

# What Do You See?

By Randolph Roper, Sr.

When high school science teacher, James Galilei, a direct descendant of the famous scientist Galileo Galilei, is ordered to appear before the Florence County School Board to answer questions concerning his teaching of Darwinian evolution, practically the whole county shows up for the hearing.

What Do You See?

Copyright © 2007 by Randolph T. Roper, Sr.  
All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be  
reproduced in any form without the written permission  
of the publisher.

Revised 2010, 2014, 2016

Published by Randolph T. Roper, Sr.  
Richmond, Va.

Editing by Laura Martin, Randy Roper, Jr., and Connie  
Thompson

Cover design by Lynda Roper

Printed in the United States of America

**Please take your seats...we're about to begin...please take your seats. My name is Bill Bishop, and I am the superintendent of the school board of Florence County. Let the minutes show that this session will be in the form of an inquiry to determine if James Galilei can continue teaching science in our district. The other members of the school board on my left are Jason Priest, Tom Scopes, Charles Darrow, and Jim Pope. Mr. Priest, you may begin the questioning.**

**Mr. Galilei, what do you see?** You are holding up a diagram, a very simplified one, of the DNA double helix, the blueprint to all life. **Is this a design?** Yes it is. **And you are aware, are you not, that Darwin said that all design in nature is an illusion?** Yes, I am aware of that, yes sir. **And you still see a design?** Yes, I do. **Are you aware that most scientists, many with far greater scientific credentials than yourself, all agree that this is not a design, but an accident of atoms evolving by means of natural selection to the complexity we see today?** Yes, I am aware of that, but if I may I would like to expand on my answer. **You may do so.**

Thank you sir. When Darwin peered through his primitive microscope 150 years ago he saw a cell with protoplasm and some fluid in the nucleus and called it "the simple cell." Today, with electron microscopes that magnify the cell 1 million times, we have discovered that the cell is anything but simple. Rather, it is an inconceivably complex manufacturing plant, with actual "machines" made from molecules and an intricate system of interlocking assembly lines and even machines inside of machines. We actually see them and can see how they work. We see an incredibly complex mechanism with a purposeful program. There are over 75 helper substances within the nucleus which all have to function without mistake at specific moments in order for the DNA/RNA mechanism to synthesize protein. The DNA contains all the genetic information for building a living organism, whether a human, a hamster, a tree or flower, or even a simple amoeba. It also contains all the genetic information needed to construct new cells as cells die, and integrate them into the organism in order to maintain the organism. Proteins are the chemicals of life. Our bodies are an assemblage of thousands of proteins of various types, including enzymes, hemoglobin, and insulin which are also proteins. The proteins are composed of amino acid chains.

The DNA strand resembles a twisted ladder with rungs called nucleotides consisting of four different chemicals. The nucleotides determine the traits of each organism – whether plant or animal. A simple, ancient trilobite would have approximately 3 million nucleotides all arranged in a specific order. A human being has approximately 3 billion nucleotides. Instead of a binary software system, the original genetic engineer used four units (bases)—adenine, thymine, guanine, and cytosine (A-T-G-C) grouped into triplets, providing an enormously more sophisticated capability than our binary system. It is a software system far more advanced than our super computers use, and of course, far more miniaturized. Talk about nanotechnology! Moreover, we see within the cell information storage and retrieval systems and replicating systems -- it is mind-boggling!

**Mr. Galilei, I don't really see why this is necessary. You are taking up the board's valuable time.**

With all due respect, Mr. Bishop, I am going somewhere with this and I would like to continue if I may.

**You may proceed, but please be brief.**

Thank you. Gentlemen, human intelligence can assemble a 747 Jumbo jet using 4.5 million non-flying parts. But a single living cell has billions of non-living molecules organized into a design with a purpose. Even the DNA molecule in a single-celled bacterium, the earth's vital cleanup crew—the decomposers and recyclers of nature's nutrients—contains more information than all the books in any of the world's largest libraries. It is more complicated than the space shuttle! You say the design is an illusion, but I cannot say that.

