum. This is what happened with the theory proposed by Darwin and the ones proposed by Luther. Many people accepted them from the start, while others do not accept them even today, after they have been presented much additional supporting evidence.

I have mentioned above the "little" placed on the scale by Darwin for debate. However what was placed on the other side, what alternative version was proposed by religion? What evidence could religion provide in support for its traditional views which claimed that:

- The environment was conceived to serve the butterflies that would come later (environment for butterflies, not butterflies because of environment)
- God made both the color of environment and that of butterflies and placed them in the right place to provide them protection through camouflage.

It is the version accepted for millenniums. However how credible, how much weight does it carry if placed on the scale next to the new proposal made relatively recently by Darwin? Below I will list four arguments relevant to this question:

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

1. According to the sacred text, God's creation work ended with the creation of the first human pair, millenniums ago. Like any other aspect of the natural environment, the geographical areas observed by scientists are susceptible to change. Therefore what we see today has not always been like this, we have no guarantee that an area remained the same from the supposed date of creation until now.

2. The butterflies move and migrate as most live things do. So we have no guarantee that one specie observed today has been in the same location since the supposed time of creation. The sacred text mentions a global Flood during the time of historical Noah, which "pushed aside" any living thing upon the land from its position. The idea that each specie of butterflies finds itself in the geographical area where was discovered today because of God is contradicted by this aspect of their traveling.

3. Any advantage for one animal means a disadvantage for those found above or below the food chain. It is a disadvantage for those hunted, as well as for those that hunt the respective animal in advantage. That is why attributing the advantageous situation, in our case the camouflage offered by the choice of colors, to divine intervention for the benefit of one specie would be an unjustified favoring, considering that at the same time it is unfavorable for other living things also supposedly created by God.

4. The reason why one animal needs protection is because another animal hunts it. If we suppose the same God to have created both animals, it would mean that on the one hand he provided one with the necessary tools for attacking, while on the other hand he made sure that the other benefits by the means of defense to counteract the efficiency of the first one. Logic makes us ask: Wouldn't it be easier if he made them so that they did not attack each other in the first place?

CONCLUSION: From four different perspectives the version of creation proposed by religion appears weak, it is not sustainable, but contradicted by reality, illogical and rather improbable. This is one of the reasons why the version proposed by Darwin had been accepted relatively easy by such a high percentage of the population: The parallel evaluation of the two options available. The first

is neither logical, nor supported by reality, while the second resulted from the objective analysis, which is both logical and supported by reality.

The second reason for the surprising success of Darwin's version is the historical context and the level of society's advancement at that time. Human reason started to question and to doubt the teachings and traditional concepts in many aspects of life as part of a process that started to gain ground more than a century ago. Darwin's idea, though new, at the beginning and incomplete was able to resonate with people of that time because their mind had already been prepared. The ground had been set, the event was almost "expected" to happen, even inevitable. The world found itself at that point in time. It was at a stage of development due to the parallel and simultaneous progress in all other fields. Steps had been taken on a path which would not return to the previous era. The Middle-Ages had gone irreversibly. In the same context can also be explained the success of the religious revolution started by M. Luther's ideas mentioned earlier.

Because of the overview gained we can now understand that the success of the theory was determined by its logic and support of reality, on the one hand, but also by the historical context on the other hand. However in no way was it the merit of the *man* who proposed it initially. The theory of evolution has detached itself from Darwin, in the same way that the protestant faith today is independent from and cannot be affected in any way by the person of its individual founder, M. Luther.

**90% OF ECO-SYSTEM'S CAUSES ARE EXPLAINED
→ WE CAN EXPECT THE REST 10% WILL BE TOO**

Nature functions by itself, that's why it has been called "eco-system". Even though some phenomenon are not (yet) explained, they can be inferred based on the ones already understood. And if all research up till now has revealed material causes, it is expected that the ones not (yet) known will also be material – therefore not a supposed hand of Got.

The eco-system represents the name we chose for a portion of nature from a given geographical area. Darwin's research focused on the observed variations of members of same species that live in different natural environments in separate geographical areas. It is called eco-system such an independent natural environment because it is self-sustained. Survival of each element of flora and fauna is determined by one or more elements present in that location: The elements need each other, they support one another, therefore are interdependent, and the survival of individual elements guarantees the survival of the group as a whole. That environment is called this way also because it is separate from other environments in other areas, does not depend on them and it is different from them. Each eco-system is unique and this is what Darwin had studied: The diversity, variety of species that can be observed after comparing different environments where these live.

Today this term is better defined, and we are very familiar with the discussion about its key properties: Fragile *balance* and *regenerating* ability. Both properties came to our attention in modern times especially because of the effect that human activity has upon nature (for example deforestation, excessive hunting, pollution, global warming).

The study of eco-systems has advanced from the level of the first observations noted by Darwin. He identified a few interactions between the environmental factors and their effect upon some species. Today this type of interactions is identified at all levels between all constituting elements of the eco-system. Today we know the explanation of these interactions, we know that they are determined by the needs, respectively the properties of each element. The entire system exists and works based on the dependence between the participating elements toward each other. Each element participates to the functioning of the system because it takes something and in turn it returns something else, what is thrown away by one is taken as needed by another, and the balance is achieved when all elements find their proper place according to the role that they fulfill individually in the whole.

In such a system found in equilibrium there are many phenomenon taking place that have been studied by biologists, botanists, physicians, chemists and other scientists in the fields defining the system. At each level there are tuning processes that we understand both individually and grouped or as a whole. The general tuning is the result of the sum of partial tunings, which in turn are the result of individual tuning of a single element, which is evidently determined by the unique structure, needs and its own properties. Because of this chain of known material causes, we can say that the tuning happens by itself, as a result of the natural processes involved. Tuning in this context represents just another term for balance, since both refer to the same process.

To illustrate, I will refer to two similar situations: Society and the market.

First example: Different groups of people. The specific human societies are defined by the geographical area were they live, the inherited culture and other relevant factors. These societies work basically the same as the eco-systems in nature, on the basis of the interdependence of the individuals who make up the group. Each person benefits from what the group offers, and the others benefit from the contribution of the individual. Each one finds his place and role in the respective society. The characteristics of each society can be unique and societies differ from one another,

however in each one individually takes place a specific tuning because of individual adapting to the rest of the group. The tuning happens by itself in the sense that it is not established or maintained from the outside, but it is the result of the sum of the tunings that are established inside through individual and common relations of the group members.

Second example: Commercial markets. In the case of markets, it is common the language in dedicated works in the field that they balance themselves. It is a reference to the tuning determined by the known relation: Supply and demand. The price is established based on the products' quantity, quality, but also by the number of buyers. The merchandise finds its place on the list and travels a specific path. No matter how many products there are in the circuit, how many categories, degrees of quality and also the volume of demands and standards on the part of the clients, the overall market balance is determined by the total of individual tunings. It is said that the tuning is done by the market itself in the sense that it is the result of its own mechanisms and not established by imposing it artificially from the outside. A known case that is often announced is that of the foreign currency value: Sometimes it is said to be real, meaning it was established by the market itself, at other times it is not real, because it was influenced by the intervention (usually) from the national bank, which imposed an artificial value either through massive purchase or selling of currency on the market.

How can we know if the tuning is an artificial one, established by someone from the outside, or it is natural, formed by itself? This conclusion results based on the analysis of the individual constituting elements: When each one has a proper explanation for its natural role and place, then the general tuning is natural. However when somewhere there is identified something unjustified additional or lacking, which has no internal cause, then the cause is external, the tuning is artificial because of the influence from the outside (partial or total).

But who has the information and can express himself in this regard, if it is a natural balance or not? First, the answer is: The one who knows the results of the analysis of all individual tunings

making up the system and which determines whether the tuning of the entire system is natural or not. Specifically, experts in the field or more often a group of specialists made up of representatives from more fields. But besides these specialists, do we, the rest of us outside the scientific community, do we have any chance of knowing the detailed complete results of this analysis? Of course. We may know them to the extent that we in turn read these results in published materials by the respective specialists on the subject.

During the debate over evolution vs. creation one camp claims the automatic tuning which is done by the system itself, while the other camp supports the idea of a tuning done by God, at least partially. Regarding the results of the analysis and those familiar with the respective results, how do you think the two groups are correlated, what is the percentage of those supporting the natural tuning, done by itself, by those familiar and those not familiar with the results of this analysis? Is it any wonder, does it seem suspect to anyone that most of those familiar with the results tend to choose the option of independent tuning, while those not familiar with them prefer the option of a tuning “guided” by God, and the difference tends to deepen according to the level of familiarity, until it becomes a unanimous choice?

In this context, to what extent is it justified to expect that the option of tuning guided by God is argued by its supporters based on evidence? We find the clues on the one hand in the fact that this camp belongs to the ones who are not familiar with research in general and much less with the results of this particular analysis. And, on the other hand, those familiar with the evidence provided by the study of nature openly choose the option of natural tuning.

If they can accept that the eco-system works and maintains its own balance by itself, without any later intervention from God, some supporters of creation will ask themselves if perhaps it is possible that God created the eco-system initially, but he had designed it in such a way that it has the necessary qualities in order to be able to function by itself, including the ability of self-tuning.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

In order to answer this question, I will refer to one of the properties of the eco-system that we are very familiar with today and will propose to analyze the extent to which the details and implications of this property influence the possible choices of answer to this question. It is: The ability of regeneration. The concept of regeneration is related both with tuning and with balance implicitly. Technically, tuning represents the process that leads to balance. Starting from an unorganized primary state, specific forces intervene and act to lead the system to balance. The concept of “maintaining” balance involves a process in which forces from within the system fight to counteract the effect of other external forces threatening to produce unbalance. All these three terms, balance, maintenance and tuning, involve forces that act inside the system to assure a certain state. What kind of forces are these? They are the forces of individual components of the system and are determined by the properties and needs of the respective components. They are not foreign forces, separated from the components of the system itself. This is confirmed by the fact that any disassembling of the system in its constitutive elements leaves the components intact taken individually. But also by the fact that gathering them together again recreates the system, which works like before, returning to the same form from the beginning. As a result of the entire process nothing at all is lost.

By extension, if we understand the principle behind this experience and apply it to other experiences (*in fact, what prevents us to apply it to all?*), if it is true that it can regenerate itself, then the system should be able to form itself entirely, from zero. The difference is quantitative (not qualitative), regeneration means a partial creation, and creation means total regeneration. The idea is best illustrated by the example of the automobile repaired: If the mechanic in a shop can repair any problem by replacing the old part with a new one, then (again, by extension) why wouldn't he be able to create the entire car? Of course, leaving aside the problem of price and efficiency of such an effort, strictly considering the perspective of theoretical possibility, the construction of the car from zero is possible.

Are the systems from the examples given of human society and market also characterized by this property of regeneration? Society is made up of citizens, and the market is made up of products (and of course sellers and buyers, clients). When one part of citizens from a society leave or others, new ones are coming, things go through a period of transition until they arrange and finally each one finds his own role and place, and the group gains a stable definition – so, yes, the society can regenerate itself. The case of migrants is known both in ancient history, but also in modern times, the population moves inside and outside a country, the new comers are assimilated and, to the extent that these exercise their own influence, the definition of the group may change. Can society be created from zero? It is relatively easy to find examples in this regard. Migrations both in the past and also present moved either to completely empty areas or to areas that they cleared by force. New areas were created and thus their population represents an example of creation of a society from zero. Or what can we say, for example, of the colonizing of America?!

The same is true for markets. The products can change partially or totally. Just as the existing balance is maintained, the market can regain its balance when it receives new products. Or when all its products are changed, a new market is created with a new balance. Markets accompany societies, that is why a new society generally means also new markets. Both society and the markets can regenerate themselves partially or totally.

Returning to the eco-system, in modern times, the industrialization produced significant damages to the natural environment in many geographical areas. And many times there have been alarming reactions to the threat that the damage could be permanent. But one of the important experiences of modern times was to realize that after a time interval, surprisingly the portion of nature that had been destroyed came back again. The phenomenon was repeated and it could be verified in many different situations, and dedicated detailed studies concluded that the eco-system is elastic by nature, partial or total regeneration is an inherent property. Also, it can be created entirely from zero.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The study of eco-systems from multiple geographical areas continued in our era and their detailed functioning has been documented in almost every condition, season and types of climate or changes in it. Now we have a complete overall view: We know how they react to changes determined by human intervention and activities, but also to changes in the nature itself. When there is light a certain type of flora and fauna is favored. Similarly, when there are variations of different degrees of light intensity, the effect is reflected in nature, and the elements directly favored in turn favor other elements and, thus, a chain of interdependence is formed. When there is dark another chain of interdependences takes place and another system is created. When it is warm, when it is cold, when it is water, humidity or dryness, a certain type of nutrients, with certain consistency, composition, accessibility. The eco-system is a result or effect produced by the conditions of the environment and the forces of all factors involved. That is why, regardless of the changes happening at any level in the conditions of the environment, the system can regenerate, can form itself from zero and can self-adjust. It has always done so. (By extension, the scientific understanding takes one principle behind any event and applies it to others – *and, in fact, why not to all?*) What we see today is the result of this process, and in the future we have all the reasons to believe that things will work according to the same rules.

Their flexibility can be likened to that of a river, which flows in any conditions. Could someone say that the river was made by God? This perspective is adopted by some on the basis of the following reasoning: Since we humans like it, because it is enjoyable to our eyes, it therefore means that the river makes up a beautiful scenery, and any beautiful picture is made by a talented painter. Who might be the painter in the case of the picture created by the river? The answer from this perspective must be: God.

However according to the alternative view, a researcher (or many) analyzes the phenomenon scientifically following a few systematic steps. First, he observes the flow of water on a certain path and notices a system in equilibrium due to its components: The water is fluid and the canal allows the flow of river in the re-

spective form and place. The next observation is that the canal of the river represents a lower position than the surfaces to the left and right around it. The measuring continues and the results are consistently as follows: The level of the canal is always lower than the level of the surrounding surfaces. The conclusion is definite: The river always flows on the surface with the lowest level, this becomes unquestionably a universal rule.

If initially someone presented the proposal that God placed the water of the river in its place, from one end of its path to the other, now we notice the existence of some rules. And we ask ourselves if it is possible that perhaps God imposed the rule, and the river simply follows that rule, and the result is partially a divine intervention and partially the behavior is due to (reaction to the rule) the property of matter.

The next step is the identification of a gravitational force, the one pulling the water down making the river to always choose the surface with the lowest level in the area. The implication of this explanation is that the phenomenon no longer has an external cause (divine), but it has a cause determined by the properties of matter itself. In other words, God did not impose a rule after the formation of our planet, but gravity exists, as a property of matter, independent of the form or its later use. If the rule is not made separately, it means that at least in this context, there was no need for the divine intervention.

The other component of the river refers to the canal (river bed): the place and form of its path. What is the canal? It is a difference in the level of two surfaces. The study of our planet revealed that its landscape is the result of natural phenomenon. And, in turn, these phenomenon have material causes themselves. There are a few explanations for the formation of mountains and valleys, however they all involve material factors (or: are determined by inherent properties of matter). When we have two options A and B and research has identified the cause A, then cause B is implicitly excluded. In the case of landscape: If the properties of matter cause the landscape formation, then, by implication, this is no longer created by God.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

What becomes of the river in the version based on scientific research? It represents the manifestation of matter determined by forces which define it, both at micro and macro level. These conclusions are in harmony with, are demanded by and resulted from the study of one segment of the river, the comparison of that segment with the rest of its path, and then with other rivers until they become universal, in the case of all rivers. The principle of water adapting to the form of landscape defines a dynamic system. How does the river react to the changes of the environment? Moving of the ground, boulders separated from rocks, snow avalanche, freezing or the fall of a tree in the canal? The river bypasses, either goes laterally or over the obstacle, either continues its old path or it can find a new canal in order to create a path on another surface. What we notice is that, by virtue of the same forces which work for maintaining the system's balance, the river will regenerate itself partially or totally if the situation demands it.

According to this version of the rivers: They never needed divine intervention in order to appear, to exist or to adapt to any and all conditions of the environment.

By contrast, the version of creation, described in the book of Genesis and understood literally supposes that God created everything separately, all elements of the eco-system, each different specie of flora and fauna and has arranged the decoration of each detail of our enchanting image of nature. According to this perspective, also the rivers of our planet, that we discussed above, were produced by God. Their aspect, with spectacular curving paths, are modeled by him personally with a purpose: In order to contribute to the beauty of natural scenery. Rather than follow always the same path, in a perfectly straight line, the path of rivers is curving in one place because of a stone situated there and which needs to be passed over by the water. In this perspective, the conclusion must be that God placed the stone in that place. And also for the others and all stones, trees fallen in its path or any other obstacle and form of landscape which determines the specific paths of all rivers.

Just like the two versions reflect opposing perspectives with conflicting explanations in the case of the functioning of rivers, also the two perspectives over the eco-systems in general contain conflicting explanations. Next I will mention four relevant questions regarding the main characteristics of the eco-systems:

1. The eco-systems are made up of pairs of elements which cooperate with each other. The question here is: Have these elements been created separately and designed in advance with someone's intention that they be together and to benefit from one another or the reverse is true – they were not intended by someone, but due to the inherent properties and not anticipated, but following a natural process of adapting, and later self-tuning?

ANSWER: A flower placed in a pot in a room is found turned toward the window. Did the owner build the window in that location and then bought a flower turned in a specific position and placed it toward the window? In other words: Preparation in advance and intentional design? Or rather the window was there for a different purpose, and the flower turned later by itself in the direction where the window was already? In other words: Adaptation due to the inherent material properties of each element?

The forces acting and that maintain the elements of the system connected to each other are identified and they are known. The idea can be illustrated by the example of a "cluster" made up of multiple pieces of magnet of different sizes brought together in one place. What holds each piece tied to the rest of the group is a known force. In this case, could one say that someone holds them together artificially or rather that they stay like that by themselves, because of their own forces? When a pile of pieces of magnet are spread in such a way that each one is far from the other, this is obvious because the attracting force has no effect upon them, and the pieces are unorganized, placed there randomly. But if they are close enough, they all start to move and orient themselves depending on polarization, dimensions, position in space in relation to the other pieces. Finally, the active forces will bring them in the form of a cluster, and we call its stability: equilibrium.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

If the balanced state obtained is due to the organization of pieces according to all known laws and the individual's characteristics, then there is no need for additional explanations. Natural adaptation results as a probable conclusion.

An explanation becomes necessary and a foreign force possible, and someone's hand suspected only when the elements behave unexpectedly, the observations contradict the known laws. For example: If two identical poles which reject each other are touching each other and stay close without an identified cause. Then we can naturally ask if perhaps there maybe someone's intervention who brings and presses them from the outside.

2. Variations identified as a result of comparing multiple parallel systems raises the same question: Each of these individual systems constitutes a separate act of creation and was intended that they be different or rather the same forces that create one system also create the other, however the difference between them is due to later natural adaptation to the specific factors which differ from one area to another?

ANSWER: One table cloth is designed to have the same form as the form of the table upon which it is placed. Let us say that we look at two cloths almost identical: From the same material, color, dimensions, however one has the form of a circle, while the other the form of a square. Then we remove them from the tables and notice that the tables on which they were placed have the same respective forms of circle and square. What would be the most logical conclusion: Are the cloths different, created to fit each one a different type of table or is it the same type of cloth, but each one has adapted later in the sense that it took the form of the table by itself?

The distinction from the previous question: There the reference was to the existence of a material cause, while here the form of the resulting product (after the cause 1.) reflects another form existing in nature. The cause exists or not, and the form is similar or not.

Still at this answer to question 2, by extension, we can apply the principle of table cloth to all eco-systems. If each different element in nature were created separately, then very many indi-

vidual creating actions would be necessary. And for later modifications in time, again, further individual interventions. However after the research, there is one force revealed that is responsible for all those results. In the second stage we study the form of the product and after comparing it with the form of the cause, we notice also a similarity between those forms.

Example of “metal grains”. One magnet under a table acts upon the metal grains found above the table. Both aspects are noticed: 1. The metal grains are moved from their place and they stay oriented in a certain direction. 2. But viewed from a distance, the entire pile of grains is arranged in the form of a circle. Then we look and there is a magnet under the table in the form of a circle. On another table we have the same thing, the only difference being that the pile of grains is organized in the form of a square, and the magnet under the table has the form of a square. In these examples the most probable version is that in both cases the phenomenon of organizing of grains is due to the natural reaction to the magnetic force, and the external form itself represents automatic adaptation to the form of the magnet under the table. The similarities are too many in favor of a causal relation between the grains and magnet, that is why the version of intervention from a foreign cause which could have acted from the outside in order to arrange differently the grains on each separate table is so improbable that we can say its chances are negligible – practically, excluded.

Example of the wind. A wind storm can move the dust that it meets in its path. We cannot see the wind with our naked eye, but we see the cloud of dust raised from the ground, which moves in the form of a spiral. In the absence of the wind, the possibility to speculate about unknown causes could have some chance. However when we identify the presence of the wind, and the form of the wind is similar to the form of the cloud of dust, then a single version has virtually maximum chances. In other parallel situations we have another cloud of dust and this is identified in the presence of the wind, the only difference being that the form of the cloud is no longer spiral, like in the first case. However that

matches the form of the wind identified every time at the location of the cloud of dust.

The same idea: Both the cause of movement, as well as the form of the resulting product correspond with factors identified in nature. What would be the chances that a person had produced a cloud of dust by independent actions and gave it different forms? Is that the sign of manual production or rather of industrial, automatic production, in series?

Just like the above examples, is there a common force that could produce all eco-systems, with the specific differences that each has in every time period and every geographic area? How is the “climate” as a candidate for the force responsible for the entire diversity of (eco-systems) nature and life?

Today we notice the mark of climate changes upon the environment, which is reflected then upon the flora and fauna (their variations): From the alternations of day-night, seasons, flux-reflux, raining season – dry season, ice age – global warming, to the differences of geographic areas, different races (including human races) at the Equator, Tropics, temperate zone, to the poles. Can one unjustifiably ignore this connection between each change in climate and the corresponding variety observed in nature?

3. In the same system we notice changes over time. And over very long periods, the changes can be significant: The system can become unrecognizable. We ask therefore: Does God recreate the entire system every time when this takes a new form? Or rather, the system by the nature of its composition can take any form, in other words, the transformation is due to its natural adaptation to the factors of the environment?

ANSWER: A house and a building in general is stable. That is why it is also called “immobile”. It does not change its location where it sits or its form. The initial building project was made on the basis of a detailed plan. Any potential later modification demonstrates either ignorance, or conflict with the original plan. Most of the times, the state government demands separate approvals every time a modification deviates from the conditions

established by the original building plan. A new building plan is necessary in order to get approval for a modified building.

Similarly, if God created all things, he must have designed each detail of all eco-systems. Wouldn't this mean that they should stay the same and not change? What would be the message transmitted about the initial plan by the multiple and constant changes of nature at all levels?

According to a literal interpretation of the sacred writing (book of Genesis), the creation days ended with the creation of the first human pair, thousands of years ago. And God entered into a so-called "Day of Rest". Any further intervention from God's part for the changes in the natural world raises the question: Do God's creation days continue until now, after the creation of the first human pair in Eden?

Often times after disasters or during other critical situations, in modern times and sometimes even in the past, man proved that he is able to intervene and manipulate the environmental factors, either by modifying, migration or simple reorganization maneuvers in order to repair or to fasten the repairing of an eco-system naturally or, when needed, to realize a partial or complete new system.

Man is capable to and even creates entire eco-systems from zero, either in nature, in parks, natural reserves or in places that are completely artificial. (A green garden in the desert – Las Vegas; winter sports on artificial snow in areas with high temperature - Dubai)

A level of flexibility of the eco-systems is noticed therefore and a capacity that they may be created from zero due to the collective forces of all components that make them up, not only impressive, but also apparently unlimited. Is any reason stopping us from extending this principle and imagine that the entire natural scenery of the planet could develop by itself from the beginning, and in order to arrive at the current form there was no need for any direct intervention of a creating act from the part of God?

4. Both at present as well as in the past periods, the changes of the environment observed and documented are accompanied by parallel changes noticed in the climate. We can ask, therefore:

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

Has God waited for the changes in climate in order to create different species of the flora and fauna appropriate to the climate conditions of each stage in the historical development of the planet or rather the different species have developed – adapted themselves to the respective environment conditions?

ANSWER: Man has always lived and formed communities around or in the proximity of rivers or a source of water in general. In the past he was dependent on the vicissitude of the weather and characteristics of nature to a much greater extent. If the weather was favorable, the production was good and man would prosper, but if not, then often times he did not survive. Today the level of technological development together with other political and social factors have led to less dependence of the population in many areas of the globe on the will of nature or made them even totally independent. Also, the flora and fauna demonstrate a great degree of dependence (can we say total?) on the environment: They migrate from one place to another since they have no control over the events in nature.