**Then you are saying that God created the cell and thus you are injecting religion into the science classroom.**

I am saying that at the very least, an intellect far greater than man's intellect, made the cell and devised the DNA blueprint. Should not the main goal of science be to find the truth?

**Mr. Galilei, do you believe in natural selection?**

Yes, I do. But I would like to expand on my answer.

**Please do, sir.**

First, let's define what is meant by evolution. There are two types: micro and macro. Micro or horizontal evolution is not contested by any scientists. It is the process whereby minor variations in the gene pool of every organism result in different types of dogs, pigeons, flies, etc., and then, via natural selection, every species can spread throughout the earth. In fact, the term "natural selection" was actually coined by a pre-Darwin creationist, Edward Blyth, to explain the method whereby species were able to adapt to different ecological conditions. It is sometimes described as "fruit flies in a jar" evolution in which different types of flies are produced. Another example would be bacteria evolving into other strains that are resistant to antibiotics. It is simply variation within type. Macro-evolution, however, is vertical evolution whereby an organism would evolve into a higher form or what is referred to as "fish to philosopher." When Darwin saw evidence of micro-evolution on the Galapagos islands, he made a giant leap of imagination, and assumed that vertical or macro-evolution must also be true. It is when natural selection is used to explain macro-evolution that I and many other scientists are skeptical, and it has never been seen in any way, especially in the fossil record. Just think of it, there are thousands of missing links. No fossils have been discovered showing an organism caught in the process of evolving to a higher species. By now we should have thousands of such fossils! The silence from the evolutionists on this vital point is deafening. Darwin also saw this as a serious objection that could be lodged against his theory, but again, he believed that in the future fossils would be discovered that supported his claims. They have not, even after 150 years.

**Evolutionists strongly disagree. They say they have many transitional fossils to point to.**

They have only two. Archaeopteryx, which they claim is transitional between a dinosaur and a bird, and Tiktaalik, thought to be transitional between a fish and an amphibian. But Archaeopteryx is simply all bird with hollow bones, asymmetrical feathers for flight, a wish bone in the breast for the down stroke, etc. And Tiktaalik has been discarded by scientists because they have subsequently found fossilized footprints of land animals dated 18 million years prior to Tiktaalik, by evolutionist dating, so

he clearly could not be transitional. But my point is that, if vertical evolution is true, we should have thousands of transitional fossils in the fossil record, as animals are slowly evolving over eons of time. For example, we should have reptile fossils with 90% forelegs and 10% wing sprouts as they are transitioning into birds; 80% forelegs and 20% wing sprouts; 50% of each; and then...

**We get the picture, Mr. Galilei.**

Well, we should have discovered thousands and thousands of these fossils as they are transitioning into higher life forms, but they are simply not there. The fact that evolutionists are spending so much time on just two, bogus ones at that, shows how desperate they are to salvage a theory in crisis.

**Mr. Galilei, we may find many more missing links in the future, the final chapter on the fossil record has not been written.**

But should the text books keep saying that we have numerous transitional fossils when we do not?

**Getting back to DNA, nearly all mainstream scientists believe in evolution. They believe the DNA molecule and DNA code came about by accident of atoms and natural selection. You are in such a minority!**

Mr. Priest, I believe that most scientists are pursuing their respective careers in their chosen fields and frankly have not thought much about evolution and the DNA code. They have not taken time to really study it since they were in college and then they just wanted to get through the life origins course and get on with the branch of science they were most interested in. They are busy as chemists, biologists, physicists, doctors, research scientists, etc., and are not interested in life origins science. They are assuming that the life origins scientists are giving them the right information. Many of these scientists, upon being challenged to investigate the evidence for themselves, are coming to the same conclusions that I have reached. In the last dozen years or so, even notable PhD scientists—evolutionists who don't believe in creationism—have been criticizing their fellow evolutionist scientists for absurd beliefs about life's origins.