Throughout our planet's history, not only since the existence of man, but in the periods incomparably longer of the pre-historical eras, the types of flora and fauna have changed completely from one stage to another. And these complete changes of the eco-system are caused by changes just as radical in the climate: temperature, light, humidity, air composition and a series of other factors resulted implicitly. Comparing these historical records with the Biblical report about creation leads to a relevant question, namely: If on the one hand climate changes are explained and have identified material causes, which means they are simply random natural phenomenon not provoked by God, and on the other hand, according to the literal description of creation in the book of Genesis, each different specie of the eco-system, flora and fauna, has been created by God directly, then the question becomes: Do we not arrive at a situation where the creator finds himself at the mercy of creation, because he creates depending on weather conditions? It can be objected that he left the climate unchecked to act freely, and then when the weather conditions permitted, he would execute his creating activity. The

situation can be compared with that of a man who works the land and chooses to go in the field only when it does not rain. Or a child who builds a castle in the sand on the beach when the waves pull away or when they are small enough.

Or rather the alternative conclusion could be more consistent and more probable, namely: Just as the climate is a natural phenomenon which changes as a result of its interaction with the known material forces, also maybe flora and fauna adapt themselves in time to the specific environmental conditions (without any external intervention from God)?

It is a verifiable fact that nature never stays and never did stay the same. We see this everywhere around us: Every individual grass grows, every animal gives birth, every aspect of the cycles in nature, day-night, annual seasons are continuously changing. What is wet gets dry, what is warm gets cold, rains and rivers erode the surface of the mountains, the activities in the nucleus of the Earth determine the movement of continents and other constant changes of the landscape ... and so forth.

Even the things apparently stable do not remain the same. They just move at a slower rate which is not observed by man without dedicated instruments. For example, the Earth rotation around its axis had a greater speed in the past; 400 millions of years ago there were 410 days in a year, as opposed to 365 that we have today. The factors influencing the changes in the past continue to do the same today. If the changes have followed certain laws then, the same thing is true today.

According to the version in which things appeared by creation, it would be expected that we be able to identify a delimitation between the moments of the creation: The period before and the period after creation. Similarly, in the case of a construction building the same stages are identified. The period of work on its construction is known and the periods before and after are determined. There is a reference point that we refer to that marks the beginning and the end of the construction activities. After it is done, other logical stages follow successively: Cleaning, furniture, taking ownership.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The reality, however, is that none of the active processes changed its properties. No element changed its qualities, their action has not stopped after the creation of life in general or of man in particular. They all continue in the same manner, rhythm, speed, force ... etc. Today and will continue also into the future. This observation raises the question that we asked often during this debate: Are there clues that the involved forces had a purpose, that the processes were initiated, guided, and then stopped depending on the interest related to man's existence? Or rather the clues demonstrate an action that is unplanned and independent from man's life by processes that are simply natural?

The observations discussed above regarding these four aspects of the nature of the eco-systems (1. material cause 2. variety between parallel systems 3. variety within the same system over time 4. accompanied by climate changes) provide reasons to consider very probable the version in which nature and life, as we know them today, have arrived to their present form through development by themselves – only on the basis of the interactions between forces determined by properties of matter in all its forms of existence. Without any external direct intervention from God. The chain of cause-effect identified during this development can be followed, by extension, even beyond the origin of life and of conditions that make it possible here on Earth, going further back to the formation of the solar system, of the galaxies, the entire Universe – and up to the initial explosion, named Big-Bang.

If the properties of matter and the laws of the Universe can explain the development of the material world, with its known level of diversity, both at the micro and macro level, then the question about the causes or origin is moved back in time to the moment of the start of the Universe.

One of the objections received to the above observation comes from some who say that “understanding” a phenomenon does not necessarily mean that it came by itself and that it was not created. Even if science found the explanation and has identified the long chain of cause and effect of the entire process involved, they ask: Why exclude God, is it not possible that science may be right regarding the “manner” in which things have been

produced, but still God “agreed “ with the process, he wanted that things work in that way?

ANSWER: In a certain limited philosophical sense maybe this possibility is acceptable theoretically. However how probable is it really and what are the implications of this supposed version? Wouldn't this mean that God is no longer in control or at least he does not demonstrate the supposed superior qualities attributed to him? He would no longer go beyond the creative abilities of nature itself! Would this not represent a very long and random path, if the sole purpose of all processes involved were life itself – the creation of man? What could be said, in this regard, about the obvious excess of time and space and the creation of billions of galaxies, each of them made up of billions of stars – would this not represent a huge waste in the given context?

Another objection against excluding the divine intervention is formulated by some who could understand that today science knows all steps taken by matter, beginning from the time of the Big-Bang and the stages of transformation by a natural evolutionary process up to the current stage. However they want to maintain the divine intervention, considering that God could act before the process of evolution, in other words before the Big-Bang: He gathered all matter in one concentrated point and somehow triggered the explosion. Even if after that point they accept the possibility that God has not intervened directly, but has left the transformation of matter to take its course alone guided solely by the forces and properties imposed by him to the definition of matter before the Big-Bang.

ANSWER: The discussion about the possibility that God had any direct implication before the moment of the Big-Bang goes beyond that current debate “evolution vs. creation” proposed by this material. Therefore I will resume myself to mention three relevant aspects shortly:

1. The conclusion does not derive from examined evidence, but rather comes from its lacking. The proposal resembles a pre-conceived idea induced to support a God of voids.

2. The very use of the term “God” is improper and it reflects a circular reasoning. Since the term comes from religion and its Bi-

ble interpretation. Science eliminated both of these sources, also the term with a definition based on such sources. The idea is reduced to an attempt to support an inexistent concept on the basis of inexistent evidence. Regardless of the involved factors before the Big-Bang, for someone accepting evolution after Big-Bang, these can not be called "God" => it would be a contradiction in terms.

3. The processes involved in the Big-Bang and before and that are supposedly attributed to divine intervention are smaller in number and complexity than the processes that followed and which science attributes to evolution. That is why, referring to external forces and unknown causes, as long as those internal and known have already demonstrated that they can realize even more than it is expected from the first ones, is unjustified. Why should we not look to the same factors used after that point by evolution in order to explain also the events before that moment?

Another objection, a reaction to the scientific explanation of "blind" evolution is, and I quote:

"How can science say that everything was formed by itself, if it does not even know who (what) caused the Big-Bang explosion, nor where all matter that was concentrated there comes from or what was before that moment? Where do scientists get all information that they present us, since none of them was present when those events happened? This conclusion is absurd, that all just appeared simply out of nothing and without any help from someone. This concept is foreign to all that our experience has thought us."

ANSWER: First, most of the answers are self evident, after we listen carefully to the exact formulation of evolution and understand what it says and what this theory doesn't say. To illustrate the way in which science was able to establish that everything resulted from the Big-Bang (1. without anyone being present at the event and 2. without knowing the causes that started the explosion and 3. having no idea about what was there before that moment), I will use an example: The pieces of broken glass.

We enter a room and see lots of pieces of broken glass spread on the floor around the table, some of which reflect beau-

tifully colored lights due to the light rays entering the room. We have no idea about how, when or who was responsible for the presence of the pieces of broken glass there. We recognize the following aspects: 1. We have not been present, 2. we know nothing about what happened, 3. what was there before, 4. however the reflected light is beautifully colored and 5. usually nothing comes from nothing or without the help of someone. Now, what version will we suppose as the most probable: Will we suppose that someone has personally arranged these pieces each one in its place with a definite purpose in mind?

The scientific version involves the systematic study of all aspects: dimensions, forms, current position, composition and properties of the glass. And it draws conclusions based on the laws of physics and chemistry and the reactions of the material to such laws, then it verifies that and to what extent the suppositions are confirmed. As a result of such rigorous process, a scientist (or many) could establish with a precision measurable in percentages of probability that the pieces used to be part of a bottle. He can recreate the process in reverse, just like a detective who solves a criminal case from the effects to the cause and can specify precisely details like the following: the dimensions and form of the original bottle, the place where it stayed on the table, the speed with which it was pushed, the place, speed and force of the impact when it fell on the floor. He can work out all their details in reverse based on the result of measurements, because of his professional background, experience, experiments to scale, of comparisons and numerous calculations.

This example reminds us that it is not always necessary that scientists be personally present at the event nor that they learn from other sources details about who, what happened or what was there before the event. It proves that it is not necessary to know some irrelevant information. Even if we will not identify all activities going on in that room, we can still determine what happened with the bottle and what was the course of events in reverse, starting from effects to the cause. In other words: if we do not know everything, it doesn't mean that we do not know anything (or cannot find out). Today the same process is familiar to us

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

from most diverse fields: criminal investigations conducted by Police, diagnosis of diseases in medicine, industrial buildings – or travel to space to far away planets. All are solved indirectly, on the basis of calculations and experiments to scale.

All these show that science can analyze clues that are provided by the Universe now in order to draw competent conclusions about previous stages of its development, up to the Big-Bang. These examples show that the answer to the objection raised is not unique, given by science exclusively with reference to the origin of the Universe. But there are many more domains, and in their cases usually we do not hear the same objection being raised.

Another objection related to the previous one, where some note one aspect unexplained by the example with broken glass. Namely, things that we notice today in the world around us in the entire Universe that resulted from the Big-Bang explosion demonstrate organization. So they do not seem thrown around at random. They respect precise laws, we are even impressed by their level of precision. Also, they reflect some forms, models, are often organized to the smallest detail. The question becomes: How can matter that is subjected to unguided processes and by pure blind evolution to produce organized things which reflect specific, definite forms?

ANSWER: In order to illustrate the solution to this aspect, I will use another example: Pieces of paper on water. If a group of little pieces of white papers are thrown in a water that moves in circle, they are visible, even if the water under them is not seen. Someone who sees them moving in circle, without knowing anything about what happened, could be impressed and suppose that a mysterious and very capable friend holds each piece in its position and turns them with the single purpose: To provide us with an enjoyable spectacle for our eyes.

However the scientific version approaches the situation differently. It will analyze both the individual characteristics, as well as those of the environment. And based on the measurements, it can explain the way in which the properties of the pieces of paper face the specific force of the water in this particular case. The ac-

tivity of these factors together have realized the spectacular phenomenon naturally. Without the separate intervention of someone from outside the system. The conclusion deriving from the analysis of this example is the following: If we notice in the case of a natural system order or specific forms or that things respect predictable and precise laws, the cause is not automatically human or from someone outside, external to the system. Nature is able to generate itself organized phenomenon and systems, which manifest themselves in specific forms and which follow precise and exact laws. It does this by virtue of a sum of verifiable material causes. In short, anything has a cause, however the cause can be found also in nature, we just need to search it enough.

At the galaxies level, the solar system or planet Earth, everywhere matter is organized according to laws, most of the times there is a set of multiple laws together. The Universe makes a show at many levels: Groups of stars and planets, but also comets and various asteroids rotate around a common given point. Then, at a higher level, multiple groups together form clusters which rotate together around another reference point. Does this look beautiful? Yes. Is it a precise movement? Of course. Are these arranged in various specific forms? Definitely, often times they are. Does man support them on their respective trajectories by means of modern technology so that they each keep course and do not collide into one another? Impossible. Because of the negative answer to this last question, there is derived the alternative conclusion that maybe God supports their movement, that he placed them in their places or supervises their movement.

In the case of the pieces of paper that move in a circular path, instead of limiting the choice between two options: 1. man supports them vs. 2. God supports them. There is actually a third option: 3. the force of water behind them, which flows in circle thus determines the observed movement of the little papers.

Is it possible that, in the same manner, the case of the Universe described above has an invisible common force that acts upon objects in space (maybe gravity?) and which could explain all aspects related to the reason of movement, its path, precision,

speed, distance from one another – as an alternative to the intervention of God?

Another objection. Often at the end of the other objections, some ask: If matter transformed and everything appeared by itself, as a result of unguided processes and blind evolution, why is it not transforming today, how come we do not see new things appearing today, modified from existing things?

ANSWER: Every time we use the expressions process “unguided” by anyone or “blind” evolution, a definition of the terms unguided and blind are helpful in order to place them in the right perspective. For example, processes taking place in nature happen because of a number of factors that influence the entire activity. So, are the natural processes guided or not? To the extent that a number of factors influence the processes, the respective factors guide the processes. The expression guided or unguided can be relative. For us, it depends on the source that performs the action of guiding: If the process is influenced by a certain “source” (or “agent”), people call this influence “guidance”, if it is influenced by another one (or more) they no longer call it “guided”. In this case the discussion is moved to a deeper level, specifically: Is it guided by one type of agent or by another type?

The same in the case of the expression “blind” evolution. The term blind in case of a human means that he does not see with his eyes. In the case of evolution, to see or not see does not refer to the eyes function, but to the perception of the world around, the correct interpretation of signals transmitted and which communicate values about the material world. That is why the term blind in the case of evolution is a relative one. And here, again, the discussion is moved to another level, namely: Does evolution have the mechanisms through which it can interpret correctly the reality of material world or not?

Besides the use of such relative terms (guided and blind), the objection also uses a supposition which is induced in the very formulation of the question: “why is it not transforming ... how come we do not see new things appearing today ...?” This formulation *presupposes* that matter does *not* transform today and that new forms of live do *not* appear. Clues that prove if such presup-

position is true or not are found everywhere, if we study the material world at any level. I will mention for example three cases: 1. global warming 2. various species of dogs 3. various species of humans.

If we answer that transformations appear during a very long period of time, and the climate changes that determined them have been more drastic than the ones noticed by man in the course of his existence, someone could ask if this answer may simply represent a tactic of avoidance or running away from the truth. However, what does the recorded evidence reveal? It documents exactly long periods, significant measured changes of the climatic factors which determined corresponding radical changes of the environment.

The difference between the examples of glass and of paper is that:

- In the first case: A. they stopped and B. they were unorganized
- In the second case: A. they move and B. they follow a circular path

In principle, the difference is superficial not essential, quantitative not qualitative. Some forces determined pushing and breaking of the glass into pieces. However in the case of the little pieces of paper, later there continued to act other forces, those of the water. In general, when a phenomenon is defined as regular, and another one as sophisticated, the cause that determines this difference refers not to the *quality* or nature, but to the *quantity* and number of factors involved. One single force produces a regular result, while multiple forces produce a result that can be impressive. Man gives a subjective verdict in the case of reality when he divides them in simple vs. sophisticated. In order to go beyond the subjective barrier, the discussion needs to be moved, again, to the level of causes and not of subjective appreciation of results: What forces can cause a certain form of the finite product? Then the question is reduced to: Does the Universe have those necessary forces, are there found in nature the specific identified conditions for producing the respective result?

LIFE APPEARED TOO LATE AND SLOW TO BE THE RESULT OF DIVINE INTERVENTION

Life in all its forms, flora and fauna, has appeared billions of years after the formation of the planets and of the solar system. Then, between the appearance of different species there have passed many millions of years. This reality contradicts the Biblical description that God created everything in the course of a week by pronouncing a simple "word".

To be able to pronounce ourselves regarding the origin of life, who its author is and by what processes was it made, the volume of information that we have available can influence the level of conviction and the ease with which we decide between one proposed option or another. In our case: If life came by evolution or by creation.

Among the aspects analyzed that are relevant for a verdict on the origin of life are elements that make up life, the processes that determine its functions, dependence on the environment factors and the length of time necessary for the involved processes to produce the final results.

During the history of the Universe extremely long periods are identified when they are compared with the relatively short period of the known human existence on Earth. It is estimated that the Universe appeared about 14 billion years ago, planet Earth and our solar system about 4.5 billion years ago, then after 2 billion years the first living cell and after 2 more billion years man as we know him today. Human life is dated relatively recently, to a few thousands of years, at most tens of thousands of years in the past. The comparison between the period of human life, both as a specie but also as individual, and the other periods of Universe's history reveal a relation that is incredible and almost impossible to conceive for our mind.

This component of the temporal aspect has a particular significance in the case of our debate. The length of time of the involved periods is a determining factor for the choice between one option or another: between evolution vs. creation. If the length of time is short, this supports one process and confirms one of the options, and at the same time it eliminates and contradicts the alternative option.

Before presenting the two parallel options to compare them from the perspective of the length of time, I will use a neutral example that illustrates the problem we face: A river flows through a deep canal in a rocky mountain. The question we ask here is: How do we know whether the canal (river bed) is artificial, built manually by someone, or was formed by itself, naturally? And how does the information regarding the length of time in which that canal was produced influence the answer to our question?

If we find a known date in the past, when the canal was not (as) deep and we compare it with the known date when the canal came to the current depth, then we can calculate the difference of time and depth in order to establish how long the process of digging the canal took for a certain depth. Separate, parallel experiments can be conducted in order to determine the rhythm and speed in which water alone digs a hole of certain depth in the rock. The experiment can either reproduce exactly the properties of the rock and the parameters of the river, or it can be done to scale, but later the results are projected in the known reality of the river and, by extension, the conclusions are applied to the debit and the rest of the environment conditions of nature. The analysis can determine how long it would take the river alone to dig a canal of that depth. If the initially measured data of the canal correspond to the conclusions of the experiment, then it means that the river could have realized the canal alone.

Of course, someone could object that the simple measuring and comparison of the results of the experiment do nothing more than offer a potential explanation of the phenomenon. But this fact does not necessarily exclude the possibility of a human intervention during the process. Even if the version of artificial creation is not completely excluded, while the possibility of natural crea-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

tion is verified and very probable, we return to the origin of life and ask: What do the observations reveal regarding the two options in this case?

The question is asked especially in the case of very long periods of time: How is the extremely long time period that passed for each stage relevant? It has been an extremely long time until the formation of our solar system and then for the formation of all elements that make up the conditions necessary for life. Then the appearance of each category of life and finally man all happened after some extraordinary long periods of time.

According to the version of creation, the Bible expression is as follows: "God said to be so. And it was so." This manner of appearance of things, as a result of direct intervention from the part of God takes us in general to a very short period of time, for many it seems as instantaneous creation. In other words, that things appeared immediately after he uttered the words. Placing the successive stages of creative work in the context of a week's period adds to the reasons for associating this process with a very short period of time.

If God created everything => this means that he intervened => which implies an influence / modification of the processes involved. Even if we do not go into the details, to what extent, how much and what specifically this intervention meant, still one thing is clear: the natural processes have not acted *alone* according to the version of creation. Either God has helped the processes, so the intervention was partial, or he made everything himself, so a complete intervention. If we refer to the periods of time involved, it would be expected that a difference of time between the version of evolution when processes act alone and the version of creation when processes are influenced by God's intervention should be noticed. God's intervention would *speed up* the processes, so the length of time should be shorter *with* his intervention and longer *without* his intervention.

That is why the measured length of time is relevant to our debate about the origin of things. It can provide clues regarding the manner in which they appeared and if there was any outside intervention or not. Today we are familiar with the way nature

works compared to the way man works. Because of the technological advancements in the last centuries man has intervened in more and more domains, he influenced partially some processes, while others he has replaced completely by the introduction of some processes that we call “artificial”. Man wanted to be able to speed up the production of some results: Often times nature produces the same things that man also does, however nature produces them slower, if left to work alone, while man realized specific means by which to accelerate the processes and to make the systems he is interested in more efficient.

Because of the past centuries’ experience, man has learned how most processes in nature work. Specifically, today we know: 1. how long it takes to produce the material transformations naturally, but also 2. the past periods in which all these transformations have been recorded. On the basis of these two pieces of information the following conclusion can be derived: If those past transformations have been produced naturally or not. If 1. the necessary period corresponds with 2. the recorded period, then 3. they have been produced naturally. If the process is artificial and an external intervention responsible for its production, then obviously we expect a difference between the previously compared periods.

The same objection presented in the example of the river, some also present here, namely: Why should creation and God’s intervention be excluded only because of such comparisons between documented time periods? If the material transformations in the Universe took place exactly in the time interval that is also necessary for the natural processes alone to produce them, does that necessarily mean that it is how it happened, namely naturally, without God’s intervention?

If under these circumstances, one still supports the version of creation and God’s intervention, it would mean that we expect God to have created in the successive order demanded by a long chain of cause and effect and in the time interval necessary for natural processes involved to produce those results. Would this not mean to claim that God works like nature does, and in the rhythm, efficiency and conditions demanded by nature? The same

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

conclusion results in the case of the river, if the canal through which it flows was dug in the time interval that it would be necessary for the water alone to dig that canal, but it was nevertheless made by man, it would mean that man digs in the same manner as the water does it.

As I mentioned regarding the canal made by the river, also in the case of life's origin, the measurements and huge past periods necessary for each stage of life's development and the conditions supporting it constitute the basis from which the conclusion derives that the appearance of all things *naturally* is very probable. Even if, taken individually, none of these clues completely excludes the possibility of an external intervention from someone (God).

** Following I quote a response received to this subject and I comment on it:

"That's just your opinion. I do not see the connection between the moment of life appearance and divinity. I hope you do not use this logic also in other fields of life: «I became healed too soon-late to believe that the doctor has any merit»".

ANSWER: The current chapter does not express disappointment, like a child who refuses the cake since it was not given him when he asked for it, nor complain that it took too long or a wish that it should have taken shorter or that life should have appeared at a different time.

The purpose of the analysis, however, is the identification of a correlation between the time interval between different stages of development of the planet and the length of time needed by the involved processes to realize those transformations *alone*. If the conclusion is that the time intervals have the same length, this conclusion is relevant in the choice of the source of the changes (or to determine their cause). The answer to this question tells us something about the forces responsible for the transformations: evolution vs. creation.

COMET ISON 23.11.2013 CONTAINS WATER → SO THE EARTH IS NOT UNIQUE

Until relatively recently it was thought that Earth was unique and that life elements are found only here. Now we know that this is not so, but the elements on our planet are the same as in all galaxies and in all the material Universe. So Earth is in no way unique, there is no proof of a special hand here, but nature is the same and it functions the same way everywhere.

In the past months I saw a television program, a documentary about comet ISON which scientists investigated for a while. The significant detail which has drawn special attention of scientists to this comet is that it contains water. Normally water on this comet is in the form of ice, and when it got close to the sun it was in vaporized form. On 23.11.2013 it was expected to pass by at the closest distance to the sun from its entire path.

The discussion about this comet is related to the discussion about water on Earth. The subject has been debated for a long time and there has not been given a definite answer to the question, where does the water presently on Earth come from. At first look it could be noted that the sun is too hot for any water to be there. The most familiar planets, Moon and Mars presently do not have any water. And the Earth seems inexplicably flooded by an immense quantity of this liquid. Water is not just an ordinary element on our planet, but it is in fact essential for all important processes that take (and have taken) place here. It is indispensable for life in all its aspects. No one can doubt that water is precious in general and very necessary for us. These three factors allow a perspective open to speculations. The factors are: 1. water is necessary 2. it exists in abundance on Earth and 3. its origin is not known.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

For some supporters of creation this situation makes it seem probable that here we have the proof of God's intervention and that he placed water in the quantity we now find on Earth. From this perspective the premises of creation "seem" to be met: 1. Water is necessary => Therefore we could think of a purpose. 2. Its quantity is more than enough for everyone => Therefore this could make us think of the qualities that we would expect from a God who is loving and interested in our well-being. 3. It is not found on any of the planets that we are familiar with => Therefore its presence on Earth is both surprising, non-intuitive and even against clues offered by examined nature.

Based on these premises and to the extent that the analyzed example matches them, creation could be considered as plausible conclusion, even probable. However if the analysis of the above example leads to different results in relation to its premises, then the conclusion regarding the probability of the options in the debate is influenced: evolution vs. creation. Let us look closer at these premises individually and see what other perspective is possible and which one is supported by evidence.

1. The idea of purpose. Creationists observe: If water is *necessary*, then it has a *purpose*. If it has a purpose, then there must be a *plan* involved, which in turn proves that *God* is its author.

In the case of necessary things, the conclusion is always determined by the perspective of the one judging, by the angle from which one looks at the situation. A few specific examples to illustrate the idea: 1. River and canal. 2. Water and glass. 3. Food and creatures that consume it. 4. Fuel and fire.

Looking from one perspective a certain conclusion can result, while looking from another perspective a different conclusion results. From the perspective of *cause*, we can ask: 1. Has the canal been made by design, with the purpose that the river that would appear later to be able to flow through a given path? 2. Has the glass been made in the specific form with the purpose that water inside it may take that form? 3. Does food in all its forms, vegetables, animal, micro and macro, exist because it was prepared for the future appearance of all creatures that would consume it? 4. Can it be said that inflammable materials, both wood,

as well as oil, exist for man, so that he can use them to make fire? Conversely, from the perspective of *effect*, the questions become: 1. Or rather the river is an automatic result of the water and the difference of levels together with gravity, which makes water flow through there? 2. Or water takes the respective form because of the glass? 3. Or life appears as a result of the existing food? 4. Or fire appears because of the existence of conditions of oxygen and inflammable materials?

Analysis of the eco-system reveals that the principle of cause-effect is respected: The system is determined by the environment. The type of life that develops in one place is determined by the conditions, by available food in that place and not the other way around, food because of life. Altered food brings about specific little flies, which come there because of the soured smell and not the other way around. Animals have their own methods of sending signals and interpreting them so that they let each other know when they discover clues about the existence of food and then they all gather to that place. They appear because of food and not the reverse. All that we observe in nature follows this rule: The latter appears because of the first, never the opposite direction.