**Name one.**

OK. I would like to start with the late Dr. Robert Shapiro—died June 2011—former professor emeritus of chemistry and senior research scientist at New York University. He received his doctorate from Harvard and was a leading organic chemist who specialized in DNA research. When being introduced to speak at Harvard on life origins, he was introduced as one of the world's leading experts. He was not interested in life origins theories until he picked up a paper years ago written by some leading life-origin scientists, and was astounded that they were confidently claiming that DNA developed by random association of molecules in the primordial pools of water millions of years ago. As an organic chemist, he knew that water is lethal to DNA. He knew from his own laboratory experiments that water quickly begins kicking off nucleotides, the coding parts of DNA, in a process known as DNA depurination. Any organic chemists in the audience, which includes the wider viewing TV audience, will immediately know that this refers to the purine bases, adenine and guanine, but Shapiro also discovered that under certain physiological conditions, water disconnected the pyrimidine bases also. In other words, Shapiro was fond of saying that water “does nasty things to DNA.” So here is the question—how could DNA form in the primordial pools of water when DNA dissolves in water?

Gentlemen, this is a major hole in the theory of evolution.

**Mr. Galilei, there is such strong quantitative support that all living organisms are descended from a common ancestor...I really don't see how this line of speculation on DNA formation is relevant.**

Mr. Darrow, with all due respect, even though you don't think it's relevant, the world's leading evolutionists are in agreement that it's very relevant. They are admitting that they have not done enough research on the base or roots of Darwin's tree of life, where non-living matter becomes living matter—that they have continually pushed the thorny problem aside for decades to concentrate solely on variation of living organisms. Now they are exhorting their evolutionist colleagues, as Dr. Shapiro was doing, to address this huge challenge to Darwin's theory. All scientists agree that DNA is the blueprint to all life, whether plant or animal, and that without the blueprint, living organisms cannot develop from non-living elements.

**Mr. Galilei, I have a scientist friend who admitted this problem with DNA, but said that life-origin scientists are now asserting that RNA, which is a single strand molecule, was able to develop in water. Therefore the double strand of DNA obviously evolved from the RNA single strand.**

Mr. Scopes, unfortunately your scientist friend is giving you an old theory that now has been completely rejected by leading evolutionary scientists. In fact, when evolutionists reluctantly rejected DNA synthesis in water due to their respect for Dr. Shapiro, they quickly jumped to the conclusion that RNA must have developed. But once again they gave heed to Dr. Shapiro who informed them that the RNA in water synthesis hypothesis was even more absurd than the DNA synthesis theory. And that is because RNA is even more fragile than DNA. Dr. Shapiro once said that he was always running out of metaphors to explain the difficulty of random synthesis of RNA. But one example he used is this. Suppose you had a huge scrabble set with letters on the blocks of every language on earth assembled in a big pile. And then you took a scoop and scooped out a bunch of these scrabble blocks, and pitched them out on the lawn, and the letters fell in a line that spelled out in English, “To be or not to be, that is the question”—that would be roughly the same odds as RNA coming together in water. Even though Dr. Shapiro became known as “Dr. No” among the world's elite life origins scientists, so great was his reputation that they simply could no longer advance a theory with such astronomical odds against its occurring.

**Mr. Galilei, with enough time anything is possible...and...**

Well, I disagree and will address that in a moment. But the RNA synthesis in water theory has been out of favor with evolutionist leaders for quite a while now.

**But Mr. Galilei, Dr. Shapiro remained in the evolutionist camp until his death did he not?**

That is correct.

**So he obviously believed that DNA eventually did come together in some way...right?**

Yes he did. But such is the problem of life originating by natural, random processes, that even this brilliant scientist, who was introduced at Harvard's annual Origins of Life lecture series in 2008 as “one

of the most well-known scholars on life's earliest spark,” had to resort to pure speculation on how it might have happened. He speculated that some sort of self-sustaining chemical reaction involving simple molecules grew more complex, replicated, and eventually led to the creation of genetic material like RNA. He was famous for saying, “Metabolism first, not RNA.”

**Well, there you have it...a perfectly reasonable theory of how it might have come about.**

Again, with all due respect, it is speculation—not scientific theory. In order for a scientific explanation to reach the level of scientific theory, it must become a well-substantiated explanation through the scientific method, and must be repeatedly tested and confirmed through observation and experimentation. Dr. Shapiro's “theory” was in fact merely a hunch, with no experimentation to back it up, and again I stress that DNA comes apart in water, so how could it come together in water? I am talking science here today—not hunches...not fictional stories.