The reverse version may be supposed when both are created by the same author. Let us say that someone gathers some dry wood and then puts them on fire. In this case it can be supposed that wood is there for fire and not the reverse, fire because of wood. However the difference is obvious when man's action is missing and a fire starts by itself in the forest. In that case the conclusion is opposite, fire appeared because of the existence of wood. In conclusion, the reverse supposition is possible only when it is based on another supposition, namely that both have the same creator. However a supposition based on another supposition is not credible, much less convincing. It is in no way appreciated as a scientific demonstration, it does not result from verifiable observations. But it is rather an equation with two unknowns, it is a circular reasoning.

2. The idea of uniqueness. The supposition that water exists exclusively on Earth and nowhere else in the Universe has never been supported by anything other than the simple lack of infor-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

mation. However this already starts to be challenged as science discovers clues of the presence of water on other planets and comets or cosmic bodies in our solar system as well as in other areas further away.

Since water is found in frozen state on planets further away from the sun and in vapor form if it is found closer to the sun, this matches with the states it is found also on Earth. At the poles, where it is cold, it is frozen, but everywhere else on the majority of the planet's surface it is found in liquid form, and in the atmosphere the clouds contain water as vapors.

This distribution and states in which water is found in the Universe is just as we would expect it to be, it corresponds therefore with the laws of physics everywhere. That is why we can ask if Earth's position on these coordinates in relation to the sun results in a certain distance and implicitly conditions favorable *with the purpose* that water exist and be here in the forms that we know or the reverse is true, it exists in these forms exactly *because* of the resulted conditions due to this positioning?

The discussion about the presence of water on Earth, the arguments about its origin, but also the mentioned factors, the idea of purpose or uniqueness, are found in generalized arguments regarding all elements making up our planet. For example, the same questions have been raised about minerals, metals, precious stones or other substances found deep in the underground, at the surface or in the atmosphere. Are they present only here? Have they been placed here by someone with a purpose?

From the perspective of uniqueness and purpose, some have suspected that Earth would be unique and that elements found here exist only here and nowhere else in the Universe. Then they speculated, based on this assumption, that extra-terrestrial beings have visited us here from very far away in other areas of the cosmos exactly to extract these unique elements from our planet. From the same perspective, some have speculated that Earth is equipped miraculously with specific elements for the sole purpose of supporting human life. Thus they imagined the planet through an analogy with a house, not only well built, but also filled with resources, a basement full of all that man needs in his life for

complex activities. Additionally, the house is arranged and equipped with enough resources, is placed in the middle of a vast desert which contains nothing but waste. On such background, the house represents a surprise which can only be explained by the conscious effort and purpose of a builder. This is how they imagine the Earth creation by God.

Conversely, the scientific discoveries provide the basis for a different perspective. Slowly but surely the composition of each chemical element of matter has been discovered. Thus the Mendeleev system has been developed as an absolute reference. As a result, there came an understanding of the processes necessary to the formation of all elements “naturally”. Then it was discovered that the chemical elements are not found exclusively on our planet, but the entire Universe is made up of these elements and only these, that what is found here is found everywhere, in all distant galaxies, stars or planets. The experiments to scale made in laboratory together with observation of phenomenon taking place here on Earth have helped in the identification of necessary conditions to produce the elements and it was understood that the Universe has both the time, environment, materials and necessary forces to produce all the known elements of matter. After all this information, we can ask the same question in general: Do forces of nature in the Universe exist *with the purpose* of creating different known chemical elements or the other way around, this variety of elements was formed *as a result* of the conditions produced by existing forces? Based on what we learned so far about the Universe, the presence of these elements everywhere, as well as identification of creating forces in cosmos, it is speculated more and more and justified that the elements necessary for life have their origin not here on Earth. But they, and maybe also the first life forms, have been brought here incidentally from the extra-terrestrial space. What we see today, the current forms are the result of the elements brought from cosmos, which in reaction with the conditions of the environment offered by our planet have evolved according to the specific universal properties of matter. Science replicates the process of star creation and demonstrates how the atoms of matter are modified under the

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

influence of heat and pressure realizing a transformation from one chemical element to another, until this process is able to produce the entire list of existing elements in the Universe. Everything that we now see, all the elements, substances, materials have been produced by these natural processes and known laws. The most recent and popular confirmation is provided by E.S.A. (European Space Agency) Rosetta satellite which landed on a comet on 12.11.2014.

As science gathers ever more information, both about water, as well as about the rest of the elements of matter, the situation matches the premises of evolution: The elements are explained, the way of producing them is understood, they have appeared predictable, in harmony with the existing laws of nature, the processes are compatible with the rest of known activities in the Universe, and the causes are material. Arbitrary attributing them to a divine intervention is justly suspected of being a conclusion contrary to objective observations, which is rather subjectively chosen and induced because of some prejudice.

IN CONCLUSION:

1. Experience tells us that all things around us appear as effect of some existing causes. Life depends on the presence of water. This means that it appeared because of the existence of water and not the other way around.

2. Water and the rest of the elements necessary for life are not found exclusively on Earth, but the same elements exist everywhere in the Universe. No one placed them here miraculously.

3. Water existed on Earth billions of years before man's appearance, for much too long for a connection between them to be concluded, much less probable that someone brought water here specially for man.

4. The version of creation matches suspiciously with the lack of information, and the origin of this version matches with a period when its ideas were based on mythology, later eliminated by modern science.

5. The entire history of nature and life suffered as a result of climate disasters, so no indication of a protecting hand was proven nor that of a purpose of life.

** Following I quote a response received to this subject and I comment on it:

“I looked briefly on the Internet. Nothing proven. There are only suppositions «Our measures showed that water on the comet contains one atom of deuterium for 6.200 hydrogen atoms», a close proportion with the one on Earth, explained researcher Paul Hartogh. So not H₂O. He says again «It maybe that all objects in the solar system contain water from these comets. Researching more comets will provide more answers..» And even if there might be water anywhere, this does not prove the inexistence of God.”

ANSWER:

1. Expressions: *“Nothing proven. There are only suppositions.”*

Two questions:

A) Is this a complete expression?

No. The object of reference is missing, it is not explained what exactly is not proven and how do we know that.

B) Is the statement true?

No. The very quoted text presents measured data which proves specific points.

2. Ending: *“... does not prove the inexistence of God.”*

A) This is not a complete expression either. It does not explain why “this does not prove the inexistence of God”, nor is it shown what would prove the existence of God and where exactly does the argument fail.

B) If the lack of water in the extra-terrestrial space is used as an argument in favor of the existence of God, then the discovery of its presence in the extra-terrestrial space overturns the initial argument.

Scientists have no doubt that water is present outside the Earth, so the expressions at the beginning of this reply are rather subjective. This constitutes an example of manipulating the information: If there are also some suppositions, they are in no way dominant, much less all “only suppositions”. The existing doubts refer to other aspects, but not the idea being discussed here, so using them with reference to the main conclusion (existence of water on the comet) is absolutely misleading.

INSTINCT NOT UNDERSTOOD SUGGESTED A PURPOSE, NOW IT'S EXPLAINED (WITHOUT A CREATOR)

Parts of animals' behavior that were not understood led to a suspected mysterious "hand" of God. However, once understood, the animal instinct does not demonstrate anything mysterious, but it has received a normal, scientific explanation, namely a materialistic one.

Today there is a variety of definitions which reflects what people understand by and the way they relate to the idea of instinct. Many times people have been impressed by the behavior of animals in general and have called any action of theirs as being done out of "instinct". Some, of course, have identified similar actions also in humans and have called them instinctual too. In short, everything that is apparently done unconsciously, without involving reason, has been called instinct. And this term often became synonymous with animalistic, exactly because it was thought that they do not have man's conscience and reason.

However the aspect pointed out by the supporters of creation and which they use in favor of their version of life's origin is related to some unexplained actions of the animals, some things that they do, but which man did not understand. For example, it was observed that some of them are able to avoid certain dangers or successfully find their way to food, shelter, their mate, family members. Without man's understanding of how animals manage to succeed in those situations. The observing man was faced with missing information, he did not see the elements marking up the path: It was an intelligent decision, but the analyzed clues that the decision was based on were missing. Animals travel a path from point A to point B. They see the connection between these points, however man did not see anything. That is why he wondered: How can animals find their way successfully without any connect-

ing element? Two possible options are available: Either they travel the specific path simply by chance, or they are helped by a mysterious foreign intervention. Their observed movement between the two points is useful and it takes place only in relation to satisfying a biological need of the individual. Therefore, the option of random movement can safely be eliminated. This leaves room to suspect a divine intervention which implanted a special mechanism in animals with the purpose of helping them to satisfy those needs and thus keep alive.

According to this perspective, the observed elements seem to correspond to the premises necessary for the version of life's origin through creation. It is a phenomenon that requires forces and conditions that are not found in our known Universe, it is an unexplained action, non intuitive, unexpected, which has no equivalent in the present environment, it is in conflict with the recognized direction of natural forces and it contradicts the properties of matter. A situation which is by necessity explained through a foreign intervention, which breaks the normal flow of events and at the same time it serves a purpose, which is compatible with the supposed personal qualities attributed to God, the supposed author of this intervention.

Because of specific personal circumstances, in the recent years I've had the opportunity to watch many documentary programs on various television channels about nature and animals and I have noticed a consistent direction of this field of research. Anything that we did not understand at a given time was because of our limited knowledge in the field. When we search for explanations, we find them. The more we investigate the world in which we live, we gradually find explanations for everything that previously was not understood. Everything that in the past was attributed to forces from another world, non intuitively, contrary to our experience and without equivalent in the world known by us proves to have been simply unknown, and the conclusions were due to limited information and insufficient knowledge that we had available at the time. The movement from point A to point B, which we did not understand at one time and which could leave room for searching the answers in an unconventional

source, became explicable through the discovery of a new element. A point “C” which makes the connection between the first two points. It is the so-called missing link. This was always there, but we just did not know of its existence.

Specifically, one of the reasons why man did not identify initially the connecting element, the point C, is because he expected that the animal would make use of the same senses known by him, those familiar to him. However, in time, research work has revealed that many of animals’ functions are using senses common to man, but which go beyond man’s recognized spectrum. For example, their sight and hearing are able to detect frequencies and wave lengths that human eye and ear do not recognize. Or their smell and taste can be many times more sensitive than those of man. Therefore what man cannot detect using his biological senses, was in fact there – that point C. And animals knew that it existed and were able to detect it. That is why they were able to use what they detected by means of their own senses and to find their way successfully. Thus, instead of a supposed guided movement by mysterious means, research has revealed a natural movement between points A and B explained by the later discovered connecting point C.

Besides using senses like ours, but which are able to detect signals outside the range perceived by us, it was discovered that animals can also use completely new senses, not found in humans at all. For example, some detect magnetic signals, electrical impulses, vibrations or various chemical reactions that their organism is able to interpret, but man’s organism is not able to. By these signals, they find out specific information which can help them find their way successfully in the world around them. Man was not aware of the presence of such signals and obviously did not expect animals to be able to interpret them. That is why the way in which the animals are able to find their way successfully constituted a mystery for them.

In principle, all the mysteries about animals lives explained up until now have proved that there was no “instinct” mysteriously implanted by a foreign force who knew in advance the path which they would need to travel. But they work on the basis of a circuit

of needs, just as man does: A certain biological need, let us say for example, hunger, transmits stimuli to the organism which trigger the action of searching for food. With the help of the senses that it is equipped with and which it learned to use by experience they interpret signals from nature which provide them with information about the location of sources of food. Then all is left to do is to make the best use of their abilities in order to go and get the necessary food. The need is satisfied, and the circle is closing. The differences from the way man functions are in the order of details or form, but in principle their function is the same, there are no essential or substantial differences in this regard.

Sometimes people did not understand all mechanisms in the process of the circuit of needs described above. For example, either they did not know how the animal is able to identify the location where food was found, or they did not know where did the animal get the abilities necessary to obtain the food, once located. The results of research have confirmed that these are always simply effects produced by natural, material causes. These material causes have always been there, but we just did not know about their presence and that is why we did not understand some processes, they seemed impossible for us. Now, even if there are still some mechanisms the functioning of which we do not fully understand (yet), I will list ten relevant observations that help evaluate the chances of attributing them to instinct, therefore to a divine intervention:

1. Percentage explained. Currently science has made important advancements compared to the time of its beginnings, a few centuries ago. Now maybe we understand a percentage of 90% the processes about how animals function and which we did not understand previously. If there have been material causes identified for all these processes, it means that those (still) unexplained processes, which give reason for some people to speculate the intervention of forces foreign to this world, definitely make up a minority percentage.

2. Level of detail. The working principle at the overall level is known, the circuit of biological needs: Both main causes are known, as well as main actions determined by these are known.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

During this circuit, in some cases man does not understand some elements of detail inside a chain of cause and effect. Maybe he does not have explanations for a missing link. In other words, in some complex cases, we know the main steps, but not an intermediary step, a subordinate action or a secondary reaction. What are the chances or how logical would the conclusion be that God intervenes in some of these minor parts, to implement a single piece in the entire mechanism? Would this not be the same as concluding that he designed based on someone else's design, like man who plans his work depending on the weather conditions?

3. Research trend. Can we ignore the explanations found, to forget that what we know today was not always known, and the lack of these current explanations determined erroneous suppositions regarding divine intervention, to ignore the very trend that these discoveries demonstrate, the consistent direction of the explanations we have found until now and not wonder about the possibility that also those 10% aspects not (yet) understood will perhaps be understood as well and explained on the basis of some material causes too? A tree found in full light can be seen completely and the path of branches can be followed from one end to the other. But if 10% of its surface were covered by shadow, most people would make justified suppositions about the area that is not visible. They would not imagine in that place the possibility of something surprising, incompatible with the rest of the visible area. This expectation is based on the rest of 90% that is visible and on the examples of all other trees previously seen.

4. Purpose of intervention. If evolution alone was not enough, and the supposed occasional intervention of God is justified by the wish of keeping the animal alive, then how can this motivation be harmonized with the lack of interest toward animals' life observed by confirmed reality of disappearing of life discussed in chapters 20-24? If God does not demonstrate that he would intervene to protect life in the cases of major natural catastrophes, then it becomes very hard to interpret that he intervened to protect life in the minor cases – such as implanting an instinct.

5. Arbitrary intervention. The percentage of animal behavior that is not understood is becoming ever smaller now. If we sup-

pose that these cases represent the evidence of divine intervention, then this would be a very selective and rare intervention. For the majority of studied animals we understand their behavior, so God did not intervene in order to implant any unexplained instinct in them. However a reduced percentage of cases is still not understood and we suppose that in these cases God intervened.

6. Insufficient design. Man understands nature to an ever greater extent today, most of phenomenon have been explained in detail. In general, it is known that things happen because of a number of interdependent factors. Supporters of creation prefer to attribute the functioning of natural phenomenon indirectly also to God and to suggest that a phenomenon is due to the mentioned factors, however the factors, in turn, are imposed by God. However if God has intervened occasionally directly to implant the necessary instinct, this means that those factors alone were not enough in those respective cases. Is this not equivalent to attributing an insufficient design to God (if the respective factors designed by him were not enough to do the job alone)?

7. Modified conditions. Nature continues to transform itself. And if we suppose the divine intervention at the creation of species, thousands of years in the past, then the divine intervention corresponded to the needs of that time. Specifically, an animal migrates between two geographical points, but the Earth geography has been modified. At the time of the supposed divine intervention there was a certain geography, and the animal needed to migrate to a certain point. Now, the same animal needs to migrate to a different point, at a different time of the year and following a different path.

8. Mythological principle. Additionally, God's intervention in the case of instinct is also hard to harmonize with the previous discussions about the other aspects. At chapters 2, 4, 13, 14 there are observations mentioned about the improbability of a direct intervention of God in the sense of breaking the natural laws, against the properties of matter and of the breaking the chain of cause and effect in the course of world events. Modern thought has not only eliminated belief in certain miracles, but it eliminated

the belief in the idea of miracles, it no longer accepts miracles in principle.

9. Level of complexity. Besides the confusion caused by the lack of a known cause for the phenomenon found in nature, people are impressed also by the level of complexity of life and its mechanisms. They sometimes ask how could blind evolution alone using simple forces to build things of such complexity that overwhelms us. They ask about the complexity itself, where does it come from and if the specific needs that a mechanism has to satisfy are relatively simple, why was it necessary that such sophisticated solution by used?

For the beginning let us mention that the one asking this question is man and we should take into account his subjectivism and that when faced with new situations or ones that he does not (yet) know the explanation he tends to express himself in terms with relative value. That is why it is necessary to verify the statement as well as its basis: Why does complexity impress him? Similarly, a user of technology can report a problem to a specialist in the field, and the latter is justified to first verify the complain. This is because the client's perspective can be different from that of the technician, and thus their respective perceptions will be different too.

Are the forces of the evolutionary process really simple and not fit with the results that they produce?

A.) The force that causes the phenomenon is nature itself. And in this case, the level of complexity of the source matches that of the resulting product.

B.) At the biological level, DNA is the cause responsible for generating the entire variety of live organisms. This in turn is defined by a high level of complexity, so that modern science needed decades just to be able to write down on paper a huge number of volumes to describe it.

As far as complexity itself, both that of the creating forces, as well as that of the resulted product, is determined by quantitative and not qualitative measurements.

The same principle is demonstrated by the recorded progress of human civilization. If we compare the primitive beginnings in all

fields of life and the current developed state, the level of complexity that our modern civilization reached is truly overwhelming. However the difference between the current status and the initial one is a quantitative and not qualitative one. It has been produced as a result of a process of development unguided by any external source, but rather through the consistent effort applied over a period of thousands of years of the unchanged biological capacities of man and which build successively on the successes of own discoveries, leading finally to results absolutely unbelievable (from the perspective of the predecessors)

The case of the amazing complexity of the neuron is defined by three principles: 1. The particles are incredibly small. 2. Their number is unconceivable like the stars. 3. Science has known an exponential development giving reason to expect that it will explain everything based on material causes in nature.

10. Plan vs. effect. Man “feels” the need to eat fat foods when it is cold. And cats “feel” the need to eat some herbs when they’re sick. Someone could ask from the perspective of planning: “Since cats don’t know medicine, who implanted this conditional instinct in them to eat those herbs only when they’re sick?” Or regarding humans: “Who programmed their bodies so that they feel pleasure for fats when it is cold outside?” However the questions can also be asked from the perspective of effect: The organism associates the effects of various experiences, in this example eating certain foods. The brain memorizes those experiences and when the situation is repeated, it can automatically send signals that the body needs the necessary food. Therefore a chain of cause-effect happens inside the organism: the food causes specific effects and thus the explanation is materialistic. There isn’t necessarily a need for someone to have known in advance the potential scenarios that man and animals would face and prepare them miraculously. But simply their natural experiences with the world can teach them the relation between the right sequence of cause-effect chain.

DNA SHARED BETWEEN MAN-PRIMATES, OR CATS SPECIES → IS A DETERMINING FACTOR

Man and primates share more of their DNA structure even than do different species of cats. Today, DNA matching is accepted as official proof of family relationship. The fact that both flora, and fauna, including man share the same DNA structure fits very well with the version proposed by evolution, that all species developed from one another.

Plants and animals and even man share the same DNA. This means they are related to each other. In the beginning, when the theory of evolution was first presented, the DNA had not yet been discovered. But there were conclusions based on observations visible with the naked eye. It was observed that between certain types of animals there are extremely small differences. Then there was noticed a selection: In one eco-system there were examples of one type, while in another eco-system there were members of the other type. After a connection has been demonstrated between the specific features of each type and the specifics of the environment where they lived, there became apparent a “probable” version, namely: That those different types belong to the same specie. But the conditions of the environment have determined a selection based on the individual’s ability to adapt. And thus the separation was produced by itself.

Later this probable hypothesis started to be confirmed by observed evidence in the cases of domestic animals and the manipulation of different races according to their particular features preferred by man.

It was suspected already, based on more and more evidence, that all forms of life could be related to each other. The discovery of DNA constituted a confirmation at the microscopic level of the suspected relationships between all forms of life. The confirma-

tion was strong, since man, animals and plants, all share over 90% of their DNA structure. So it is a close relationship, sure and convincing.

The method of identification based on the analysis and comparison of DNA characteristics is accepted and used successfully in all fields of research, from science, to biology, medicine, history, politics, Justice, social ... etc. In the court of law they pronounce legal verdicts on the basis of DNA analysis. We today know more than just that two individuals are related, but we can establish the type of relationship between different individuals. We can tell who belongs to the immediate family, who is closer, or further, the genealogy tree, where and when the branching took place and how people are distributed according to families and groups of families.

The DNA analysis reveals a close relationship between man and primates, in fact the similarity is even closer than that between various species of cats. For science this means that cats belong to a group of families, while *man and primates belong to another group* of related families – exactly what evolutionists suspected before the discovery of DNA.

Some deny the relationship between man and primates, even if the DNA test confirms such relationship. They claim that man is separate from the rest of the species and was created by a distinct creating act. Those who deny the relationship between man and primates on the basis of DNA analysis use a reasoning and way of reaction in face of evidence that is contrary to those of the scientists. Contrary to the Justice system, for example, which solves the cases that establish the paternity test on the basis of DNA analysis.

Sensing a clear difference between the reasoning of supporters of creation and the reasoning of an entire system supported by scientists, we would like to treat the ones advancing a different opinion in an equitable and correct manner. However being correct requires the same thing from their part, which means that the ones who dare present an opinion contrary to the majority should also be prepared to justify their position with the use of

evidence. And this should be done in a transparent manner preferably.

Many of those who ignore and even contradict the results of the DNA test, when they are asked “why” they embrace a contrary opinion, they answer something like the following: “So what if their DNA structures are very close, could God not create both man and primates separate and also make their DNA structures similar?”

Science calls this type of argumentation: “Circular reasoning” Because, in fact, it is an equation with two unknown variables. First we suppose that God exists and that he has unlimited powers, then we suppose that he created something apparently impossible and use his “powers” as an argument. Thus we have a supposition based on another supposition.

Science wants to know what evidence supports a particular opinion, even if it is a contrary opinion, it does not reject contrary opinions. This is part of the definition of science itself: It welcomes critics. But it does expect a contrary opinion to demonstrate its basis. Science asks therefore: What are the observed facts and what derives from their analysis or how probable is the respective alternative version?

When the evidence is missing some are willing to analyze more, but others adopt an attitude of avoidance and personal attacks (see chapter 11) while others make use of subjective arguments (see chapter 1) and also they ask others to do the same (see chapter 12).

AFRICANS APPEARED FIRST, BUT THEY ALSO RESEMBLE PRIMATES (MOST OF ALL RACES)

The observation that out of all human races Africans appeared first and that they look most similar to primates again fits very well with the evolution proposal that man came from primates. And also that initially the transformation has happened in Africa.

Generally science has more than one argument for each of its theories, and an important characteristic of science is working as a team. In most fields of research the results obtained by one researcher confirm the results obtained by another researcher. And the confirmation was not only between two, but usually it is a confirmation of more researchers in the same field and even confirmation between multiple separate fields. If one idea is true, it will be confirmed at all levels.

1. Now we have the results from one line of research proving that man evolved from primates.

2. Another line of research established that the transformation took place in Africa.

3. Third line of research discovered the order of races: African race being the first.

4. The last stage is to notice that Africans resemble primates more than any other race.

The conclusion resulting from these observations is that the separate research lines confirm each other. Regarding the research of the origins of human races, first I heard of a program sponsored by IBM about ten years ago, called The Genome Project, which used DNA analysis from all different races found in all geographical areas on Earth. Taking samples of DNA from people of all categories, from all races, they have been able to identify the relationships between each of them. Thus they created a map

of the entire globe and they drew a schematic of the development of mankind's genealogical tree. Where the first race started, when it started to expand and the directions it went, including each race that appeared from this movement. In this way it was demonstrated precisely that all races that are spread on the globe today came from a single one, the black African race.

Usually the critics of this research reply by saying: "Well, this does not prove that ... so and so" and refer to some aspect, which, obviously, is not covered by the respective research. And thus the discussions never end. Each one maintains his own position unshaken, though it is obvious that the truth cannot be on both sides. Why? Because the overall perspective is missing and the ability to understand the value of each argument in its context, and this first because the *desire* to understand the other one's position is not there and also because of the attitude shown by the ones involved in the conversation.

Of course, taken separate, each of these research lines does not prove by itself the entire theory of evolution. But we need to understand in fact what they are and what they are not. And, before accusing "what they are not", to find out from those doing the experiments that they do not even pretend such things. And thus we will avoid accusing them of something that they did not even claim. It would be unfair for them, but also for the ones criticizing, if they are interested in learning the truth, because in this way they miss out the benefits of a realistic, honest conversation.

In our case, someone could reply: The simple resemblance between blacks and primates is not enough to prove that man evolved from primates. Or the observation of DNA similarities between races and the conclusion that blacks were the first human race in themselves do not prove evolution. Regarding this kind of replies, I would like to draw attention upon a problem of perspective. When we have one single proof, the balance goes in favor of that respective proof, and at that stage, this can be called rather a clue. If we have other evidence which contradicts the first one, then we can express a reasonable doubt. The situation where 1. there are no contrary proofs, but 2. rather there is additional evidence supporting the first one => then 3. whoever

doubts the conclusion, is doing so without a justification. But serious, objective people will tend to go in the direction of the existing evidence, considering the direction very probable, the most probable and the only one probable at the time. In mathematics, a solution that verifies itself in the case of any tested variables is considered the correct solution and the problem declared solved, the theory demonstrated.

The researchers of the human genome project did not do it with the purpose of proving evolution. This was simply an independent project, without any connection with the evolution theory. The intention was strictly to analyze the DNA connections between different races and to establish the successive relationships between them. They have analyzed facts from the reality of the material world around us. The human races are a fact, the DNA structure of each race is also a fact. The researchers have not introduced anything of their own, but only analyzed the facts and have presented impartially the results of their objective research work. The evidence itself demonstrated a certain relationship and successive order between the races.

Comparing the results of different lines of research is a separate voluntary act that can be done by anyone, anytime and each individual can notice the conclusion regarding the direction indicated by the evidence that is derived from the consensus of all separate lines of research.

SECTION IV

PURPOSE

According to the creation version and the principles and qualities attributed to God, we should see evidence of him leading and protecting his creation. But the observations of the real world, the random origin of life, the principles of its existence, disappearance and the causes of life disappearance contradict such a supposition. Nothing in life's history proves any care for the creation, consequently neither any purpose for it.

- 20 Birth is random: due to
 random successful insemination 171
- 21 Entire species (majority) disappeared
 over time (without any sense or purpose) 174
- 22 Life's disappearing is random:
 due to uncontrolled natural catastrophes 177
- 23 Creatures that eat other creatures
 => have been made this way by design 182
- 24 Flora and fauna: unexplained level of
 complexity, still they disappear forever 185

BIRTH IS RANDOM: DUE TO RANDOM SUCCESSFUL INSEMINATION

Both in the case of vegetation, animals and also humans, birth takes place as a result of fecundation between a male and a female. This dependence on material factors contradicts the version of creation by a God who should have a purpose for life.

Supporters of creation oftentimes accuse the implication that life's origin through evolution would have upon the value of life: This would mean that it appeared at random and thus life would lose its importance and value. It would be an offence, in their opinion, to say that life itself, the absolute value for us, appeared by chance. The loss of value would be not only because of losing the connection with God, who promises man reward beyond the present world, but also the producer of life itself would be lifeless nature. The intelligent human is reduced to the value of its creator, which now becomes the blind forces of nature, without intelligence. Today we understand that a respectable producer makes good quality products. Brand name products have superior quality, while imitations have a lower quality. The value of the product is given by the value of its producer.

The implication being that: If man is made by blind, unintelligent nature, he has a lower value than something made by God or even by the intelligent human himself.

When something happens at random, an immediate implication is that it was not planned. When we receive a gift, for example, we feel honored if the owner tells us that he made it "special" for us. But if we find out that it was actually prepared for someone else, who unexpectedly no longer needs it or refused it and by chance the decision was made to be given it to us, we no longer feel so precious.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

We have not been present at the creation of first humans, to see if they appeared at random, by evolution. But what we see under our own eyes, the birth of human children, thus the creation of new lives, is absolutely a *random* process. Birth is not at all a controlled, precise, guaranteed process with predictable results, but it depends on the lucky insemination of two cells coming from two partners (male and female – the parents). This phenomenon is seen repeatedly by each generation, at each birth, every time a child comes into the world.

Medically, we understand that insemination is a very random process, it is pure luck, the number of male cells that try their luck is impressively high and systematically they all fail. The ones that succeed are incredibly few. Practically, we know that not all couples can have children and no one knows in advance if they will succeed or not in having children or if they will have a boy or a girl. Because of this uncertainty, not knowing and impossibility of influencing the process, much less to control it, many wait helplessly and express themselves: “If God wants .. “ or “When God will decide to give us a child ...”. For many couples the impossibility of having children is one of the greatest problems and both now and throughout history many couples have had fewer children or later than they wanted. Others had none.

All births are as random as the creation of first humans by evolution. And if we did not personally witness the evolution of the first humans, we are present now at the absolutely random process every time when a new birth takes place. We see the phenomenon every day a new life appears randomly. Just as in the case of humans, in the same way it happens with animals and plants.

Is it difficult for anyone to identify which of the versions of life’s origin is supported by this birth aspect? The more factors are discovered, both medical, hereditary and those related to stress that determine the chances of successful insemination, the more obvious the dependence of life on matter and the world around becomes. And the independence from a supposed divine intervention. When there is the hand of God involved, then modifying the material factors and the environment no longer influence the

phenomenon. Otherwise it could no longer be attributed to the action of God, the respective attributing would lose any sense.

Science sees the process at the microscopic level and can reproduce it using cells taken from the human body and inseminated in controlled environment in the lab with guaranteed success. It is called artificial insemination, *in vitro*.

When fecundation is determined by material causes, for most people this means automatically the elimination of the first version of an immaterial, divine cause. However some prefer to say that God decides partially or totally. In this case, the burden of proof is on them to explain *how* exactly is this done? Where exactly in the course of this process is the intervention of God? Does he replace a material cause in the identified chain of causes, and if so, which one? Then also to prove that it is so.

ENTIRE SPECIES (MAJORITY) DISAPPEARED OVER TIME (WITHOUT ANY SENSE OR PURPOSE)

At Noah's Flood a few pairs of animals were saved for the purpose of preserving the species. The historical reality shows that in the course of time most species that ever lived have disappeared. And this truth contradicts the idea presented by the story of the Flood, that God had created all species, that they have a purpose and that he would care for them.

The issue of life's lack of purpose is raised by various aspects observed in the material world. The manner of new life appearing, by random birth (see chapter 20), the way in which incidental factors cause death (see chapter 22), the design of predators, that are conceived to kill other live animals (see chapter 23), the eternity of death, both flora and fauna disappear forever (see chapter 24). Now I will draw attention to another aspect that raises the question of life's purpose: Disappearing of species, not only of individual animals.

Mass extinctions in the prehistoric eras led to the disappearing of most species out of the total number of species that ever lived on the Earth. For each existing specie alive today, other one thousand have disappeared in the past. So disappearing of species has been a major proven phenomenon.

Eternal death of individual animals questions the purpose of those animals' lives. And from the beginning of history until now all past generations have died, both the flora and fauna.

Sometimes an argument is attempted when looking for the purpose of one life to the extent that it benefits another life. The argument, obviously, does not answer the question regarding the purpose of first life, because no matter how many benefits could enjoy the second life, the first one will not be conscious of anything after it dies. If we are talking about the benefits of the se-

cond life, then we are discussing another issue, that of the purpose from the perspective of the creator, but not of the creature.

Anyway, this argument is lost in the case of the disappearing of species, because not only the first life dies, but also the second one dies as well. So there is no purpose remaining, either for creature, or for creator.

An example illustrating this thinking is found in the Bible, in relation to the flood in Noah's time. We are told that most people and animals died. But the reason why God ordered Noah to build an ark was to save a pair (or two) from each species. Thus God considered that there would be no problem that he destroyed all animals because of man's sins. From here we understand that an animal's life had no value in itself, as it could be destroyed for any reasons that had nothing to do with itself. However it was thought that it would be worth saving a pair in order to perpetuate the species. The death of individual animals does not matter, as long as the *specie* is saved. From here comes the idea that the purpose could be justified if the specie survived.

How does the disappearing of all species that happened throughout the entire history of life compare with the two options under discussion: Origin by blind evolution or by intentional creation? The disappearing demonstrates: 1. lack of value, 2. lack of planning, 3. and lack of protection by anyone. Could someone harmonize these cruel realities with an all powerful, all knowing, good and loving God? (Since creatures represent his own children, created by separate personal effort)

Evolution understands that species did not appear individually, separate, but they all come from already existing species, which modified parts of their characteristics. They have evolved from one another like the branches of a tree that come from the same root. Creation, however, supposes that each specie represents a separate creative act by God. Disappearing of species therefore poses a much bigger problem for creation, because the regret is greater for multiple separate efforts and personal investment. The loss is more significant.

In the case of evolution, the loss is not as great. Life comes incidentally, so it does not matter if it disappears. Because it is like a

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

tree that loses one branch, but does not lose the whole tree. Or in the case of sleep, when life is temporarily interrupted every night. Death of one generation to be replaced by another – In spite of the interruptions or replacements of some branches, individuals or species, a certain continuity is maintained through the survival of others. Furthermore, if they are not created, the loss is not painful for anyone (creator).

Today, organizations for nature protection get alarmed by every threat of a species's disappearing. And this shows how much they treasure life, although most of them believe in evolution and they are certainly not the creators of those species. Nevertheless they try to prevent the disappearing of species. How much more would we expect God to be interested in preventing their disappearing!

The development of human civilization has not been a process guided from outside the material world. It took place simply as a reaction to the existing factors in each generation. That is why, for us today, the previous generations do not represent much. The ancient pyramids or old cultures do not affect us, other than perhaps fascination or pure curiosity. Any effort from those times is completely past and therefore irrelevant because it does not have any direct connection to us. It will not return to the present. If we talk about what people used to eat at that time, what wars they carried out, what alliances they made, how big a wedding feast one prepared. We do not keep them in memory and, like a first level story, which supports the above stories of a building, it no longer plays a role for us or for themselves today – from our perspective they are absolutely useless efforts.

Even the Bible describes the routine of life, which it calls "waste and running after the wind" in the book of Ecclesiastic.

The same judgment is applied in the case of species that disappeared completely. Their supposed creation, if they were created, represents an absolutely useless effort.

LIFE'S DISAPPEARING IS RANDOM: DUE TO UNCONTROLLED NATURAL CATASTROPHES

Since the time and manner of life's disappearance were decided by the uncontrolled forces of nature, this indicates also that no one intervened. Those lives had no purpose, their disappearance served no one, it was not coordinated, much less prevented by a God who would have a purpose for and an interest in his creation.

We have talked about disappearing of many species (chapter 21) and that the disappearing is eternal (chapter 24). The very fact that animals die raises the question regarding their purpose, their disappearing demonstrates rather a lack of purpose for their lives. Bible itself recognizes that if there is nothing outside or after this life, then for the believers it would be the greatest disappointment. (1 Cor 15:19)

Now I would like to draw attention on another aspect of disappearing, namely the causes of life's disappearing. The selective disappearing, the conditioned or programmed one could potentially have a justification. If God destroyed life, this would prove that he made it for no reason. But still, in that case, life could remain God's creation, if we have separate proof in this regard. This case of destruction eliminates the purpose, but not necessarily the *possibility* of creation.

But just as the origin and birth are, in the same way comes the disappearing. It is a phenomenon with material causes, explainable, predictable, expected, consistent with the other phenomenon of the material world – random, without guarantees, unguided, without the intervention of a foreign hand. Does it match the premises of creation or evolution? Most disappearing took place at the time of mass extinctions. And these happened because of natural disasters. However this means two things: 1.

Disappearing happened at random and 2. nature acted uncontrolled. Life was destroyed without any sense.

Both conclusions demonstrate that life was not created by God. If he couldn't do it, the conclusion would be different. But the reason is because God did not try to protect life. And also they demonstrate that nature is not guided or supervised by God either. Nature acts on its own in every case. If it was not kept in check by God to avoid the greatest extinctions, then much less could it be kept for smaller reasons. God is supposed to have been able to, but chose not to do it => This means he is either not interested, or that he does not exist.

Some think of certain Biblical promises about "heaven". Namely that God will restore things and will control everything to assure our everlasting happiness. And that he will guarantee protection for all in every aspect. That nothing bad will ever happen: either to us or to animals and nature in general. Then these promises are correlated with the description of the curse in Eden uttered against man *and nature*, and some suppose that nature is out of control only at *present*. God no longer cares about nature to prevent damages only after the original sin in Eden, but before things were totally different. From the initial creation until Adam and Eve's sin there had been perfect harmony and everything listened to God, without deviation.

Again, we consider the facts: Mass extinctions took place during prehistoric eras. They wiped out of existence over 90% of all species that ever existed. So the species that we know today and that we suppose exist since the time of Adam and Eve represent only a small fraction compared to the total number of species that disappeared forever in the prehistoric times. The relation between present and past is maintained also regarding the length of the compared periods. Before man's origin, life existed for hundreds of millions of years, while since man's origin, there have been at most some tens of thousands of years. The number of species that disappeared in prehistory and the length of their existence is incomparably greater than the number of existing species today and the duration of their existence. In other words,

they would be hard to ignore, as exceptions to the rule or as insignificant events.

The mass extinctions happened primarily because of a phenomenon that we see today in the functioning of eco-systems: The lack of food. For example, changes of climate have an effect on vegetation, its decrease and partial or total disappearing cause chain reactions, affecting many types of life. All connected to each other through dependence on food and their respective position in the food chain. Direct causes have been: volcano eruptions, which cause a number of changes in temperature, water supply, dryness and the effect on life in general. Cosmic phenomenon also affect climate conditions. Asteroids coming from outer space caused modifications and a chain reaction on planet Earth.

Can anyone say that the process that influenced the course of life during the prehistoric eras demonstrates God's control over nature and his maintaining it in balance in order to avoid any damage and to guarantee that life is unthreatened by any danger?

Besides natural catastrophes that arbitrarily affected life and the Earth, the known history of the material Universe is much longer and its dimensions are much greater. Therefore what principles governed its existence in general, beyond the limits of space and time of life existence here on Earth? The material forces, gravity, micro and macro properties of the elements have determined the development of the Universe in a way that we call today "natural". It has been a constant process of action and reaction where some parts were in advantage, while others disadvantaged. Some appeared, while others disappeared. Some were built, while others demolished. Attraction toward a common point would lead then to explosion and departing from that common point. This is how stars are formed and how they disappear, this is how every galaxy, including ours, was formed. And their rotation and gravity have determined the present form of the Universe, including our solar system.

Catastrophes have taken (and still take) place in the Universe continuously. They are part of its definition, they were part of its development, were present at each stage. It exists and has been formed on the basis of this principle. Just as in the wild there is

hunter and hunted, what for one means death, for another means life, the same is true in the entire Universe, what for one part means catastrophic, destruction, for another means construction and progress. It is one way of saying that: "There is no front without back, up without down, left without right". There have not been more good things than bad things, more order than disorder or more harmony and matches than conflict and chaos in all phenomenon that took place in all Universe and that continue even today.

There is no difference between the natural catastrophes that caused mass extinctions, similar catastrophes with similar causes and effects have taken place all the time everywhere in the material Universe. Instead of asking if God lost control or is still in control over nature in order to protect selectively a part of his creation, the above description presents serious reasons to consider the alternative option, namely, to ask: Did he ever control any laws, and if such idea could ever happen or if it even makes sense.

Among the supporters of creation there are some people who say that natural laws have never been out of control and therefore they claim that these are not out of control today either. If they are presented with cases of devastating storms, a tsunami that hits and destroys indiscriminately all that exists in a certain geographical area together, some believers try to claim that all events happen with God's will. And in those cases it was also God's will, and those people, the victims, deserved what had happened to them, as punishment for their deeds. Does this conclusion have any basis? 1. If the damage affected only a part of the population, selectively some died while others escaped, 2. then perhaps an investigation could be done to reveal if there are common characteristics of one group. 3. Then if those characteristics are completely missing in the other group, 4. then a final verification could be done if that specific characteristic justifies such punishment from God.

What can be concluded, however, when one does not follow these preliminary steps in order to determine the possibility that a tragic event had a divine cause, but hurries to claim that it did have a divine cause without any argument supporting that claim?

Does it convince anyone, and if so, whom and why? The statement represents nothing more than the expression of a personal preference, but it does not constitute in any way a basis justifying the option or to influence our own evaluation of the situation.

CREATURES THAT EAT OTHER CREATURES → HAVE BEEN MADE THIS WAY BY DESIGN

Creatures feed on other creatures due to a series of characteristics of their body structure. If God created all of them, then this means that he designed them to eat one another. But this present and past reality about flora and fauna contradicts the Biblical description that God had intended peace among them and for all to feed exclusively on grass.

The reality of the world which we live in and where one creature eats another creature presents a challenge for those who try to harmonize the situation with creation and the supposed qualities attributed to God.

When one life dies, this shows its lack of purpose and it contradicts the idea that it was created by God (with a purpose). When death appears as a result of natural disasters, this shows that, if God exists, he remained passive and did not intervene in order to protect his creation. When death comes because of advanced age, this is considered a natural factor. However when life is taken away by other living things, this now means “premeditated” murder. The predator is constructed so that it would take the lives of other animals. It is a premeditated act from the part of the one who designed animals that kill other animals in order to feed with their flesh and blood.

Violence is manifested at other levels as well. For example, a male kills the cubs that a female had with other males, in order to mate with that particular female and to give birth to his own cubs. Or males who fight each other fiercely for access to females, with “unfair” consequences for the loser. Food distribution also happens on the basis of the principles of violent dominance. From birth, the weaker cub lacks sufficient food and it often dies as a result of this. Then the entire life is a continuous running and cruel

fighting. Each one is on its own, the principle on which they all function (including herbivores) is opportunism. Tragedy is a natural component of the wild. This means lack of guidance, lack of “ethical” principles like those attributed to God.

The popular saying describing this reality would be: “God has forsaken this world.” Indeed, all evidence shows that this is a world without God. This conclusion derives from the verifiable observations of reality. In order to keep the faith in God, supporters of creation need to make use of *suppositions* in the unverified field and to say that this inconsistency (between the real world and the concept of God) is a temporary one. That before the current world, there was consistency, the world was different (although a modified world should be called “another world”) and that in the beginning the evidence showed something different from what it shows today. In other words, their argument is based on evidence contrary to the existing one and at the same time a supposed one, since neither archeology, nor research of any kind have demonstrated that these existed during any past period, but they still insist that such was the case.

All evidence given in support of a different initial world are only attempts to read in it what the supporters of creation decided *in advance*, but the idea does not derive from the evidence itself.

- The curse mentions man and the land, but the details refer to difficulties for *man*, while nothing is said about *animals*, much less changes of their functions.
- Animal changes should be so major, that they would no longer be the same species
- If changes didn’t take place, then their specific characteristics indicate that they were designed to be carnivores from the beginning.
- Predators have their members, physical construction, internal organs, structure of bones and many details making them fit exclusively to catch and eat other animals. But also the prey, the hunted animals are equipped with features that allow them to protect themselves. These features, coloring,

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

form, running ability and other defense mechanisms reflect that they were *designed* for that specific purpose.

- The eco-system functions at the very fundamental level on the principle of supply and demand, hunter and hunted. Therefore this proves that (if created) it was designed this way.
- Our organism is also an eco-system that at the microscopic level feeds on other life, so it could not have possibly been designed any other way in a supposed “initial world”.
- If we analyze also the properties of matter outside the planet Earth, then the image found everywhere in the Universe is continuous transformation, one system dies in order to give birth to another (explosions-implosions). This causes us to ask: How much should the supposed curse in Eden be extended? Is the sun also covered by this, our galaxy, the whole Universe?

FLORA AND FAUNA: UNEXPLAINED LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY, STILL THEY DISAPPEAR FOREVER

Creationists claim that the level of complexity in itself represents proof of purpose: No one would build something very complex just to abandon it forever. Thus they are convinced that there has to be eternal life for man. However this argument is contradicted by the reality that all flora and fauna are characterized by the same complexity and still do not have eternal life.

Supporters of creation use the complexity argument in this way: If something is simple, then it could appear by itself. However, the more complex it is, the less probable that it could appear by itself. And therefore it must have been created by someone.

This idea contains an accusation against evolution which needs to be corrected right away. Evolution never propose such a ridiculous formula. It does not say that things appeared “by themselves”. But it claims that they were produced by a series of forces that acted upon well-defined materials during certain periods of time and in particular conditions. So there were multiple factors involved – things did not just appear by themselves, that would sound like fairy tails, it would be called magic. Rather the claim advanced by religion gets close to the idea that things appeared by themselves, because religion does not explain their origin, it does not demonstrate the process. (It supposes a spontaneous creation as a result of divine order: “Let there be... and it was so ...”)

Science has been able to explain not only simple things, but also very complex things. But when a complex thing is not explained, it is considered that its level of complexity goes beyond a certain limit, and for some it means necessarily that it must have been created. The higher the level of complexity, that particular

thing is viewed with more respect and it is given more importance and value. Thus people tend to attribute it a purpose and a justification for the effort invested in its creation by God.

If the level of complexity is related to the invested effort in its creation and a purpose for the respective creature's life, then the same argument is contradicted directly by a well-known reality, namely: Both flora and fauna are defined by such level of complexity not yet explained in all detail by scientists as it is that of man, but they still die forever. Religion accepts their death, on the one hand because it uses them as food, but also because it prescribed their sacrifice, both from vegetables as well as animals for God's service. So death or even premature death of both flora and fauna were accepted without hesitation.

The fact that these creatures die so easily and with no trace of regret can be interpreted that they have no value at all. Man views them only from the perspective of the benefits that he can extract for himself. But their existence is transitory. And the fact that they will never come back to live again makes their short life to be nothing in relation with the eternity of their non-existence. Because any number compared with infinity is zero. Some have tried to say that animals die today, but that in the beginning they did not die, when God created them. However after man's sin, that of Adam and Eve, God cursed the Earth and since then animals started to die. Three relevant observations here:

1. This hypothesis is not supported by the Bible. That curse does not include this aspect, so it is only a *supposition* by modern readers. The idea appears nowhere in the Biblical text. Eternal life is mentioned only as a reward given to humans.

2. Animals have died hundreds of millions of years before the first human's sin. This is proven unquestionably by numerous fossil records found in specialized museums. And it is also proven by the fuel deposits found deep in the ground of the planet.

3. Hypothetically, if they were not designed to die, we would arrive at some impossible situations. On the one hand, because their multiplying would soon mean overpopulation, and if all animals that ever lived on Earth would all come back, they would never fit on the limited space... etc.

Their death demonstrates most clearly that God is not interested in them. They have no purpose. This is not a deduction or interpretation, but just a fact of reality of the material world that is directly observed, objective, verifiable by anyone interested. In no way are these isolated cases, but this happens universally, at every step, anywhere and anytime.

Interestingly, no one has ever tried to deny the death of vegetation. Even in the Biblical description of creation it is said that vegetation was meant to serve as food. So it is destined to perish by design. But the complexity of flora is not inferior to that of animals or humans. It is something measurable. What determines the level of complexity of an organism is the DNA structure. And in this regard, we share over 90% of our DNA with that of flora and fauna. The differences are rather smaller than what we are tempted to believe, essentially they are differences of form, not fundamental ones.

Applying the argument about complexity that reflects a purpose, which in turn reflects creation, is inconsistent and circular. 1. Inconsistent because the same level of complexity in the case of humans leads to one conclusion, but in the case of animals and plants leads to another conclusion. 2. Circular, because it starts from a supposition, then it uses that supposition as an argument. It is supposed that in the future man will receive the reward of everlasting life, then this is used as proof that man is immortal, and in turn this conclusion (based on supposition) is used to demonstrate how good is (the supposed) God and that he is interested in us and that he created us for that reason.

Obviously most supporters of creation would reject this accusation of circular reasoning, but how many of them would try an effort beyond the simple denial of the accusation and actually try to *demonstrate* that the argument is in fact not circular?

Everything that can be verified shows that life is just as complex: Both flora and fauna and man himself. All live for a certain length of time and die without exception. No one demonstrated interest toward life, in order to protect it beyond the means which it is equipped with that allow life to protect itself. No connection between life and eternity. No evidence that someone

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

who died ever returns back to life. Religion's suppositions are all unverifiable. They are actually contradicted by verifiable facts.

Out of the verifiable reality – that flora and fauna are characterized by inexplicable complexity but they die forever nevertheless – derive two conclusions: 1. They have no purpose, consequently have not been created. 2. Their level of complexity is the same with that of humans, therefore the argument could not work in the case of man either, that he would have a purpose and a creator because of his proven complexity. Why? Because if the argument does not work for flora and fauna, it cannot work for man either.

SECTION V

MAN

Christian supporters of creation “see” in man the mark of a God from another world and consider him in a different category, separated from animals, that he has something immaterial in his definition and way of action. However this idea is not proven, but rather it is an inherited subjective impression. Taken individually, the so-called “spiritual” qualities of man are in fact 100% material. And the difference between him and the (other) animals or the world around is not qualitative, one of substance, but rather quantitative, one of form.

- 25 For humans we “see” a purpose => because
we relate to ourselves (subjective) 190
- 26 Life’s pleasures are not for
our happiness => but they satisfy needs 195
- 27 The sky is blue not for our eyes
enjoyment, but due to its composition 200
- 28 Senses, emotions, feelings:
reduced to a few basic ones (= animal) 206
- 29 The brain is imitated, equated, outrun by:
computers and software in principle 217
- 30 Difference from (other) animals = one
dimension extra (of the same category) 229

FOR HUMANS WE “SEE” A PURPOSE → BECAUSE WE RELATE TO OURSELVES (SUBJECTIVE)

Creationists appeal to sentiment and claim that it would be unmerciful for God to create so many beings, just to let them suffer. However flora and fauna have always suffered similar losses. The loss is perceived differently for humans, only because the one analyzing it is also man, and therefore the perception is subjective.