**Mr. Galilei, the breakthrough may come any day proving his “hunch” as you say. And again, as I said before, with time anything is possible, and 4 billion years of earth's history is plenty of time for the “impossible” to become possible.**

Gentlemen, there is another huge hole in the theory of evolution at the most basic level regarding that time argument.

**Really Mr. Galilei, before you inform us on the limitations of 4 billion years, let me inform you of the time constraints of this hearing, and your time is rapidly expiring...Ok, stop the laughter...order...we will have order! Visitors who cannot keep respectfully silent will be ordered to leave. Go on Mr. Galilei.**

Consider this. The DNA molecule is, as you know, in the form of a double helix—the familiar twisted ladder as I have mentioned. Now the sides of the DNA “ladder” consist of alternating phosphate and sugar molecules, the latter is termed deoxyribose, making up part of the familiar acronym DNA, which stands for deoxyribonucleic acid.

**Just a moment, Mr. Galilei. Please explain to the board why it is called deoxyribose sugar since you seem to be passing yourself off as an authority on DNA.**

Well, even though I am not an expert on DNA, I keep up with the latest research and peer-reviewed papers, and I have taught organic chemistry in pre-med college courses. Deoxyribose sugar, a monosaccharide, is derived from ribose sugar, a single-ring pentose or 5-carbon sugar, but missing the hydroxyl or OH group on the 2 prime carbon (2' carbon). In other words, it has lost an oxygen atom compared with ribose sugar, and thus the prefix “deoxy.” This is important because the 2 prime hydroxyl group in RNA restricts it to a single strand, whereas its lack in DNA permits the double strand, familiarly known as the double helix, by means of which an awesome amount of genetic information is stored in digital form.

**Proceed Mr. Galilei.**

But like many molecules in nature, the ribose and deoxyribose sugar molecules are chiral, meaning that there are equal numbers of left-handed and right-handed ones in nature. They are mirror images of each

other. But the DNA structure uses only right-handed sugar molecules. How can random associations account for this?

The evolutionists are also perplexed by the chiral nature of amino acids of which proteins are composed. Incidentally, many people think of proteins as simply a dietary consideration when perusing food labels. But actually, proteins are the building blocks of our entire bodies. You have probably heard that our hair is simply a type of protein, but it surprises most people that our bodies are comprised of some 50,000 different types of proteins somewhat like Lego blocks. Our hearts are made up of heart proteins, our kidneys are a different protein, our brains another, etc., and even our skin, the hemoglobin in our blood, enzymes, hormones—all are different types of proteins. But unlike Lego blocks, every protein is a different shape. Now, when proteins are being synthesized within the cell, only left-handed amino acids are used. If a right-hand amino acid gets mixed in, the amino chain will self-destruct. Again, there are equal numbers of left-handed and right-handed amino acids in nature, and there are over 500 of them, but life only uses 20, but the point I'm making is this: out of the 500 chiral amino acids, DNA only codes for 20 left-handed ones. Many proteins are made up of amino acid chains that are hundreds and even thousands of units in length before the protein is completed, at which point it folds into a three-dimensional shape. Do you see that, in light of these facts, just saying that millions or billions of years is somehow the answer is not...

**Mr. Galilei, I'm sure the evolutionists have answers to all of these so-called statistical improbabilities and there is no need to continue trying to convince us along these lines.**

Perhaps I can put this another way to help you see what I mean.

**Go ahead. But I want you to know that you are not doing yourself any good with these arguments.**

Perhaps, but I'd like to try. I want to give an illustration of the astronomical odds against even one protein being formed by random association of amino acids in the warm, primordial ponds envisioned by evolutionists. I will use an illustration provided by Dr. Stephen C. Meyer in his book, *Darwin's Doubt* published in 2013. Since amino acids are strung together in long chains according to the DNA code, I would like for a moment for the members of the board and the viewing audience to picture a bike combination lock with three dials each numbering from one to ten digits. In that case, there are 10 to the third power ( $10^3$ ) or 1000 possible combinations but only one will open the lock. Now, let's assume that instead of three dials, we have a lock with five dials. In that case...