Man can get used to the idea that plants and animals die, but with his own death he cannot get used to. (Or the death of his kind, namely man in general) We view it as something normal that plants die. That is why they carry seed: So that other new ones can grow after the old ones die. No one would imagine that plants live forever. Man cuts the grass, tramples it on foot, cuts trees for wood, in general he considers that vegetation is not related to him in any way. (Although the DNA test tells something else.)

Most people consider animals in the same way. They use fish, birds, animals on land as food and they are used to see animals eating other animals. The organizations created for animals' protection are sometimes against the abusive killing of animals by man. But never when other animals (predators) kill them (the victims) in their natural environment. No one thinks about regulating the wild animals' behavior like the rules established in human society. Modern man would not use another man as a slave, but he trains and domesticates animals for his use (just like slaves).

Man relates himself clearly different to his own kind than to animals and plants. For example, we react very sensibly when doctors or the medical personnel consult us or administer us treatment, however for these it is just a mechanical procedure. During school, medical students learn to control their emotions

when administering different treatments to patients – proving that education changes perceptions. And in case of another man, we are not indifferent, but tend to be subjective when we relate to our neighbor.

Among animals, empathy is relatively reduced when something serious happens to another member of their species. However empathy is much more developed in humans.

Conclusion: Many supporters of creation consider that all that relates to man, everything he does and the way that he manifests himself have special value. To them it seems that human’s manifestations have meaning in themselves. Man must have been created. Otherwise how could have he appeared out of nothing, all his qualities: a smile, a warm hug, a wedding with many guests, a show at the theater, a fashion presentation, elegant clothing, family, society in general, a festival, a cake, ornaments on furniture – man does all these in a unique way. How could all these be the product of blind forces of nature?

Does this not constitute the definition of subjectivism itself? Every parent considers his child as being better than all other children, just because it is his own child. When analyzing himself, any human tends to over-evaluate himself, to consider that he is more important than others. This happens with the place of birth, everyone tends to claim that his birth place, his country, race are better than other cities, countries, races – clear evidence of subjectivism. That is why we are so impressed by our own characteristics.

We need not go too far. Not only in relation with the animals are we subjective, but also in relation to other human races or other cultures inside the same race. From one place to another in the same country there are different customs and as much as these can mean for the locals, they can leave foreigners and tourists unmoved.

Suspiciously the behavior is repeated when man evaluates the world around and considers that other places are not unique and that they could have appeared through blind evolution. But that man is unique and he must have been created by God separately. Man evaluates flora and fauna, then again he evaluates man. Is it not more likely that everything is unique and special in

its own way, however if someone considers man to be more special, this is because he is evaluated by man himself? (And the evaluation proves to be *subjective*.)

A first clue that things are indeed so is the fact that scientists no longer make this distinction. Scientists do not consider man to be fundamentally different from animals and the material world. Only ordinary people who are not specialists are subjective and “see” something special in man.

For man, the location where he lives and which was built by man is felt as “home”. But he does not feel the same thing for a bird’s nest, a bear’s cave, a fox’s den, or that of any other animals. Each one has a special feeling for its own house and would be indifferent toward that of another. Is anyone (in our case that of man) special? No, but rather each one’s impression is – which means subjectivism by definition. The same can be said, for example, about multiple ways of courting the partner of the opposite sex. There are specific manifestations (very) different for each species and also for man. However, for each one, the manifestations of that one’s species are felt as relevant, and those of the others are not.

Also regarding food, reactions are very different. Between flora, fauna and man there are differences, but also similarities regarding food. For example, water is consumed by all categories, and similarities are also found in the case of herbivores and carnivores. Even some plants are carnivores too. Even though the nutrients from food are the same, and digestion happens the same way in principle, the differences are only in form, we can relate to the food that we are used to, but not to others. Some people’s food seems weird to us and impossible, maybe even repulsive. We are shocked when we learn about what others eat, but understand, agree with and even taste other people’s food if it resembles what we normally eat. This is obvious proof of subjectivism. For each creature its own food is important. We tend to think that our food matters, is relevant and special for the simple reason that we eat it. But this is in no way a valid argument that things are really so and that our evaluation is correct.

If we realize from the above mentioned examples of house, sex, food, that man’s features and those of the animals are the same, and these features in animals do not lead to the conclusion that God gave them as gifts to the animals since he had a purpose with them and out of appreciation for them, that they somehow deserved the respective features in the sense of favors, then in order to be consistent, we should apply the same conclusion also in the case of humans. Therefore these features do not mean that man’s life has a purpose either or that God would somehow relate different to man, that he would treat him at a different level.

Some might object that the list of features considered here is not complete and that taken individually, there can be found some specifically human characteristics, that would demonstrate that it’s not only a subjective conclusion, but that man really is special and he does have a purpose, and that is the objective conclusion.

Among the aspects that are most often used we can name “beauty”. It is said that man has the concept of beauty, only he understands and can appreciate beauty. This separates him from animals and makes him special.

I propose that this objection too can be solved and it can be proven that the statement is subjective.

Regarding beauty, we are dealing with a circular reasoning. We formulate an abstract expression, then again we draw the conclusion that it is something foreign from the material world. We separate it, then we notice that it is separated.

It is like saying that only English people eat “apple”, but the Romanians eat “măr”. The apple is unique to the English and is special for them. However in reality only the word resonates in a particular way with them, because the product itself is the same for all nations of the Earth. (That would mean creating an artificial difference, not a real one)

The same with beauty, it is a term only understood by man, because man named it with that word. Obviously animals do not understand the word beauty, as they do not understand any other word. They communicate in a different “language”. However the reality of beauty as such is understood in the same way by both

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

humans and animals. One of the main applications of the word beauty refers to persons of the opposite sex. Men understand that women are beautiful. Such application has become so representative, that feminine came to be synonymous with beautiful. The feminine sex is called the beautiful sex. Is man the only one who understands that a woman is beautiful, is he unique in this regard? Maybe animals do not consider a woman to be beautiful, just as man might not consider the females of different animal species so. But in fact, males of each specie understand the beauty of females belonging to their own species. In this regard man and animals are no different as far as understanding and appreciating beauty.

Beauty is not really something specific, but it refers to the way in which we relate to something. What is beautiful in the eyes of one individual may be ugly according to another one's opinion. So beauty is not something stabile. We call different weather conditions: Nice weather or bad weather. There is nothing unique with man, nothing specifically human. Animals can also be affected by changes in the climate and they react accordingly to sunny or rainy weather.

No matter how complex beauty might appear, it can be broken down into basic elements, and then it becomes easier to identify the same features in animals. So the impression at first sight that man would be unique, special, is simply only an expression of our subjectivism.

For example Earth too can seem to us as more beautiful than other planets, however our appreciation is relative. From other perspectives, the Earth can be viewed as hostile. Oxygen is too inflammable on this planet and this can cause fires too easily – may be a possible critique, for example. Obviously we call this planet home and view it as the most beautiful out of subjectivism.

LIFE'S PLEASURES ARE NOT FOR OUR HAPPINESS → BUT THEY SATISFY NEEDS

The cycle of pleasures matches the cycle of needs. If man's life is motivated by pleasures, then he lives in order to satisfy certain needs. This closed circle is the same for the rest of the material world: every effect has a material cause. Therefore there is no separate, superior, divine purpose left for the human existence.

(Creationists connect pleasures with our happiness and thus explain the purpose of man's life, but also the purpose of those things that provide us pleasure. And if our life has a purpose and the things around us too, according to their reasoning, they have all been created by God, who is himself defined by love and the desire to share happiness with others.)

Creationists make three suppositions related to human pleasures: 1. regarding things 2. regarding humans 3. regarding God. 1. The things provide us pleasure, 2. man enjoys the respective pleasure, 3. and God wants them to be this way. 1. Since they provide us pleasure, things receive a purpose. 2. Since we enjoy that pleasure, our own life makes sense. 3. God is the one who could make them both. And if he did want this, then he must be both good and loving. If things have a purpose and man's life has a sense => then both must have been created. If they were created => then God is the one who created them.

What do we notice that all these have in common, when we take some examples of things that provide us pleasure, let's say: water, food, sweets? We notice that they are associated with specific needs of our biological body. 1. We start to like them when the need appears, 2. we like them for as long as the need lasts and 3. we stop liking them when the need has been satisfied.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

From these three observations derives the conclusion that the *purpose* of pleasures is rather related to satisfying specific needs. This is a relation of dependency. Pleasure is synonymous to satisfaction.

If human happiness were the purpose, then the following four conditions should be verified: 1. Pleasures should have been permanent, and not temporary. 2. They should have been felt only by the deserving individuals, only by God's friends, not by his enemies as well. 3. They should be found only in humans and not also in animals (and plants). 4. And there should have been only things that provide us pleasure, nothing should have produced pain.

These pleasures vary depending on the intensity of the physical need. For example, the more thirsty we are and if it is hot outside, we may find ourselves "seeing" water in front of our own eyes. We imagine and talk about scenarios involving water. We come to express ourselves poetically and to praise the qualities of an ice cold, fresh spring water. The pleasure is greater when the need is greater.

A parallel discussion can be carried regarding pain. If we are cold or burn or hit ourselves, we feel pain. Would anyone be tempted to say that these things which produce us sufferings receive a *purpose* because of the effect they have upon us? And if we have the ability to feel pain, does that somehow mean that suffering is the purpose of human life and implicitly that God created all these because he wants bad things, he himself being the personification of evil? Not at all! The purpose of pain is not for human unhappiness, but our protection. We feel pain and we learn to avoid cold, fire, hits ... etc. Therefore we can ask: In the case of pain and pleasure, is there a purpose or rather a result or an effect?

A conclusion derived from the parallel examples of pleasure and pain is that their roll is to keep us alive. On the one hand to satisfy our needs, and on the other hand to avoid dangers. So the purpose is to keep living, but there is no *separate* proven purpose of life itself. One way of expressing it could be that evolution "equipped" us with these abilities to feel pleasure and pain, be-

cause it wanted us to live. Obviously this is a figurative speech, because evolution is not a person with conscious will. The process happened rather in the following way: Through a genetic modification, someone came to have a useful ability, while someone else did not have it. If the environmental conditions required necessarily that respective ability, if it was necessary for survival, then those having it remained alive and would bring offspring, while the rest didn't.

In this way, after many generations, if we look retrospectively and see that some abilities have helped us survive, we can understand the "roll" of the respective abilities – that of keeping us alive. Otherwise we would have died. However the abilities are not related to any specific purpose of life itself, after and separate from keeping us alive.

Man tends to view this subject in a subjective way. In general, it sounds encouraging that our life should have a purpose. We have a purpose for our daily activities. Taken individually, we do everything for a reason. And when we do something because it has a purpose, it is noble and it confirms our personal value. That is why we are easily tempted by the idea that life itself should also have a purpose. Usually for someone who once believed that life had a purpose, the idea that life should have no other purpose other than satisfying personal needs seems unnatural. For them it seems that we could not live without a purpose. That it is confusing. But in the case of people who started from the beginning without faith, to them it seems very natural that things should be this way. They are in full harmony with themselves knowing that life has no distinct purpose. They do not feel that anything is missing, the lack of purpose at this level does not bother them in any way.

Just like in the case of property or goods that we own, their loss hurts us, but for someone who never had them, their loss produces no pain.

The third supposition of this topic: How logical is God's interest toward the fate and happiness of man? Believers tend rather to avoid this question. They say that we should be glad that God was interested and that he gave us life. The analysis of this subject

in any depth bothers them. It is unpleasant to question a concept that is so dear to them and with which they have become familiar, namely that God would have an interest in us or that he would relate in a special way to man.

How could someone relate to something from a different world, totally separate, which has nothing in common with our own world? Between us and animals there are small differences, only of form, not fundamental. Still we relate to them only to the extent that we are able to identify common points, similarities between us and them. We can relate to animals or other humans because we can read their emotions by interpreting their manifestations. The manifestation of emotion is universal, generally the same look and change in the face expression in the cases of joy, sadness, fear, love are found both in humans of all races and to some extent also in animals.

Human beings empathize with those who go through the same experiences as they do. For example, a broken leg seen at someone else causes us to feel sorrow. But how could there be empathy between beings belonging to separate worlds, where there are no common experiences shared? That is why it is impossible to explain God's empathy towards us. His desire that we should be happy. A popular saying goes like this: "The one who is not hungry cannot believe a hungry individual." That is why a God without needs cannot empathize with beings like us, who function on the basis of individual needs. God's very motivation to create humans from zero is hard, if not impossible, to explain – what could motivate God before there was any Universe, to start his creation work. Since he has no personal needs.

(Alternatively, not only the things considered positive and moral provide us pleasure, but also the "bad" ones. When they see trouble around them, people gather together and are anxious to learn additional details. Life events that are recorded and remembered best are the ones causing most shocking sensations. Regardless of if they are positive or negative experiences. Man is excited by what is shocking, on the news he is captivated by dramatic events, tragedy, in the movies, he likes to watch fear, terror, violence. Obviously, he also appreciates scenarios of love, peace

and is inspired by progress. But he does not demonstrate that he had been built to react *exclusively* to positive events. In music, many songs have tragic, painful content, they sing about the emotions of divorce from the partner, the pain of loss, the emptiness left behind. And the ones suffering, who find themselves (or can relate to) in those negative situations described find pleasure in voluntary listening for long periods of time to those sad songs.

Can it be concluded from the human behavior that God is the one who gave him the ability to react and feel pleasure? If this ability were implanted by God, it would have a purpose, and its purpose could not be anything other than to appreciate exclusively good things. Not to find pleasure indiscriminately both in good and bad things.

The alternative answer, in harmony with the confirmed reality, that the world is made up of both good and bad things, is that man is simply a reflection of what the world contains, because he is a product of this material world. He is a part of it, and he has adapted to living in it. The cause and manner of his existence do not originate outside the known world. That is why he is a product and bears the mark of the world, just like a “mold” that molded him.)

Religion demonstrates a “circular reasoning” when it supposes first that God exists, that he is good and that is why he created everything and all was made “good”. Then, when it discovers that there are also “bad” things in the world, it makes another supposition, that man sinned and therefore God cursed the world, changing things to their present form which we know today, with both good and bad things. And a third supposition, that in the future, things will be modified again to return to the (supposed) initial perfection. An unknown future is guaranteed with an unknown past. This is not a reasoning with conclusions derived from objective independent observations. It is rather an equation with only unknown variables.

THE SKY IS BLUE NOT FOR OUR EYES ENJOYMENT, BUT DUE TO ITS COMPOSITION

The color blue is simply an inherent material reaction. Is it possible that God had made the sky blue for the enjoyment of human eyes? This is possible only in the sense that he could have anticipated this aspect at the creation of matter itself. But, since there is no evidence of alteration of the properties of matter, his later intervention for this purpose is not probable.

The sky has a nice blue color. The sky's blue color has been appreciated by humans for a long time. People talked about it as a reference in poems, songs because it has a calming effect. This color spreads above our heads over a very vast surface. All these aspects constitute reasons that have determined some individuals to express themselves that: "God had chosen" that the sky should have this color for our benefit and enjoyment.

In this regard, some claim that when they admire the beautiful colors of the sun rise or sun set, or when they view the spectacular mountains, superb water falls and, in general, the wonderful landscapes in nature, these remind them of God and make them feel closes to him. And cause them to be more convinced of his existence.

Therefore the question I want to examine in this chapter is the following: Has God chosen the sky's blue color specially for our benefit? Is this idea logical, does such idea prove to be in harmony with other implications and facts demonstrated by science?

Let us examine three rules of basic statistics and the necessary conditions that would justify the conclusion of a divine intervention in this case:

1. First, there should be the ability to choose a certain color. The sky should be able to have multiple colors, and if in spite of multiple options available, it still happens that he has exactly this particular one, then we could say that it was chosen by someone.

2. Second, there should be no other potential reasons that could justify the respective choice of color. If we are the only beneficiaries, and all other reasons are eliminated, then we could say that the choice was made specially for us.

3. Third, the rest of things in nature should satisfy us in the same manner. Then we could say that the person choosing the sky's color for our benefit is God himself. Because nature, his creation, *consistently* reflects these characteristics everywhere we look.

The reality however is that science has revealed a material explanation for the specific color of the sky. Namely: its composition. The elements making it up and their respective concentration determine the blue color in contact with the rays of light. This scientific fact contradicts the first two of the three conditions mentioned above:

1. The sky couldn't have other color => so there is no longer a matter of optional choice.

2. The reason for this color is a material cause => so it can no longer be exclusively for us.

The properties of matter have also determined the rest of landscapes in nature. Mountains have been formed because of volcanoes or by bending of the surface of the Earth. Waterfalls because of the water fluidity and the form of landscape found in its way. The sun rise and sun set because of the planet's rotation maintained on its course by gravity. It is like a domino effect, in which one cause starts an interdependent chain of cause and effect.

Regarding the third condition, valid statistics require taking into consideration, in principle, all and any examples, not just some of them. In reality, the sky does not *always* have a calming color. During storms, for example, it can actually have a scary, threatening color. In nature there are many beneficial things for man. But, at the same time, there are dangerous things, or others

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

can be neutral – doing him neither good, nor bad. There are all kinds of smells, some pleasant, others repulsive, or others we do not even sense. The same for food, there are fruits and other delicious foods, others by contrary are poisonous.

If all things around us were the same, all of them beneficial, then we could suspect that someone made them this way on purpose. However the form in which we find them today in nature demonstrates that they are rather produced as a result of unguided, random processes. It would be a very suspect and arbitrary way if we chose preferentially only some convenient examples and to say that these demonstrate that they were specially made for us by God, however the rest of things would not demonstrate anything. The result of an objective analysis shows that nothing in nature has been chosen (optionally) to be this way. The natural features are not optional. They are this way because they could only be this way. The reason why nature has the form that we know today is because of the properties of matter itself. It does not reflect any purpose for our benefit.

Why do we like certain things? Because of the definition of our organism, which, in turn has this specific structure because of the properties of matter that it is made of.

If we relate well to the environment, and since nature existed long before the origin of man, and man appreciates the natural characteristics due to the properties of matter that he is made of, then the logical conclusion is that: Man has “adapted” himself to nature. Just like one piece adapts to the mold, he is the way that we know him today because of the natural environment in which he developed and not the other way around, nature because of him. It is like saying that a hole in the ground was made because of the lake that fills it and not the reverse, the lake was created because of the existing hole.

The version of creation finds itself in conflict with scientific facts at all levels. At the same time the version of evolution does not contradict any one of the scientific discoveries. It is like a solution in mathematics, where the solution is verified for any given value of the variables. The version of evolution appears not only possible, but very probable. And the reason is because that is ex-

actly how this theory originated. It was proposed by scientists as a result of objective observations. It is derived from the information we have available. It is neither a preconceived idea nor one inherited from ancient times and that were imposed by force from the outside against the current situation, against the level of progress and the direction indicated by existing evidence.

1. The following example illustrates well the idea: Single youngsters who search for a partner. The desire is great, and they dream in advance about the happy event of meeting the partner. However many times the search is hard and the waiting is long – sometimes without success to the end of their life for some people. Often finding the partner is viewed in the reverse way: Not as the result of hard searching efforts, but rather that the partner was “put aside” and that he or she “was waiting” specially for this seeker. Since no one took him or her before and since it is viewed as such a good match and much desired, all these make it seem that “luck” was too great and therefore it becomes hard for some to accept that it was all just simply coincidence.

This can result in generalizations of the type: “What is yours is always set aside.” “It was meant to be this way.” Or: “Every sack has got its own patch.” Science does not support such formulations. Objectively analyzed statistical data shows that everything is determined predictably by material factors: the seeker’s perspective, the degree of tolerance showed by both partners, the perceptions and compromise that they are willing to accept. Not to mention that often times the first impression, the appreciations expressed at the first meeting can change fast after the wedding. So the evidence does not support the option of advanced preparation from the outside, that of plan and of purpose.

2. Another example: Shopping at a clothing store. We try on and analyze carefully many articles, but one of them seems to fit especially well or we like very much the way it looks on us. Then we can say: “This clothing (seems to) has been made especially for my size” or that is was “made especially for me”. Those words may express the excitement or our emotional state at that moment. However such statements are far from representing a scientifically demonstrated fact.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The same perspective and appreciation of some positive aspects discovered in nature is approached by some regarding our human body. On the one hand there are noticed impressive performances of some organs in our body. Then these performances are compared and contrasted with some correspondingly inferior ones belonging to products made by humans in order to imitate similar functions. Thus the demonstrated superiority of the biological organism is considered as being special, that it represents a proof of the intentional intervention by God in our interest.

Some could make such comparisons between the functions of human heart and mechanical pumps produced with the help of modern technology. Between the efficiency and superior durability of man's bones vs. the metallic skeleton or of other materials realized in the industry today and which have a relatively lower quality. Between the abilities of the human eye and the performances of photo cameras of the last generation today ... and other such comparisons.

This is obviously *one* way of looking at things, however it is by no means *the only* possible one. If there are multiple possible perspectives from which a situation can be viewed, then the exclusive choice of one of them does not demonstrate a desire to view the complete reality, but rather this type of selection indicates a suspect relation with the subjectively preferred option.

Analyzing all perspectives reveals two new aspects: 1. The advantages found in the biological organism are relative: The superior qualities of the eagle's eye constitute a disadvantage for the animals hunted by it. 2. The different qualities noticed between the biological material and the one non biological are inherent to the respective substances. Namely, those properties are the same anywhere the respective substance is found. Not just in the human organism. They are due to the material itself and not because of some special application in the human body.

The properties of matter, with its relative advantages and disadvantages, do not have a necessary independent cause. But just as any line has two directions, any front has a back, any up has a down, any light also has a shadow, these qualities exist because they are part of the definition of nature, of reality of the

material world. However they manifest themselves the same way anywhere and are verified anytime. We cannot attribute an intentional choice that would demonstrate a purpose only based on some of these qualities arbitrarily selected.

By contrary, the explanation based on the universal properties of matter is the only one that does not come in conflict with the scientifically proven facts. Furthermore, it is verified both in the case of planet Earth, of the human organism, but also beyond this, and in the case of the origin and functioning of the solar system, of galaxies and the entire known Universe.

Obviously, the discussion about the blue color of the sky can be repeated also for the green color of vegetation, for example. This is pleasant for the eye and beneficial for man – to his psychic. The same question can be asked here too: Did God give the green color to vegetation for our benefit? Science has explained that substances that make up plants determine exclusively their colors => so it is not optional. There is nothing artificial or any unknown cause in this process. We are simply witnessing some universal principles here: The respective elements do not behave this way only in plants, but they would determine the same color green anytime and anywhere else if the same composition is respected.

SENSES, EMOTIONS, FEELINGS: REDUCED TO A FEW BASIC ONES (= ANIMAL)

Human feelings are complex and, at first, they look impressive. However, taken individually, they prove to be derived from just a few basic ones. And these few are also found in animals. So man is not separated from animals in this regard either. Which means that evolution could provide for this complexity of human inner experiences too.

When people try to demonstrate creation, most of the times there are references made to the unique human characteristics which (supposedly) separate man by an impossible gap from all animals and the rest of the material world.

Evolution claims that man represents the last step of an evolutionary process, but that he still comes from animals and is related to them. By contrast, creation claims that there is no connection between man and animals, but rather there are absolute differences, fundamental ones, that these are not even to be compared. It claims that man is the result of a unique creative act, that he does not belong to their family, that he exists in a separate realm. That he was created with a different purpose. That the gap between him and animals is so great and absolute, that he exceptionally carries “God’s image”. In him is reflected the creator’s personality, who does not belong to this world. He carries the mark of an intervention from and a connection with “the world beyond”.

We are talking about: SPIRITUALITY. Most often, critics of evolution say that accepting it would be impossible simply because that would mean ignoring the signs of man’s *spirituality*. The direct argument being that only man has spirituality, and animals do not demonstrate anything similar or close to it. So we are dealing with a separate chapter. Spirituality places man in a class

by itself. It is something so different and high, that nothing material could touch it – this is separate from the material world: It appears as something “immaterial”. It cannot be perceived, measured in any way by the material world with its specific available means.

Therefore, what is spirituality and what are some of the specific examples? What is not found in animals and nowhere else in the material world but comes to present man as a “surprise” for the Universe in which he lives? Thought, reason, feelings, morality, justice, wisdom, culture, artistic creativity, music, literature, poetry, cinematography, theater, education, ingenuity, honor, family, religion, society ... are just some of the answers most often heard as a reply to this question.

Next I will try to verify how true the creationists proposition is, that spirituality and the above mentioned examples represent something separate, foreign, unknown to animals and the material world. Let us see how impossible the imagined gap between man and animals is from this perspective. In order to arrive at the essence of the matter, we will try to identify which particular aspect of spirituality belongs exclusively to man and separates him in an absolute way from all animals and the material world in general. The mentioned examples could have some material elements or features that are also found in animals. That is why a strict identification of the purely spiritual and specifically human elements is necessary.

1. One example: Specifically, if we refer to a house built by man, this is found in a certain form also among animals. They build a nest, a den, a cave. So the idea of house with its specific functions is not in itself an absolute example of spirituality. However when that house has specific forms, colors and unique arrangements, it could be considered as a work of art and therefore a spiritual creation. So, what is the difference between a standard house and an artistic one? In the case of the artistic one, the man building it contributes also with a measure of his own feelings. Thus, what identifies it with spirituality is the human feeling.

2. Another example: A famous painting contains material components which are found also in nature. Starting, first, with

the texture and the colors used, these are material substances. Then the image that it represents, be it a natural landscape, a flower or a bouquet, a portrait ... etc. All these are found in the material world around us. That is where the image was taken from. The painting represents the image of a scene taken from the existing reality. But the simple image or copy of it does not in itself represent an example of spirituality. Animals also have eyes and are able to form images of reality on the retina of their eyes and they can interpret what they see. So, what is the difference between a standard image and a painting done by a famous painter? The artist transmits a reflection of his feelings together with the image. There are specific elements that make the difference between a painting and the photographic copy of an image. And the differences refer to the inner experience of the author, which we call simply human feeling.

3. Third example: Literature, music, poetry in all its forms represent ways of communicating some information about the reality in which we live. However a composer, writer or poet does more than just relate an event. The event of any kind, the specific information or simply relating it does not represent an artistic work in itself. This does not mean spirituality. The events are found in nature, the specific information belongs to the material world – they are taken from the surrounding reality. However between the simple relating of some facts and poetry there can be identified specific differences. The presentation has a certain style, the author modifies in a certain manner the order of words used with the purpose of transmitting emotions. These emotions that the respective works are able to cause in the heart of the readers are considered in general to be spirituality.

4. Other examples, like justice, honor, refer similarly to the evaluation of certain events. But the events in themselves do not represent spirituality, however the way in which we relate to them and our evaluation of them is considered to be spirituality.

In short, the examples discussed above show that spirituality in all its forms is defined by and associated with human feelings.

Therefore attributing spirituality exclusively to man is equivalent to attributing the feelings only to him, and the supposition

that animals do not have spirituality proves to be based on the implicit supposition that animals would not have feelings. That is why, next I will try to ask the same question regarding the feeling that I asked also about spirituality: If and to what extent are all forms of feelings specifically human and represent something separate, foreign, unknown by animals and the material world in general. Is the gap between man and animals impossible in this regard?

A first observation regarding the association of feelings with spirituality is that initially they are hard to identify. They obviously exist, and our body reacts when seeing a work of art with verifiable confirmations that there were feelings involved in its make up. We experiment the feelings that an artistic creation transmits, but when asked specifically “what feeling exactly does that contain?” it is not easy to answer. It is not easy to specify or to define exactly what feelings are we talking about. The impossibility of defining those feelings gives more reasons to the temptation that we in turn should consider the feeling as something separate from the known material world.

The reasons for such difficulty of definition are in part because there is not one single feeling involved, but a combination of multiple feelings together. The situation is comparable to an unending variety of nuances resulted from the combination of a few of the basic colors. It might be hard to define a nuance apparently complex initially, but it is easier to identify the known basic colors. Another reason for this is obviously the fact that feelings, regardless of their type, are invisible – what we generally call abstract concepts. And generally man is concerned less with articulation in words of their definition.

Then the basic feelings themselves, even though they are easier to define, for the person experimenting them, they tend to appear as something specifically human, something that is not found in animals and which separate man, placing him on a higher level than them. This seems like a subjective evaluation, rather than a logical conclusion based on demonstrated facts.

Medicine defines feeling in principle as an extension of the chain: 1. senses 2. sensations 3. emotions. Emotion is felt as sen-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

sation, which in turn is given by the senses. The senses are simple basic elements, emotions are more complex elements, while feelings are even more complex.

Starting from senses, which are our sensors: By our skin receptors we perceive touch, by the receptors of the eyes we perceive light. If these senses transmit positive signals, together they could create a positive emotion. In turn, emotions repeated in time are transformed into feelings. If initially the feeling appears complicated and inexplicable and it is conveniently called spirit, after systematic study, when it is broken down into its building blocks, it becomes easier to understand – and this is called “de-mystification” or in our case: “de-spiritualization”. From this perspective, after we understand how they are produced, what they are made of and how they manifest themselves, we can relate to them objectively. And the question of whether human feelings are fundamentally separated, foreign and totally unknown to animals and in general to the material world around us receives a verifiable solution now.

After we identified the combination of basic colors that makes up a certain nuance, we can compare it with another nuance and can justifiably say that the difference between them is not fundamental, qualitative, but quantitative, one of numbers and percentages. Each nuance contains a different mixture from the same basic colors.

After we realize that a building is made of bricks, then we can compare it with another building also made up of bricks and note that the difference between them is not fundamental, qualitative, but it is one of form, quantitative. Because each of the buildings represents a separate and different arrangement of some (identical) bricks.

The same way we can compare an apple juice with pear juice. Both are made from fruits, and in turn fruits contain similar nutrients. It's just that their composition has different percentages of each. Or we can compare apples and apple juice. The difference between them being that the apple is whole, while the juice represents the same content but resulted from breaking the whole. So there is a difference of form, not one of essence.

Now we can return and notice that the same difference is found between man's feelings and those of animals. The basic feelings are the same: Both man and animals perceive signals from the environment. For example, both perceive images by means of their eyes, and these images cause corresponding sensations for both. For example an image can generate fear. There is no difference in principle between this emotion felt by man or by the animal.

And the same thing proves true in the case of other sensors which allow the perception of reality. By the help of sound stimuli perceived by means of the ears, both man and the animals interpret the information about reality which can cause the same sensations to each one. For example, if a strong sound is heard, that could cause fear. Or if the sound comes from the child's mother or of an animal with cubs, the generated sensation can be one of calming or mobilizing and the reverse, if the sound comes from a child or animal cub, this generates a corresponding sensation to the mother hearing it.

The sense of touch is the same, in principle, for man and animal. If the pressure is too strong, this is perceived as a hit, and the generated sensation is that of pain.

Receiving of rewards will always cause joy. When a dog meets its master or when it receives food, it will manifest its joy visibly. The same joy can be seen in a child in similar conditions. Another example of a primary sense is smell, which awakens the same sensations in man as well as animals. On the one hand, there are bad smells, repulsive, which give unpleasant sensations, but also nice, attractive smells, which give pleasant sensations. If we talk about the smell of food or the scent of the representative of the opposite sex.

The conclusion is that basic senses are found in the same way both in man as well as in animals. These senses transform the perception of information about the material world into sensations. So human feelings are not something separate from animals or from the material world. Absolutely the entire variety of feelings experimented by man derive from a few basic ones, which in turn are common to all animals. This means that there are no

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

separate categories: some material feelings, that animals can also have, but others fundamentally different, immaterial, without any connection or correspondent in animals or the material world. But rather, all belong to the same category.

The noted differences between human feelings and those of animals are only of form, not of content. Only quantitative and not qualitative. It is like the mentioned difference between buildings made up of the same basic bricks. Or that between fruit juices, one of apples, the other of pears.

In the animal world, some herbivores feed with leaves from trees, others with one type or another of grass in the field. Both trees, as well as grass belong to Earth flora. It is just that a tree represents one form of vegetation, while grass represents another form.

Other animals are carnivores. Some of them feed on insects, others with small animals or various other creatures in the food chain. There is a difference of form, not of content – all these animals belong to the same general category.

Such differences of form and quantity are observed also between different races from the same species. For example some races of dogs can have apparently very different characteristics compared with other races. However these are differences of form or size. All dogs remain members of the same canine family.

Another perspective on the differences: We can talk about multiple degrees of refinement or sophistication, however this does not mean a fundamental difference. For example, we notice this aspect in humans: Some smoke expensive cigars, others smoke cheap cigarettes. But in essence, it is still smoking. Some wear new clothes according to the latest fashion, others wear things from second-hand stores. But they are all clothes and serve the same purpose – it is significant that they satisfy the same needs.

One man courts his partner offering her a flower. A bird offers its partner a straw. A monkey may offer its partner a banana. There are minor differences, of form, not fundamental ones. The basic principle and mechanism are the same: It is a matter of sexual needs and behavior influenced by hormones in each case.

Some individuals have priority in society, others are on second place. Animals reflect the same hierarchical principle. The dominant member of a group is first, eats the best quality food, while the rest of the members of the pack or of the flock eat the remains, something of lower quality. Is this a fundamental difference? Not at all, it is still food in both cases and it satisfies the same needs. It is just a difference of refinement.

Example of arms: In the past, peoples used to make war with swords and spears. Then came the fire arms. And now we have the atomic bomb. The difference is not fundamental, absolute, considering on the one hand the fact that the same people were the ones who built the primitive arms and also the modern ones. The motivation was the same, the basic common need to fight. It is just a difference of form, of volume, quantity, performance – of refinement and sophistication.

What determined the progress and advanced degree of sophistication of the armament is absolutely an element (or more) that belongs not to man, but is external to him. Internally, man's composition, his definition, biology were and remain the same. The basic need and unchanged motivation to fight have met external elements, like: passing of time, new discovered metals and improved technologies.

The idea is easily illustrated by the stages that any work done by someone goes through – man or animal. If we compare anything that is unfinished with the same thing when it is finished, we'll notice a difference. The author maybe the same individual. But the difference is due to some elements external to the author: passing of time, additional resources, materials, energy ... etc.

Example of water: The path of a river can have spectacular forms, it maybe pleasant to look at and to hear its sound. However water has only a few basic properties. And these remain constant in the case of a beautiful lake, a fresh spring, a mountain river, a waterfall or all the rivers which flow on splendid paths in nature. Water flows in liquid form and it has weight. So it always chooses the lower surface. Thus, even if these properties remain unchanged, when meeting the various forms of landscape of the planet, it is able to take forms of the most diverse.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The different level of refinement and sophistication is found also in human feelings. And respectively in animals. However the basic senses are developed through exercising. Most of the time we are not aware that in fact all our senses are learned after birth. Surprisingly for most, the same is true not only of the more elevated senses, like maintaining balance on a bicycle, but even of the most basic of our senses.

When he is small, after a few days from the arrival into the world, the baby does not even know that it has a body. Gradually he learns that the hands belong to him. He looks at them repeatedly, moves them constantly and slowly, based on association with what he sees, what he feels, the memory of past experiences and signals from the brain together, he learns that he has hands. And that these hands are his, he can feel them.

It is the same with sight, we learn to see. Technically, sight means interpretation of light signals perceived by the eyes. If a person blind from birth, who has never seen anything, opens his eyes for the first time after many years, he would not understand what he sees in the beginning. He does not know what those forms and colors mean. Will not know what close and far mean, nor up and down. If he lays at the top of a high mountain, he doesn't know that he might fall down. All simple details need to be learned from zero.

Also hearing and touch do not come automatically, but need to be learned gradually by the same process. For example, the direction where the sound comes from is learned by associations with sight and other senses and memory of past experiences, which help us understand distances, location, direction, position. The sense of touch learns what the external and internal means, smooth surface, hard or soft, cold, warm ... etc. Initially the baby does not know these, just like a sleepy individual who just woke up or who is under the influence of alcohol.

All our basic senses function through a certain type of supposition. They can mislead us. We can see optical illusions, which mislead us to think that we see something, but in reality we may see something else. The same with touch, we can feel a hand on our shoulder and we may confuse it with something else. And

hearing, taste or smell, any one of these can betray us occasionally. Why? Because we learned how to use them all by associating a perceived signal from the world around with a certain past experience in our life. And this association is susceptible to mistakes. They are all relative, the brain always advances suppositions based on partial data.

Without learning to feel by means of our basic senses that we are equipped with, we would remain a “vegetable”. The direct relation between senses, exercise and their development demonstrates their *dependence* on the material world. Man does not have a spirit that is absolutely personal or independently his own. The senses unlearned, unexercised do not develop, and this means the same as saying that they do not exist.

In principle, we understand that a physical muscle, if exercised it develops. If it is not used, it gets weak. More recently however, science discovered that the same is true in the case of our brain. If we use it more, the intellectual abilities develop. And if we do not use it, they decrease. What was at one time considered to be a spirit, separate from matter proves completely dependent on and a part of matter.

By prolonged exercise we come to pass the average level of development. Man can reach exceptional athletic performances. But not even this superior level of refinement represents a unique property, specifically human. Both walking straight, but also riding a bicycle or any special acrobatics practiced during sports competitions are also found in animals. Animals learn through experience to control the same physical abilities. Not only to keep balance standing straight, but also to jump, to run, to fly (birds), to maintain balance on the tree branches (monkeys), on tight mountain paths. They learn how to evaluate precisely distances, the effect of oscillation, size, weight, resistance of wood and stone, and many other properties of the material world. In fact, they outrun humans in many regards in the field of physical abilities and athletic performances. Wild animals develop these specific abilities in the wild. However the ones raised in captivity do not learn all the same abilities and that is exactly why they cannot be released and let free in the wild. Because they would not be able

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

to cope. They are not “adapted” properly. What the wild ones have additionally is a certain degree of *acquired* refinement. Acquired means that it does not simply exist separate, but is dependent on and consequently a part of the material world around.

If I made myself understood through these examples that the high level of refinement is something acquired ... then can we also understand that man is an animal with an improved or advanced degree of refinement and sophistication? If that is so, then man is not fundamentally different from animals, nor separate or completely foreign to them and the material world in general.

The objection mentioned at the beginning, that accepting evolution would mean ignoring the evidence of man’s spirituality is not sustained. That objection was broken down, analyzed by the use of the definition of each constituting elements, and the result of this analysis shows that it is nothing more than a simple statement made without any solid basis. In ignorance. It is simply the personal reaction of someone who does not understand the phenomenon and who never even examined it closely.

In this chapter we have showed that spirituality means feelings and emotions. And these are also found in animals. And their dependence on matter makes them a part of the material world. From this perspective, evolution is perfectly compatible with spirituality.

THE BRAIN IS IMITATED, EQUATED, OTRUN BY: COMPUTERS AND SOFTWARE (IN PRINCIPLE)

Some have been tempted to think that our brain might contain an immaterial component. However, taken individually, each of the brain's abilities and characteristics can be replicated by technology. So nothing "mysterious" from another world is present in our brain.

Scientists compare the (human) brain with computers, and the comparison takes place in both directions. They try to improve their understanding of the brain and the human mind on the basis of this analogy. In turn, a deeper understanding of functioning of the brain has led to progress in technology, in general, and the field of computers in particular.

"Artificial intelligence" has ever more applications and the potential for the future is impressive. In the movies there are presented scenarios of a parallel world in which robots pass beyond the limits known today. They can do everything that man does, but in such a way that the difference between man and computers is no longer noticeable. How one works so does the other.

However, many supporters of creation consider man to be a special creature. Namely, if the biological organism is similar to the organisms of the rest of animals, the human brain must have something unique, since the human mind reflects the divine model. The human brain has been called the most complex object in the known Universe. Which obviously gives some further reasons to feel tempted by an analogy with the divine nature. They consider that if evolution could perhaps produce some simple elements, without God's intervention, then complex things, out of which the human brain more than anything else, constitute the most powerful proof of creation and of the existence of God. Because these could not be produced "alone" by the existing forces

of the material Universe, but a superior intelligence would have been necessary to create them.

Consequently, most of the supporters of creation consider that the analogy between the brain and computers may not be a real one, nor a possible one. But the similarities would be only apparent, incidental, or partial at best. That after a certain limit, there is no correspondent, the computer cannot reproduce the things done by the brain.

There is also the impression that, if man would make a computer that could imitate all that the brain does, then man would somehow claim to replace God, building at the level of the highest performance proven only by God, who himself created the brain.

According to them, the unequaled aspects of the brain that the computer could never reproduce refer to a certain spiritual component. More exactly a mystery that cannot be dissected nor be it expressed correctly, since it is immaterial in nature, and it belongs to another foreign world.

For myself, the current subject belongs to my field of expertise, as a software developer. And a popular name generally given to this process is artificial intelligence. Namely an intelligent action that is executed by a material device made by human hand. Any imitation by man of processes found in nature is called artificial. Just like in mathematics we have simple problems and difficult problems, some calculations are very simple, while others are not so easy, the same way, the level of complexity of intelligent actions executed by computers can differ from one action to another.

Today software programs have known an expansion that is unstoppable, the fields of application and variety of methods implemented are unlimited, at least in principle. The slogan is well-known within the software development business, that when a customer asks regarding a job, if so and so request can be implemented. The idea in principle is that "anything is possible". The answer to any request is: "Yes, that can be done." There are no impossible requests, just that some require more resources and can cost more money than others. In other words, the message to a customer is that the problem is not: 1. if something *can* be done

or not, but rather 2. what are the costs for implementing a solution to a problem or another. And then obviously, 3. how much is the customer willing to invest in the requested solution.

Therefore, returning to the title of this chapter, can the computer imitate all that the brain does? Are there actions that the brain executes, but that are impossible for the computer to implement, because they are too difficult, too complex, impossible to replicate?

The answer to this question in the current context depends first on the meaning of the concept of complexity. I will mention two aspects regarding complexity:

First aspect: A high level of complexity means, just like in the case of a tall building, made up of multiple stories one on top of the other, the sum of a number of levels with a reduced complexity. One complex job in general means the sum of other smaller jobs, which taken separately, do not have the same high level of complexity as the initial job as a whole.

Second aspect: The idea of complexity has relative value, even a subjective one. At first sight many things can “seem” complex to man or even impossible. For example, a tourist usually wonders about many unknown things, artistic creations or daily works of civilizations that he is not familiar with. This was in part the mission of science in the last several centuries, to explain what for the uneducated man was inexplicable and to reveal things that were not known previously.

Among the things considered by believers that the brain possesses and that would be impossible for the computer to implement it is considered to be the ability *to create something new*. For example, they refer to man’s creativity in the field of arts. The type of works that are found in museums: sculptures, paintings ...etc. Or to write literature, poetry, to generate a movie script, theatrical play, to compose music ... etc. If we include in here the variety of all fields of creation mentioned specific to each people individually, throughout each historical period and the specific of the influential currents in the respective eras on those peoples, we arrive at a vast cultural heritage of the human specie globally.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

Is the computer's impossibility of recreating the artistic creation only an apparent, relative one, or is it rather real? Can we break down the works of art in general into simpler elements, that could then be automated and implemented by machines? Is the principle, that we mentioned above about a high level of complexity, by extension, verified here, which could be broken down into smaller levels of lesser complexities and the one about scientific activity, which systematically explained all that was apparently unexplainable before?

One example: About twenty years ago I have seen all kinds of artistic porcelain works for sale on the market. Some were produced in factories, by machines, automated, serial production. Others were done manually. The ones done manually were, of course, more expensive. After a number of a few years, on the market started to appear works that were at one time done manually but now they were at a cheap price. Why? Because, in time, the industry has figured out a way to automate their production. Machines have been able to reproduce what initially seemed too complex and was considered that only the human hand could do. This is one of those cases which prove the technology trend which verifies the principle that what seems too complex is only a subjective impression. But in time it can be broken down into smaller elements. Anything can be deciphered and transmitted into a language understood by the machine. And, in turn, artificial intelligence can reproduce.

Another example: About ten years ago I have received a diploma for a certificate sponsored by IBM in project management (PM). I was particularly impressed when I realized how many advanced software programs there were already in that field. Various platforms would automate the very work of a project manager. The respective software programs did everything: They were able to impose mandatory or optionally the principles of efficient management at all stages of development of a project. They could determine the terms, measure risks, make decisions regarding resources. Also they would adapt their activities to the specifics of any individual project. They would interact with the team members and could even learn practices that proved good results, to

apply them to future projects. They kept records of own past experiences, gathered data about involved factors and results and would systematize them in order to interpret and learn principles and methods and provide new recommendations.

The surprise was that in this case the computer reproduces the work of the manager. Up until then, I was used to and many are still familiar today with robots or computer programs which reproduce the work of a regular employee or many. It is generally known that *simple and repetitive* jobs can be automated and reproduced by the artificial intelligence. But for many the impression remains that at a certain level, however, man is still in control. So no one expected that technology would reproduce the activity at such complex level, considered specifically human, that of a manager.

Therefore, how can the computer reproduce the work so complex and sophisticated of a manager in a successful big corporation in our days? The answer is essentially: Based on the principle that one whole, initially appears very complex, but it can be broken down into smaller components of lesser complexity. Like in the illustration of a pile of stones that cannot be transported as a whole, but can be moved stone by stone. How relevant are the examples mentioned above for the current discussion? How can this principle apply, by extension, also in the case that we started with, to the example mostly used as activities “too human” to be able to be reproduced by computers, namely: artistic creation?

In order to best answer this question it is necessary to first ask those people claiming that it is impossible, specifically why would it be impossible?

On the one hand, it can be objected that a computer can only execute jobs that work according to precise laws, while artistic creation does not belong to this category. And therefore the computer could never create art.

Two observations regarding the so-called precise laws, or the way this term is preferred in education, exact sciences: 1. If an activity is not exact or precise, then it means it should be inexact, imprecise. But even so, it still belongs to this world. It does not belong to a foreign world. 2. Professional critics in the field can

transform any detail of a work of art into a definite element, an exact information and precise rule. The tendency of calling art as something rather inexact, imprecise is due to the fact that the artist lets himself free to create. However, that freedom is only at the intentional level. Unintentionally, the artist is still influenced by a number of factors, which taken separately are both precise and exact.

Conversely, it can be objected that artistic works, for example a painting, transfer on paper or other texture a combination of human feelings, spiritual experiences, subjective perceptions. And the computer does not feel, consequently it cannot create art, because it is missing those necessary ingredients. Two relevant observations regarding feelings: 1. Art expresses feelings, but feelings express nothing out of this world. 2. Feelings can be explained (see chapter 28) as being specific needs determined by the biological organism. And complex feelings are made up of a "mixture" of some individual basic feelings. A professional critic in the field can identify all these factors involved in the case of a work of art. In chapter 25 there is described the relevant example of a nuance that is hard to define, but which can be broken down into its basic constitutive elements, which, taken separately, are easy to define.

The key always consists in defining the problem. Just as in all fields of activity, work is divided into several distinct stages, the same in information technology. First stage is the gathering of data which defines the problem. The following stages refer to designing the solution, then implementing it and verifying it. The first stage is decisive for the success of the rest of the stages and of the project in general. In principle, in information technology one real situation is transferred from analogous format (understood by man's senses) into digital format (understood by the machine's operating system). The more people invest in the definition of the problem, the easier the solution becomes. Defining a problem means simplifying it in order to be understood by our mind. A problem appears too difficult or impossible only when it is not defined well enough, when it is not understood exactly. But if

it is properly defined and understood, there is no problem that cannot be solved even by a beginner.

Most of the times, people who claim that a computer would not be able to imitate the brain are not able to say also “why”. They are not able to define brain’s intelligence, to explain what it means, to show specifically what aspect of intelligence cannot be reproduced – they hurry to say, based on the impulse of the first impression, that it cannot be imitated, period. But when asked to explain the reasons, there are only delays, abstract answers, vague, uncertain, and none demonstrated.

In order to define brain’s intelligence we need to recognize the process in principle and its behavior. In chapter 28 we talk about “de-spiritualization” of feelings and at chapter 31 about “de-mystification” of personality. Here we talk about “digitalization” of intelligence. The brain’s working process is similar to that of the computer in the following areas: The brain receives information through sight, hearing, smell, touch => the computer receives the same type of information: audio, video, press of a keyboard by hand.

The processing of data is learned. In chapter 28 we mentioned that man learns what his needs are and how to extract everything from the environment for his benefit. The computer does the same thing, it learns how to process the data received based on the objective desired by the software program installed on it.

In chapter 32 we compare man with a sand castle, which water transforms back into sand. At first sight, the feelings and personality may give the impression that they have something particularly their own. So they are called proper will. However, further analysis, just like we find in chapters 28-32, can explain their exact meaning and demonstrate that they do not have anything original besides the factors influencing them. In other words, man is not separate from the world, position from which many are used to relate to the world. But he is totally a part of it. In the same way that the sand castle is just that, namely sand, so also man is reduced to the sum of material elements that make him up.

In summary: Man processes data on the basis of three principles: 1. Information received 2. his shaped personality and 3. the feelings developed. However all these are received. Correspondingly, the computer processes the introduced data on the basis of its operating system installed on it and the software programs installed – all these three elements are received as well. Taken separately, each “received” thing in man’s case is something that a computer could also receive. And in principle, the way of processing (determined exclusively by received elements) of the brain can be identified in the way of processing of computers (also determined exclusively by received elements).

However in the daily conversations many tend to express themselves in a way that leads to the idea that human feeling would be felt somewhere distinctly, placed in a determined space, which would separate it physically from the rest of the world. This supposed place where every feeling is felt would represent the personal ego, considered proper, distinct and separated from the rest of the world and which also remains after the death of the physical body.

There is a tendency of distinguishing between the reaction to various direct stimuli from the outside world, which are easier to accept that they can represent simply a biologic reaction of the physical body, and a reaction to the internal indirect stimuli, which is interpreted as an effect of some voluntary decision, a voluntary action – separate and distinct from the reactions of the biological body. The challenge consists in verification of such supposed distinction. If it cannot be demonstrated or probed that feelings are different from the rest of the biological reactions, the supposed distinction remains only a myth.

A systematic approach, however, reveals that all that man does, he does because he wants to. All our actions are based on personal desires, either in the case of immediate actions, of the moment, what we do now, or in the case of plans and long term objectives. We do them all because we want to, and the fact that we want is due to our desires. However from desires to needs there is only a single step. We need only ask the question separately: What are all our desires, then taken separately, is this a

desire or a need? If it is a desire, then where is that desire coming from? It comes from our biological body. And in turn, the body feels it because of some unbalance at a certain level. But any lack of a substance in our organism means a need of the organism. And so we come to understand or to discover, if we did not expect it to be so, that each desire is in fact a need of the biological body.

Man's life starts as a child, then grows to maturity and eventually comes old age and death. Throughout his entire life there are changes of behavior and associated to these there are changes of his needs. However none of these transformations goes beyond the limits of the specific needs of man's biological body.

To simplify: One of the main motivations that determine most of our actions, from childhood to old age, is *obtaining food*. No one can deny that both globally and also throughout history, this need has determined man's actions in a dominant percentage. A second concern, related to the first, is *perfecting the methods* of obtaining food. Man learns early the association between chances of obtaining food and the level of development of personal abilities. The need for food conditions him to feel the need to develop his abilities. Just as the percentage of time spend working in life is significant, also the length of time dedicated to education is great. Education in various forms continues even after the so-called school age. All this desire to learn is supported by the desire to develop personal abilities.

This is how they are connected, one basic desire is determined by a basic need of the biologic body. And, in turn, that determines another (or more) secondary desire and in time we come to a real web of desires. However all of them are determined exclusively by those few basic known ones. We can follow the trace and, with enough time and dedication, each of the branches and dependencies which successfully connect all desires among themselves and then with the basic needs of the biologic body can be identified.

Why is this identification relevant for the current discussion? Because what is explained, understood, defined can be reproduced by the computer – in principle. If the biological needs can be reproduced, then also man's desires can be reproduced. This

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

means that a computer could be programmed to manifest a will of his own.

Just as we discuss in chapter 30 that self consciousness means one seeing his own self, viewing the circuit that defines our functioning – from desires, which motivate us, to associated plans and then to actions executed implicitly. The fact that we see and can follow this entire process which takes place in ourselves. If the functioning process can be replicated, reproducing self awareness no longer constitutes a problem.

From this perspective, neither do the feelings constitute a problem: Just as the organism feels a physical touch or another material external stimuli (heat, cold), in the same way the inner psychic feels the abstract representations of such stimuli, like touch, heat, cold or memories of such past experiences. In the same analogy, or by extension, can be explained the way self consciousness is felt. The sensation can be replicated separately and awareness separately => then the concept resulting from connecting the two ideas can be reproduced too.

In the category of feelings proposed by those claiming that there are characteristics of the brain that a computer cannot replicate the following are often mentioned: feeling of justice, honesty, honor ... etc. In order to decide if these concepts can be replicated or not, it is enough just to define them correctly. Without this definition, the situation resembles that of one who asks if an apple is heavier than a pear. In order to pronounce ourselves realistically it is necessary first to weigh them each. After we weigh them, the answer to the question becomes very simple indeed – only a formality.

Righteousness refers to the corresponding reward for a given action. The same process is followed here as well: We measure both the reward and the action, and if they correspond => then it is righteous, otherwise it is not.

Honesty refers to a match between what we say and what we do. We follow the same process: We need to measure the two, then compare them and the verdict is automatic.

Mercy is defined based on the way one relates to someone else's needs, suffering present or potential, real or imagined. The

same process is followed: If the need and suffering are defined they are measured and then not only the presence of mercy is determined, but also the various degrees of mercy could be determined.

Empathy is considered to be the ability of one individual to put himself in another one's situation, with the result that the first individual actually feels what the other one feels. The process followed is the same: definition, measuring, comparison.

In the same way, any moral feature can be defined, then the investigated cases measured and a computer could, based on some criteria received by a software program, be able to identify, in principle, if the respective moral feature is verified or not.

Therefore, does the objection stand, that a computer differs from the human brain because the computer is only able to do what it is and if it is told to do by man? In other words, the computer does not do something because it itself wants to do it. Two observations regarding this objection: 1. The ability to execute a job is harder to implement than the motivation to execute it. 2. We have explained above that the desire to do something is due, in principle, to some basic biological needs. Since these biological needs are material in nature, it means that they can be replicated by the computer, implicitly it means that the motivation to execute a job can also be replicated in digital format. In reality, at a certain level these are already implemented: motivation, desire to execute, the initiative to want to do something. It is enough to think of the examples of intelligent toys for kids on the market which can react "emotionally", or the sophisticated computer games, which reproduce a large range of feelings that determine the human behavior.

We can say here, what we are saying in chapter 30, that ability to want to do something represents indeed an extra dimension, but it belongs to the same category with the abilities to do that thing.

Note: The definition of terms received special attention relatively recently. Science realized the need for a correct definition of things in order to be able to study them, to operate with them, to talk about them in a systematic way. Defining the terms is espe-

cially a requirement in information technology, which meaning and object of study is the technology of information itself.

In the past, people generally accepted the idea that it is enough if we personally understand what one thing or another means, because the industry was not developed and man's activity was not as systematic at the level that it is today. Therefore neither was the need for communicating the details so important.

Now, because of the level of development of technology and the progress of society in many areas, the very day to day language of people has been modified. We are generally careful, and our speech is more exact, we express ourselves more professionally.

Art is a form of communication. It expresses inner experiences, and personal experiences are determined by the subjective perception of the individual regarding the reality of the world. A technical language can transfer into words what the artist expressed without words. Consequently, something that in the past could not even be expressed into words, can now be transferred into digital format for a computer to reproduce.

SUMMARY: This chapter has shown that, in principle, artificial intelligence can reproduce any aspect of brain's activities, all its functions and to reach its level of abilities or performances. The objections were that: 1. Brain's activities would be too complex or that 2. artistic creation belongs exclusively to human brain and that 3. the computer does not feel and therefore neither could it have a will of its own. All these objections have been eliminated. They prove to be subjective impressions at first sight. However if they are defined and explained well enough, any job can be reproduced by the computer.

DIFFERENCE FROM (OTHER) ANIMALS = ONE DIMENSION EXTRA (OF THE SAME CATEGORY)

The difference between humans and animals is rather one of surface, subjective, definitely relative. Taken individually, the differences refer rather to the results produced by humans, not the causes that determined them. The causes differ very little, though the results can differ a lot. Evolution is responsible only for modifying the causes, but the results came implicit.

How different is man from animals? After the discovery of DNA and of the fact that man and animals share 90 % of their DNA structure, it was understood that man is related to animals. Of course there are differences between the two species. However in this chapter we will ask if this difference can be defined, how can it be measured and if its causes can be identified. We are interested specifically (if): Could evolution have produced this difference or was there a separate creative act necessary?

Just like with any other project in the industry or any problem found in a mathematics manual, in order to evaluate the situation, to be able to answer the question if a certain job can be done or not, first we need an exact definition of the problem. Only then would the answer be relevant, valid, correct.

Regarding the current topic, we will have to start with the question: "What makes man different from the animals?" Most research studies in the field focused on the identification of two aspects that are specifically human: 1. self awareness and 2. abstract thinking.

FIRST ASPECT: An advanced level of self awareness.

We cannot exclude completely self awareness in animals. They are aware of their own characteristics, they know their weight when they sit on something, in order to anticipate if the

pressure is too much. Also, they are aware of the size of their body in order to anticipate if they can pass through a certain hole. They know how much energy they can produce, in order to anticipate at what speed and for what length of time they can run chasing their prey. They know how sharp their claws are, and the way in which they scratch themselves indicates an awareness of the different parts of their body, including their location.

However the level of man's self awareness is highly superior to that of animals.

First observation: In the formulation of this conclusion it is induced the idea that we are not talking about foreign things and independent from the known material world. But we refer to *self* awareness. What does self awareness mean?

The functioning of the organism is the same both in man and in animals. Both have the same basic needs: hunger, thirst, physical comfort, sexual reproduction. They satisfy their biological needs by the same relation to the external material world, which they perceive by the same senses: sight, hearing, touch, taste, smell.

Self awareness means simply awareness of the functions of the organism. To perceive these processes in ourselves. In other words, this can be likened to raising somehow above to be able to view ourselves and our own actions. The actions remain the same, but we are just able to see them at the same time.

Second observation: For this discussion the correct identification of the differences between causes and respectively of the differences between results has a decisive role. Two examples relevant to this difference:

First example: A child hits the stone with a small hammer, while an adult hits the same stone with a much bigger hammer. The difference between causes refers to the difference in size of the two hammers. The difference between results refers to the difference between the respective cracks made in stone by each hammer separately.

Relevant for our discussion is to demonstrate what led to the difference between man and animals. Consequently, we are interested to know if they could have arrived at the current differ-

ence by evolution or only by creation. Which means that we are interested in the difference between causes, not between results.

The argument is as follows: If the results differ much, this is irrelevant, meaning that this difference does not prove the need for creation. However if this big difference between results is due to a very small difference between causes, this is relevant. This means that evolution could realize a relatively minor difference at the level of causes, which, in turn, is alone responsible for the incomparably greater difference between the produced results.

Second example: A telescope using relatively small lenses can see at big distances. One that uses bigger lenses can see at correspondingly greater distances. The causes are the lenses, while the results are the distances how far each one telescope is able to see. If the difference between lenses' sizes can be extremely small, the difference between distances how far they are able to see could respectively be extremely great. In short, the difference between causes (lenses) is very small, while the difference between results (distances) is very big.

The confusion appears when we look at very different results produced by man and those produced by animals and ask if this difference could be realized by evolution or if creation would be necessary. Of course the difference between results is very big, and based on this comparison of *results*, we may be tempted to consider that evolution would not be able to do something like that and that creation was necessary. However, when we compare man and animals, we need to compare the *causes*, because evolution or creation were not responsible for the results produced by man and animals, but they are only responsible for the causes. So we need to look at differences between the biological structure of man and animals.

Third observation: In the title of this chapter we mentioned an additional dimension from the same category. The above examples compare the same dimension, but the dimension has different values in each case. Next, I will refer to an example where we compare different dimensions.

Comparing a train and a car. The train goes on single lines, so it moves in a straight line. The car goes on the asphalt roads, so it

moves in all and any direction. The difference between a straight line and a plane surface is given by an additional axis. The line has only one axe, while the surface has two axis. The second axe represents the additional dimension, but from the same category. It is still an axe, like the first one, but just that the space destined for movement is now defined by an additional one. The difference in results produced is infinite, however the difference between causes which determine them is a simple, quantitative one.

In the case of self awareness, there is an additional dimension, because it is still awareness. The difference is that an animal, that acts instinctually, is aware only of stimuli received from and which provide information about the external world. While man's self awareness, who thinks of his own actions, adds to the object of awareness information from and about himself.

Just as the "first observation" of this chapter noted, instead of seeing only straight ahead, specifically to see only in the horizontal plane, now he has the additional option of seeing himself, specifically to see also in a vertical plane. Clearly, a case of an additional dimension, but from the same category.

SECOND ASPECT: An advanced level of abstraction.

We cannot totally exclude abstraction in animals either. And this is seen after we define the concept. Abstracting can be described as the identification of some common elements found in a group of distinct objects. Then, on the basis of this identification, other things can be separated into distinct categories. Specifically, animals demonstrate this quality during their learning process. In the beginning, right after birth, they do not know the dangers, in order to avoid them. Then they start to learn dangers one by one and avoid only that one, without extending the learned rule to other dangers. However, in time, they begin to generalize, they learn not only individual dangers, but also rules based on common characteristics of those individual ones. When they notice something that resembles a danger, they already suppose that it could be from the same category from past experiences. And thus they know to avoid also new things, that they never experimented in the past.

However man shows an advanced degree of abstracting.

Computers generally can constitute a proper example for what abstracting means. The lowest level of abstracting is found in applications installed only on one computer, called “client”. The next level of abstracting is found in applications installed on two computers. A part on one, called “client”, and the other part on another, called “server”. The first part is the one implementing the interactions with the user for the exchange of information. The second part implements the actual processing of data itself. A superior level of abstracting is obtained by applications installed on three computers. Client, server and DB. The third deals with efficient deposit of data used by the first two and it is called “Data Base”. Of course, the level of abstracting can continue to grow and there can be additional categories identified in each one of the mentioned parts for activities or elements sharing common characteristics. And these can be separated and in turn even installed each on separate computers. Different types of interactions with the user, different types of processes and types of saved data.

The difference between all these different models refers to the distribution of execution according to fields of expertise. We are talking about some (one or more) additional dimensions, but each from the same category. It is like the difference between triangle and square. The square has one additional side, but it is nevertheless a side, just like the other three. So it belongs to the same category, but it’s just that instead of three, it has four.

In principle, human mind works like that of animals. Both function on the basis of learned methods. And, in turn, their learning takes place based on associations and rewards – the phenomenon explained by Pavlov. Any ability of the mind is obtained (and it was obtained) by the principle of associations: One action associated with reward is learned.

In the same way does man train animals. He repeats a certain action with the animal, and each time the action is executed correctly, he gives it a reward. In this way, the animal learns to execute it correctly. According to the same method does the animal also learn by itself in nature. For example, an animal raised in the wild learns how to hunt and how to protect itself from dangers.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

However the same animal, if it is raised in captivity, it no longer has this learning opportunity. Consequently, if it is later abandoned in the wild, such an animal could die either from hunger, since it does not know how to hunt, or it will be killed, since it does not know how to protect itself from dangers. In the wild, for the animals raised and adapted to that environment, the trainer is nature itself.

Man learns according to the same principles. From the stone age until now, mankind has made a huge progress. However this entire process meant a learning activity. Biologically, today's individual is identical with the one from ten thousand years ago. He has discovered one by one the technologies and was only guided by the principle of associations and of reward. The proof consists in the fact that today a child born of parents who live isolated from civilization, if it is taken when he is small into a civilized country, he will have no problem learning all the wonders of latest technology. And the other way around, a child born in the middle of civilization, if he is taken when he is small into an isolated undeveloped country, he will not know anything from what the other child knows. Nothing is transmitted genetically, it is not specific to his genes' structure, nothing belonging to the physical body or to the mind. But all is learned.

Both learn, man as well as animal. So learning is not a specifically human quality, but man just has a greater (quantitative) capacity to learn than the animals.

For the inexperienced ones, it might be tempting to consider that this is a fundamental difference. For example the colonialists generally believed that the black race was inferior to other races. And in turn, many of the isolated tribes far from civilization, when they first met with representatives from the civilized world, they thought that these were (qualitative) superior, sometimes even considered them "divine". Today it is a universally established fact that all races are equal and able to reach the same level of performances, if they benefit from the same conditions to learn, from the proper environment. For example, the US now has a black president – a confirmation of the equality and the equal potential of all races understood today.

We just have to use the proper comparison, namely to compare the causes and not the results. Because even though civilized man has “miraculous” achievements comparing to the old undeveloped ones, their body and mind do not differ at all. Therefore we should not compare the great achievements of modern man to the lives of the animals. But should compare the characteristics of the body and mind of both man and animals. Thus we can notice that the difference between the abilities of the human brain and those of the animals is one of refinement and sophistication. That in principle they have the same basic functions, but just that man’s level of self awareness and abstracting are relatively more developed (quantitatively, not qualitatively).

I was watching a documentary program on television about a year ago about dividing animal species according to three types of births: 1. laying eggs 2. marsupials 3. mammals. For the first type, the new born comes out undeveloped. For the second, the new born comes out partially developed. And for the third, the new born waits inside until it is fully developed and only then comes out. However, its brain continues to develop even after birth.

Then I made a parallel association between the gradual development of the brain on the one hand and the resemblance almost complete between man’s brain and animal brain on the other hand. That minimal difference is alone responsible for the huge difference between (results) what man can do comparing to animals. This comparison makes it seem possible that evolution has led to the development of human brain only a little further in one direction or another.

As I explained previously, the differences are of the same category, just quantitative. So they are something that evolution had already done. Consequently, it could do it again. Evolution demonstrated flexibility in development of the brain at different stages, rhythms and sizes. All we know until now about the subject, the overall image that we are able to understand today supports the version that man is a product of evolution – not only as probable, but the only one probable.

The very progress (of civilization) experienced by man throughout the history of his existence is based on the evolution

principles. From the primitive age onward, he has discovered one by one a long line of improvements. He has taken many steps naturally until he reached the level of civilization today. The principles had been as follows: 1. Discover something new. 2. If it is beneficial, it is kept, otherwise abandoned. 3. Then with the new discoveries he goes further on the same principle and any new discovery is added to build on the previous ones. Just what evolution came to name as: “natural selection”. Only that here it was no longer nature that did the selection, but society itself. And we can say that society is also the instructor that “trains” scientists and researchers.

Discoveries have all started from zero and none of them has been presented to man as ready to go by some extra-terrestrial source. In other words, the course of civilization’s development was not helped by any external interventions. But it was driven exclusively by its own forces and the unchanged abilities of man alone.

One relevant example can be the discovery of photo camera. Purely by chance, someone noticed that in a dark room, if light enters through a small hole, it would project an image of the world outside the room. Something as simple as light passing through a hole can create a miracle. For someone who does not know the explanation it may seem incredible. The discovery has proved useful and so it was kept. And later others have built upon it.

The human brain has developed in some areas a little more than that of animals and this offered him advantages over the (other) animals. And the advantages have been transmitted to the following generations since they helped them survive. (Obviously there are also aspects in which animals can be superior to man)

A modification at the genetic level could gradually move the moment of birth. From eggs (undeveloped brain), to marsupials (partially developed) and mammals (cubs born alive). Man has a long childhood, and his brain develops over a much longer period than animals. This could be exactly the difference that we have been waiting for – a development in the same direction, but just one step further in man. A child manifests the same level of de-

velopment as that of an animal. Later, when he is mature, he outruns the animal.

The image of moving the moment of birth in three stages of development could make a parallel comparison with moving the direction of our eyes: From the object in the front, to the outside world, then to the sides and finally vertically, upon the person himself. Only the reference point is different, then the entire view point and perspective change completely. It was enough just an additional length of time and active interactions with the outside reality of the world during that time, and man's brain could have developed today's specific characteristics of his specie.

All our accumulated experiences demonstrate that this is a verified process. The world around us demonstrates this phenomenon at multiple levels. Evolution of the brain qualifies therefore, as being not only possible, but also very probable.

Again as proof of the existence of this phenomenon, I looked on television in the past couple of days and have noticed on German and Romanian channels programs with various American animation movies. The cinema industry in these countries import massively movies from the US. Why? Because they are better than the ones produced locally. But how come they are better? Do the Americans have something extra, that other countries do not have? Maybe they do. Are they at a different level, a superior stage of development and do they work according to more advanced methods, thus creating better quality products?

If things are so, the *reason* for such difference is significant here. The path followed by these people until they arrived at that level. It is important to recognize that the American society is not a biologically different specie. But it is made up of people coming from other countries, initially from Europe and later from the rest of the continents, which now they came to surpass. Did this difference come by evolution or by creation? Well, they followed the same processes, from the same categories, but just that these were continued further in some areas. Clearly this means: "Evolution".

MORALITY

Judging of man as an independent agent with free will before God is contradicted by the scientifically demonstrated reality that his entire behavior, what we generally call "morality", is totally dependent on matter: on genetic inheritance, on material factors, which reflect the quality of creation and the environment. Morality is not given by any characteristic, independent, immaterial, separate or specifically human quality.

- 31 Personality: is random and
changing => with no merits of its own 239
- 32 Freedom of choice and obedience
represent simply: reactions of matter 242
- 33 Morality test is: the test of health, intelligence,
environment (= animal training) 246

**PERSONALITY IS RANDOM AND CHANGING
→ WITH NO MERITS OF ITS OWN**

Man's personality is determined to a high degree by the genetic inheritance (from his parents). Therefore it is random, independent of the individual's will. Later it changes under the influence of the environment. So it is not stable. If this is what makes up the individual, then he is neither planned in advance, nor eternal, or separated from the material world.

The word personality is primarily associated with man, the only creature in the material world named "person". Although sometimes we may also say about animals that they demonstrate a personality. Personality features are sometimes attributed even to natural phenomenon and figuratively also to some objects.

However, supporters of creation tend to separate man from animals and the rest of material world because of his personality. The idea is that God does not have a relationship with animals or the rest of the world, because they do not have personality. But he relates in a special way to man because he has personality. The understanding is that only someone with personality can communicate with another person.

It is said that God is not interested in man's money, his outlook appearance, his physical force or abilities, but only in his personality. No other quality or feature related to man is important before God, but only his personality matters.

Thus personality receives a special status, man deserves to be judged and rewarded or condemned based on his personality. More and more religion considers this part of the human beings to be something totally independent from everything else, separated from the world, as something immaterial, not affected by and which does not take on the characteristics of material things.

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

The interaction between personality and matter or the physical body is seen as irrelevant. God attributes it eternal value, he introduced the spirit in man at his birth and he receives it back after the death of the body of flesh. Man's actions are judged by God, and they determine the value not of the body, but of personality. Of this non-temporal spirit, which deserves to receive the verdict of judgment: either eternal approval, or eternal damnation.

Such a process with eternal implications is important to God and it justifies the *purpose* of man's existence and of creation itself. That is why some consider that God created the rest of the material world *for* man and that he is willing to sacrifice it for him anytime. (See chapters 21-24 regarding disappearing and natural catastrophes)

Two objectively observed aspects come in conflict with the creationists' vision about personality.

First aspect: Man's birth is random (see chapter 20), so the origin of personality is also random and not guaranteed. It can appear at an unplanned moment or maybe never.

The type of personality that appears is also random. Composition and determining factors are made up of a set of genes chosen at random from one partner and another set also at random from another partner, the choice of which pairing is also made at random.

None of these conditions – “if” (it appears) and “what type” of personality appears – corresponds with the idea of an already existent spirit that is introduced in the material body at birth and independent of it.

Second aspect: The influence of the environment upon personality. This is a factor influencing not only the appearance and initial formation of personality, but it also influences it constantly throughout its life course. The geographic location, where a person is born, is just as random, and this determines the environment in which that individual lives. Therefore what results is a personality totally random, or not even that, because at birth personality is not yet fully developed, and the environment is respon-

sible for the rest of formation of personality. Man cannot decide where to be born, so he cannot be held responsible for that.

Until now, I have listed elements responsible for producing man's personality. In short: genetic inheritance and the influence of the environment. It is relevant to notice here: 1. Not only the dependence on the material world, but also 2. its make up completely out of external components and 3. the conclusion that, in fact, personality does not have anything which it did not receive. Absolutely nothing of its own. Any evaluation or judgment of personality does not judge something of it *own*, but it judges elements of the material world that contributed to its formation. (See chapters 32, 33.)

In time the environment changes the personality. It is a phenomenon that happens throughout the course of our life. We see it in our own life, in the lives of others and it is documented globally and also that in the past man behave in the same way.

Besides man's life, evolution proposes that all things, both flora and fauna, and even the planet itself, they have all been shaped by the forces of the environment. At the first look, this principle is easy to verify in man's case, because it is available to us, but it seems harder to verify in the case of transformations that took place in prehistoric eras or at far distances.

The implication if the phenomenon happens also in the case of personality is that it demonstrates a dependence on and identification with the material world which is incompatible with the non-temporal value and eternal judgment which the creation version makes it responsible for. It is incompatible with the permanence of an immaterial spirit that comes from the eternal past and continues into the eternal future, with its relation to an eternal God.

It no longer resembles something implanted by God from the outside. And something that is neither stable nor independent becomes harder to hold responsible.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE AND OBEDIENCE REPRESENT SIMPLY REACTIONS OF MATTER

God supposedly judges free will and obedience, which are considered to be exclusively features of man. If the human body is made entirely of matter, then the decisions taken by man are reduced to simple decisions of the body, which means: reactions of the matter that he is made of. So God would "judge" the reactions of matter, the creator of which is himself?!

It is claimed (by creationists) that God gives man a specific ability and right: Freedom of choice. And in return he asks for his obedience. But he expects that man obeys voluntarily, meaning: obedience while he exercises his freedom of choice. Not a "forced" obedience.

During the discussion in chapter 31 we have seen that man's personality is given by properties of matter that make it up: the genetic inheritance and environmental factors. So any action of man represents a reaction of matter. And from here derives the conclusion that even the freedom of choice and obedience are also reactions of matter.

The expression "freedom of choice" contains the idea of freedom, namely a free action, without influence, or at least not an influence that we could not ignore or that we are able to resist. Obedience, too, has meaning when it is voluntary. Otherwise it has no merits or justification to be rewarded. In that case, instead of being obedience, it becomes a reflex, an involuntary reaction or a forced action.

However, the fact that man's actions are simple reactions of matter contradicts the definition of freedom of choice and obedience for three reasons: 1. matter is made 2. its reactions are pre-

dictable and 3. they are not free. Below I describe these three reasons.

1.) Man is matter, born from it, raised with and fed by it, and when he dies he transforms back to it. Just like some sand castles made by children on the sea shore. They could be interesting, even complex, if we look at them from the perspective of what they represent, what their form transmits and what was invested in their building. But from the alternative perspective: The water comes, destroys them and transforms them back into sand spread on the beach. Just like man is matter, they are sand (and vice-versa). And they do not contain anything additional, other than sand and the form in which they are built, which belongs entirely to the builder. So it is not something *specific* to the castle. Practically nothing that a castle has is its own. But all is received. All its elements are received, absolutely each one of them. In this case, can the builder hold the castle accountable for any of its properties?

2.) All man's functions are material in nature: We receive the information via material ways (neurons), the feelings are based on emotions given by properties of the (biologic) body. Our actions, including freedom of choice and obedience, represent decisions of a material organism influenced by a chained number of factors, which in turn is each a material process.

(Matter's reactions do not change, because its properties are universal. So is matter's reaction free? Obviously not, because it is programmed by its definition.)

Knowing the properties of matter, we know its reactions too. And knowing the process at the base level we can know a whole chain of such reactions in principle. Therefore is the reaction of the respective chain predictable? Absolutely so. Because it is predictable at the base level.

Matter reacts according to its properties. But those properties are like that because of the "one" who made them so. If matter is judged according to those properties, we arrive at the question: Is there something proper to matter that is being judged or something that matter has received, therefore something that actually belongs to the creator? Obviously, the answer leads to an

impossible situation: God judges something that he himself gave, something that actually belongs to him.

3.) Together with the requirements that are expected people to fulfill, God also presents them the reward for each one of the choices. This raises questions regarding the freedom of choice and obedience. And again we come to an impossible situation.

Reward is found in the training process. But in that process it has the purpose of stimulating the subconscious, and the debate can move to the question of whether there are cases where reward might also have a role other than to address just the subconscious. The decisions that are conscious of the existence of a reward associated to each option, can they be called independent decisions? Does not the reward have the role of pushing the balance of options and does this not reduce the decision to a logical and automatic evaluation of the benefits?

The definition of decision includes the choice between two (or more) options, which in turn contain a set of information each. If the reward is added to the list of information about one option, this changes the balance between the examined options. To the extent that the information is related to the filter of a set of known personal characteristics, the reaction of man's subconscious is predictably influenced. And to the extent that the decision is a reflection of the subconscious reaction, then the very decision itself is a predictably influenced one.

The difference between a conscious decision and a subconscious one becomes arguably the difference between a decision taken by the organism, that I do not know, and the same decision taken also by the organism, but which this time I know. But I know it after it was already made. Still, it is not a decision done by the conscious, but in both cases the decision is made by the subconscious.

Besides knowing it after it is made, I learn what decision was made, there is one other aspect that may leave the impression that the conscious is the one deciding. Namely, when the conscious communicates the decision to the outside world or when it has an active role in its execution. However neither knowing

about it, nor communicating it or being involved in its execution does not mean that the decision was made by the conscious.

The answer to the question of whether the environment influences the person, and the reward constitutes an act of “training”, becomes a fundamentally affirmative one.

The resulting question is now: If the decision is not free, then can that persons’ judgment and reward be justified?

SUMMARY: This chapter discussed three aspects that lead to impossible situations. I repeat the respective rhetorical questions below:

1. Matter is made => so, is judgment from the one who made it justified?
2. Its reactions are predictable => can this represent a real test then?
3. Decisions are not free => can the author be held accountable if he is not responsible?

MORALITY TEST IS: THE TEST OF HEALTH, INTELLIGENCE, ENVIRONMENT (= ANIMAL TRAINING)

Human morality is supposedly considered by God as a test of the individual's value. If morality is directly dependent on the level of physical and mental health and the influence of the environment, then this is no different than animal training. The animal develops its behavior based on external factors controlled by others.

Creationists claim that God evaluates our moral values. However who is responsible for the lack of morality and how impartial or even justified is this morality test?

Today the dedicated fields of research have established that morality, as part of human behavior in general, is determined by genetic inheritance, passed on from parent to children. And also by the influences of the environment.

If morality is defined *only* by these two categories of factors, then man's "soul" is no longer the one responsible for his behavior, but only the above mentioned factors are. In this case, the following question is raised rightly: To what extent the morality test before God is still justified.

The statistical data demonstrate a dependence on these factors and the resulting conclusions: 1. Children demonstrate behavioral features inherited from their parents and 2. the environment in which man lives correlates predictably with the behavior manifested by him.

QUESTION: Can anyone prove that there is anything else (= soul ?!) besides these two components responsible for the behavior of every human? And if there is, what is it exactly?

If God has the ability to manipulate the involved factors, and according to the qualities attributed to him, there should be no doubt that he could do this, the question is raised: If nevertheless

he chooses not to intervene in order to manipulate these factors, then could he not be held responsible for humans' lack of morality, which as we've seen results just because he did not intervene? In the Justice system there is recognized the guilt by negligence or lack of action – passive guilt.

If the environmental factors are not modified, then the genetic inheritance remains the only option that could be manipulated. In this case what is the point of God allowing some couples to have children, if on the basis of genetic analysis it is determined that they would transmit “undesired” features to their children? And why doesn't he allow only those couples to have children, whose genetic composition determines the production of children with preferred features? Could he not be held accountable that he allows something that predictably will later be condemned by himself? Sometimes the doctor prohibits some couples, on the basis of a similar principle, because of the presence of predictable risks identified in the parents, that these should not have children.

And regarding the other category of mentioned factors, society recognizes the power that the environment can have upon the individual. That is why it designs special programs for reeducation of people with behavioral dysfunctions. And these programs are successful, at least in principle or in high enough percentage so that they maybe convincing and to justify continuing support and financing of those programs.

The conclusion based on experience in the field is that man *can* be (re)educated. And if he would benefit from the right conditions, to be healthy, to have enough understanding ability, then any person that is properly helped could become a completely moral individual. One relevant example in this regard is given by the cases of disadvantaged cubs of wild animals, which could not survive in the wild, but can be saved at the zoo.

Thus modern society's ethic standards prove superior to those contained in the Bible and supported by religion. Research in the field has understood the role of education and consequently the lack of it. Also, mechanisms that determine formation of deviant behavior have been identified, from bad habits to wrong thinking patterns. The exact causes of behavioral problems are

known, the so-called favorable and unfavorable circumstances. That is why today, both in clinical studies as well as in the Justice system they take into account and so responsibility is distributed accordingly among all involved factors. The capital punishment has been abandoned in principle.

Instructing animals to do a certain task is called: training. However the principles do not differ from those involved in the learning process of humans. It involves associations and a reward system. The so-called conditioning system. In principle, just as the biologic behavior is learned, the basic functions of the organism are too: We learn to walk, to see, to eat, to speak and all other functions. And in the same way is the social behavior learned – be it the moral or the immoral one. The moral characteristics are not some absolute qualities, separate and independent properties. But rather, just as they could form wrong, the *can* form right.

If every behavior is learned, both the biologic, as well as the social one, it means that the role of education is absolute. A major part of learning happens in the subconscious. But it is true the phenomenon is far more extensive than we realize most of the times. There are no functions or senses that are not learned.

The animal that does not learn the abilities necessary for adapting to the requirements of the environment during its normal growing period does not survive. In the case of domestic animals, man cares both for them and for their conditions of life. However in the wild, where many cubs die before reaching maturity because of this reason, this test of reality is demonstrated most clearly.

The socially unadapted man, regardless of what deviant behavior he manifests, becomes so because of education, or rather because of flaws in his education during his growing years. Just as in the case of animal cubs, who do not survive. And like the tree, that once grown twisted, it is hard for anyone to fix, but during its growth period, it can be given any desired direction, so animals and man benefit from a key period of growth, which forms them for the rest of their lives. During that time, education has the greatest impact.

In prison, most individuals talk about their problems in childhood and are able to refer to deficiencies during that period and the troubles with adaptation later. This confirms the vital role of education. They mention different moments when their parents at home, or the teachers at school neglected them as children. Then the chain reactions led eventually to problems of adapting – which means conflict with the law. And implicitly the consequences of this conflict, namely punishment.

But could man still make his own decisions, in spite of and independent of the other factors from the material world or even independent from the biological factors of his own body? At chapter 32 I have mentioned the relativity of freedom of choice. Practically, a conscious decision is taken also by the subconscious. But the conscious learns about it after this is already made. Who wants to contradict this statement is invited to do so. The search for arguments could lead to “surprising” results.

But how can the subconscious, namely the biological structure of our organism, react to abstract problems and itself make a decision at this level? Can our biological senses understand abstract notions? Are not these notions only understood by our conscious mind?

The problem lies in the way that we define “abstract”. The description of abstract is always done with reference to the material world. And this can be seen from the expressions used in presenting and communication this notion. Abstract is translated in a way that our material body understands and interpreted at the level of our biological senses. This communication in a language understood by the physical body and perceived by the senses is done on the basis of the universal principle, the one that is used in any kind of learning: through associations.

Decision itself means a choice. But the choice is influenced by the organism’s reactions. And these reactions, in turn, are determined by inherent properties of the substances from which we are made of. Contrary to some impression at first sight, the phenomenon of decision is in no way something specifically human or without correspondence in the material world. Animals take decisions continuously: any interaction between them and their envi-

ronment demands taking some decisions. Technically speaking, the decision represents the reaction to external stimuli. Even nature makes decisions from this perspective: The water of a river meets the Earth landscape and decides to flow on the lower surface of the two terrains. That decision, like decisions taken by animals (and obviously by man too), represents the reaction to some stimuli. In the case of the river, gravity stimulated a reaction from the fluidity of the liquid water encountering a difference between the levels of two surfaces.

Man's decisions, no matter how many they are, how they are perceived by him or how sophisticated they may seem, they function on the basis of and can be reduced to the level of the same fundamental principle. Informatics for example illustrates well how all decisions, no matter how complex, can be reduced to a binary system, which in principle chooses only between two values: 0 and 1. No matter how much someone would try (by the way, this could prove an interesting endeavor), it is impossible to find examples of decisions that have another definition and explanation or that contradict or go beyond the simple model presented here.

In this sense, of a purely materialistic explanation of human morality, I remember the reaction I felt personally during a conversation with a psychologist about two years ago, when he said: "Man is the product of the environment." Besides the fact that I found myself in a horrible environment, which I could not change, and the idea of becoming the product of such environment frightened me, it was also the implication that even the person that I was before, those honorable features of my personality, my habits, values and noble behavior, that I treasured in my person, it meant that those did not belong to me either. But rather all these represent simply the projection of a correspondingly better environment from the past upon my person. In other words, the idea seemed to suggest a simplification that was neither honorable nor correct: a dehumanization.

The immediate reflex was to reject the idea. And I *wanted* to believe that, regardless of the environment, man can reject the pressures that try to mold him and that he is able to impose his

own will in order to follow his proper norms and principles in life. And thus to achieve the goals he set for himself. I considered that the environment cannot force *all* people into a “mold”, or at least not totally. Conforming to the environment should not be absolute, not total.

We do have the option to fight the environment, at least from one perspective. We demonstrate such fighting when we change the environment, or when the environment itself changes. However the fight against the environment is not absolute, meaning that we cannot fight against any environment in general. Rather, the fight against one environment supposes that the individual relates to another. He does not like or does not agree with his current environment and thinks of another preferred environment and tries to live in that environment and to imagine it in his mind.

Reality proves that in time, the individual “forgets” the imagined environment and “adapts” to the current environment, whether he likes it or not. It is the same principle as expressed by the proverb: “Eyes not seen are forgotten.” This is proven by communities of emigrants in a foreign country. If they do not maintain contact with the old community where they came from, no matter how much they fight it or how unbelievable it may seem, they *will* change and take on characteristics from the new environment where they arrived. The same way in prison, no matter how hard one tries to avoid the conditions where he lives and continue to think of the environment he left outside, and try to live not in the world where he is physically captive for a while, but in the world where he comes from and to which he dreams of returning to, it will not be as easy as he might think. If there is enough time passing he will effectively (gradually) forget the outside environment, and the present one unavoidably will leave marks upon the person at multiple levels.

Man functions always by relating to the environment, even when he is not aware of this. Most of the times he chooses his own environment. Not necessarily in the sense that he becomes a monk, but that he is selective in his interactions. For example, people around him may be different. As a result, he will relate

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

differently to every one of them. He will spend more time with those that he shares more in common with and he will be comparably more reserved towards the rest. The ones favorably interacting with him can represent an extremely small percentage, sometimes these can be reduced only to the immediate family members. Man will make this selection and will survive. This minimum percentage of relations represents the Universe for him. That defines him. Specifically, man does not have anything of his *own*, besides what the interactions of his organism with the environment offer him. That is why he cannot be defined apart from the environment. (See chapter 31.)

CONCLUSION: When human morality is tested, in fact it is evaluated the quality of man's physical and mental health together with properties of the environment. Consequently the meaning of a so-called *morality test* of man before God is eliminated.

– THE END –

GROUPING OF ARGUMENTS (SECTIONS):

All 33 arguments (chapters) are grouped in six categories or sections, as follows: 1. *science*, 2. *religion*, 3. *evolution*, 4. *purpose*, 5. *man*, 6. *morality*.

1-7 Science: Using a systematic approach, science has developed a superior methodology based on: logic, transparency, objective observation and critical verification. Thus it has discovered things unknown before and has explained phenomenon not understood up to that time. The result is that the supposed God who held the place of the unknown and unexplained in antiquity, no longer exists. He has been replaced by the natural causes.

8-12 Religion: The success of science has meant the defeat of religion. All erroneous ideas that were supported by religion in antiquity have been corrected now by science. At first, religion has opposed the scientific discoveries. But with the universal confirmation of science in our time, it was forced to give up the fight. It was never supported by evidence, since it reflects the mentality of the time when it originated, when the evidence was yet unknown.

13-19 Evolution: All objective observation of the world around us shows that: 1. The Universe is transforming itself, 2. the causes have a natural basis and 3. the laws of nature are determined by the properties of matter. In other words, this means there was no foreign intervention from God, but the reality of today's material world represents the effect of an evolutionary process which continued from the beginning (and continues even today).

20-24 Purpose: According to the creation version and the principles and qualities attributed to God, we should see evidence of him leading and protecting his creation. But the observations of the real world, the random origin of life, the principles of its existence, disappearance and the causes of life disappearance contra-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

dict such a supposition. Nothing in life's history proves any care for the creation, consequently neither any purpose for it.

25-30 Man: Christian supporters of creation "see" in man the mark of a God from another world and consider him in a different category, separated from animals, that he has something immaterial in his definition and way of action. However this idea is not proven, but rather it is an inherited subjective impression. Taken individually, the so-called "spiritual" qualities of man are in fact 100% material. And the difference between him and the (other) animals or the world around is not qualitative, one of substance, but rather quantitative, one of form.

31-33 Morality: Judging of man as an independent agent with free will before God is contradicted by the scientifically demonstrated reality that his entire behavior, what we generally call "morality", is totally dependent on matter: on genetic inheritance, on material factors, which reflect the quality of creation and the environment. Morality is not given by any characteristic, independent, immaterial, separate or specifically human quality.

DESCRIPTION OF ARGUMENTS:

1. *Science is based on observation (objective), religion on experience (subjective)*

Scientists measure things around us and analyze them according to principles of logic. They are concerned with learning the truth. A Christian, however, experiences at one time in his life the impact of faith in God upon him: If the results of this impact are perceived as beneficial, he will decide to believe in his existence – regardless of the evidence or despite the fact that the same impact can also be explained based on other factors, besides God.

2. *Systematically science has explained 90% of myths => eliminating Biblical basis*

Religion originated in antiquity, when people understood everything with the help of mythology. In the last 400 years, modern science has replaced the mythical image of the cosmos and offered a materialistic, demonstrated explanation of natural phenomenon. Since these material causes were unknown in the past, they used to be attributed to God instead.

3. *Science uses the terms “God” and “creation” improperly => it doesn’t believe them*

Hearing scientists who occasionally use terms like “God” and “creation”, some Christians interpreted this as proof that even in the scientific community, some might believe in the existence of God and creation. However, even if scientists may use such terms, the sense is definitely not the one usually accepted in the religious context.

4. *Police investigators no longer consult psychics => there is no supernatural*

Police stopped consulting psychics in the last centuries, and they did this against their own interests. Not because they didn’t need help, but because all objective verification has proved that those so-called powers do not exist. The reasons must have been seri-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

ous and convincing, as it would otherwise be in their interest to exploit any chance, if there truly was one.

5. *We've been born with God and the Bible => we cannot judge totally impartial*

Just as we show a natural tendency to support our own nationality, place of birth, race ... etc., the fact that we have been born in a geographical area where Christianity is the dominant religion affects our capacity for an objective analysis of all options, especially the opposite ones. We tend to express ourselves in a "biased" way.

6. *We start with 10% myths unexplained by science => to us it seems like a lot*

Today science has explained many things, but there are also things not (yet) explained. If we only look at the present situation, we may be tempted to consider that the ones not explained are "many". But if we consider the whole history of the scientific progress in the last four centuries, things not (yet) explained prove to be relatively "few".

7. *Creation is based on the 10% unexplained by science => called God of 'voids'*

Creationists often accuse "evolution" of being ridiculous since it claims that intelligent things originated from non-intelligent things. However creation has always been based only on the lack of explanations, which "conveniently" left room for a Creator. And when science reduces the list of unexplained phenomenon, creation comes to support a God of voids.

8. *The East converts to Christianity while the West loses faith => it's a cycle*

New conversions have given some the impression that modern society might be recognizing the truth of religion. However the level where the East finds itself now was experimented by the West already long before, and so this conversion to Christianity

can be associated rather with a beginning stage in the development of a society.

9. Authenticity of Bible stories is confirmed only by the authors of the Biblical text

In the absence of historical confirmations, their authenticity is supported by a circular reasoning: 1. NT describes some important personalities, 2. these personalities guarantee with their name and reputation the value of the text, 3. but that very text gave them authority.

10. Diet: fruits only (in Eden) => not recommended by nutrition specialists

Today there is debate among nutritionists regarding percentages and quantities of food. Some recommend a more or less vegetarian diet, however none would recommend a diet based exclusively on fresh fruits from trees. Even though food is not related to spirituality, it is to be expected however that a book from God would be exact in every aspect that it touches on.

11. Avoidance, self-justification, personal attacks => signal the lack of arguments

The talk about God is not easy, people do not discuss this subject in a calm, normal way. Comparing a regular conversation with this discussion, we'll be able to see right away the difference of attitude. Any change in the tone of voice, gestures, personal manifestations indicates fear, which in turn is a sure sign of the lack of arguments.

12. A guilty person hiding something avoids verification (Bible demands: "faith")

Just as respect is earned as a result of a proper behavior, also trust can be strengthened as a result of proper evidence being presented. However the New Testament does not insist upon the evidence at all, but jumps directly to the result. It over-

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

emphasizes, suspiciously and contrary to the natural course the need for “faith”.

13. *Darwin didn't prove the evolution completely, but offered a very probable hypothesis*

The theory of evolution has developed in stages, and the evidence was discovered over time. Critics have often attacked the man Charles Darwin and his ideas. However Darwin never claimed to have demonstrated it completely. Thus he is being accused of something he did not even claim. The theory just started with him, so it would be unfair to attack its beginnings.

14. *90% of eco-system's causes are explained => we can expect the rest 10% will be too*

Nature functions by itself, that's why it has been called “eco-system”. Even though some phenomenon are not (yet) explained, they can be inferred based on the ones already understood. And if all research up till now has revealed material causes, it is expected that the ones not (yet) known will also be material – therefore not a supposed hand of Got.

15. *Life appeared too late and slow to be the result of divine intervention*

Life in all its forms, flora and fauna, has appeared billions of years after the formation of the planets and of the solar system. Then, between the appearance of different species there have passed many millions of years. This reality contradicts the Biblical description that God created everything in the course of a week by pronouncing a simple “word”.

16. *Comet ISON 23.11.2013 contains water => so the Earth is not unique*

Until relatively recently it was thought that Earth was unique and that life elements are found only here. Now we know that this is not so, but the elements on our planet are the same as in all galaxies and in all the material Universe. So Earth is in no way

unique, there is no proof of a special hand here, but nature is the same and it functions the same way everywhere.

17. Instinct not understood suggested a purpose, now it's explained (without a Creator)

Parts of animals' behavior that were not understood led to a suspected mysterious "hand" of God. However, once understood, the animal instinct does not demonstrate anything mysterious, but it has received a normal, scientific explanation, namely a materialistic one.

18. DNA shared between man-primates, or cats species => is a determining factor

Man and primates share more of their DNA structure even than do different species of cats. Today, DNA matching is accepted as official proof of family relationship. The fact that both flora, and fauna, including man share the same DNA structure fits very well with the version proposed by evolution, that all species developed from one another.

19. Africans appeared first, but they also resemble primates (most of all races)

The observation that out of all human races Africans appeared first and that they look most similar to primates again fits very well with the evolution proposal that man came from primates. And also that initially the transformation has happened in Africa.

20. Birth is random: due to random successful insemination

Both in the case of vegetation, animals and also humans, birth takes place as a result of fecundation between a male and a female. This dependence on material factors contradicts the version of creation by a God who should have a purpose for life.

21. Entire species (majority) disappeared over time (without any sense or purpose)

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

At Noah's Flood a few pairs of animals were saved for the purpose of preserving the species. The historical reality shows that in the course of time most species that ever lived have disappeared. And this truth contradicts the idea presented by the story of the Flood, that God had created all species, that they have a purpose and that he would care for them.

22. Life's disappearing is random: due to uncontrolled natural catastrophes

Since the time and manner of life's disappearance were decided by the uncontrolled forces of nature, this indicates also that no one intervened. Those lives had no purpose, their disappearance served no one, it was not coordinated, much less prevented by a God who would have a purpose for and an interest in his creation.

23. Creatures that eat other creatures => have been made this way by design

Creatures feed on other creatures due to a series of characteristics of their body structure. If God created all of them, then this means that he designed them to eat one another. But this present and past reality about flora and fauna contradicts the Biblical description that God had intended peace among them and for all to feed exclusively on grass.

24. Flora and fauna: unexplained level of complexity, still they disappear forever

Creationists claim that the level of complexity in itself represents proof of purpose: No one would build something very complex just to abandon it forever. Thus they are convinced that there has to be eternal life for man. However this argument is contradicted by the reality that all flora and fauna are characterized by the same complexity and still do not have eternal life.

25. For humans we "see" a purpose => because we relate to ourselves (subjective)

Creationists appeal to sentiment and claim that it would be unmerciful for God to create so many beings, just to let them suffer. However flora and fauna have always suffered similar losses. The loss is perceived differently for humans, only because the one analyzing it is also man, and therefore the perception is subjective.

26. Life's pleasures are not for our happiness => but they satisfy needs

The cycle of pleasures matches the cycle of needs. If man's life is motivated by pleasures, then he lives in order to satisfy certain needs. This closed circle is the same for the rest of the material world: every effect has a material cause. Therefore there is no separate, superior, divine purpose left for the human existence.

27. The sky is blue not for our eyes enjoyment, but due to its composition

The color blue is simply an inherent material reaction. Is it possible that God had made the sky blue for the enjoyment of human eyes? This is possible only in the sense that he could have anticipated this aspect at the creation of matter itself. But, since there is no evidence of alteration of the properties of matter, his later intervention for this purpose is not probable.

28. Senses, emotions, feelings: reduced to a few basic ones (= animal)

Human feelings are complex and, at first, they look impressive. However, taken individually, they prove to be derived from just a few basic ones. And these few are also found in animals. So man is not separated from animals in this regard either. Which means that evolution could provide for this complexity of human inner experiences too.

29. The brain is imitated, equated, outrun by: computers and software(in principle)

EVOLUTION vs. CREATION

Some have been tempted to think that our brain might contain an immaterial component. However, taken individually, each of the brain's abilities and characteristics can be replicated by technology. So nothing "mysterious" from another world is present in our brain.

30. Difference from (other) animals = one dimension extra (of the same category)

The difference between humans and animals is rather one of surface, subjective, definitely relative. Taken individually, the differences refer rather to the results produced by humans, not the causes that determined them. The causes differ very little, though the results can differ a lot. Evolution is responsible only for modifying the causes, but the results came implicit.

31. Personality: is random and changing => with no merits of its own

Man's personality is determined to a high degree by the genetic inheritance (from his parents). Therefore it is random, independent of the individual's will. Later it changes under the influence of the environment. So it is not stable. If this is what makes up the individual, then he is neither planned in advance, nor eternal, or separated from the material world.

32. Freedom of choice and obedience represent simply: reactions of matter

God supposedly judges free will and obedience, which are considered to be exclusively features of man. If the human body is made entirely of matter, then the decisions taken by man are reduced to simple decisions of the body, which means: reactions of the matter that he is made of. So God would "judge" the reactions of matter, the creator of which is himself?!

33. Morality test is: the test of health, intelligence, environment (= animal training)

Human morality is supposedly considered by God as a test of the individual's value. If morality is directly dependent on the level of physical and mental health and the influence of the environment, then this is no different than animal training. The animal develops its behavior based on external factors controlled by others.