**Mr. Galilei, is this really necessary? The board members are all familiar with powers of ten.**

I am well aware of that, sir, and I promise not to be tedious with illustrations.

**All right, please proceed.**

Thank you, sir. As I was saying, in a lock with five dials, the combinatorial possibilities would be 10 to the fifth power ( $10^5$ ) or 100,000 possibilities. As you know, with every unit increase in the power, the previous number is multiplied by 10. So ten to the sixth power ( $10^6$ ) would be ten times 100,000 or one million and so on. A bike lock with ten dials would be ten to the tenth power ( $10^{10}$ ) or ten billion. And a lock with 100 dials would be a number so astronomically large—a 1 with a hundred zeros after



it—that we have no name for it.

Now, I would like to relate this bike lock illustration, as Dr. Meyer did, to the chain of amino acids in a protein. Many proteins have amino acid units numbering in the thousands, but I will use an average protein length of 300 amino acid units for my illustration. In that case, the number of possible amino acid sequences would be twenty to the three hundredth power ( $20^{300}$ ), because instead of 10 digits in the bike lock dials, we now are dealing with 20 amino acids used to create proteins. In mathematics, we now convert this number to a power of 10 which would be ten to the three hundred and ninetieth power ( $10^{390}$ )—a number so large we cannot comprehend it. And remember, only one of the combinatorial sequences would produce a functional protein three hundred units in length. To bring that number into perspective, the number of atoms in our Milky Way galaxy is estimated by astronomers to be ten to the sixty-ninth power ( $10^{69}$ ), and the total number of atoms in the observable universe is estimated to be ten to the eightieth power ( $10^{80}$ ). Gentlemen, how many years, or rather, how many millions or billions of years would it take for random association of amino acids to hook up correctly to construct an average length protein, when there are ten to the three hundred and ninetieth power combinatorial possibilities for sequencing of the amino acids—referred to as sequence space by probability experts—and only one combination will result in a functional protein that then folds up into a three dimensional shape used in life? And remember, the odds against it occurring are increased exponentially even above this, since nature could only use 20 amino acids out of the 500 which occur in nature, and the odds would again increase exponentially above that since only left-handed amino acids can be used to make proteins. Gentlemen, I submit to you that it would be impossible for random association to construct even one protein in the 4.5 billion years of earth's history as estimated by evolutionists.

**Mr. Galilei, since none of the panel members are scientists, we have enlisted the services of a noted life origins scientist, Dr. Aldous Spencer, who would like to comment on your last statement. Dr. Spencer.**

**Thank you. Mr. Galilei, you are in error that only one sequence of amino acids in your illustration will produce a functional protein. The protein chains of amino acids, or residues as protein chemists refer to them, will tolerate a certain number of substitute residues, thereby greatly decreasing the odds against randomly occurring protein synthesis in sequence space.**

Dr. Spencer, I agree that some very limited substitutions can take place due to genetic mutation in the DNA in a large population of life forms. However, such residue substitutions are usually injurious to the health of the organism and would certainly not be a survival benefit to the earliest life forms or their progeny. And I realize that some codons in the genetic code can code for two different amino acids. But please note that my illustration only involved the synthesis of a single protein, not a life form consisting of hundreds or thousands of proteins. And I must emphasize again, that your answer did not take into account that the amino acids must be assembled by random processes from only 20 left-handed amino acids out of 500 left and right-handed amino acids in that warm, primordial pond you evolutionists envision. And I also want to point out, especially to the wider viewing audience, that after decades of trying, scientists have not been able to assemble even one protein under highly controlled laboratory conditions.

**Mr. Galilei, apparently you are not aware of the tremendous advances in synthetic protein synthesis such as being carried on at Princeton University and other research laboratories.**

Dr. Spencer, I am aware of such research, but the synthetic proteins are “protein like” but not the actual proteins found in our bodies. And besides, even if scientists eventually do create a protein like the natural cellular ones made according to the DNA code, it only shows that intelligence is required to do so.

**All right, enough of this protein debate. Mr. Galilei, we must move on.**

I understand. But before leaving this DNA discussion, I would like to mention that only 2 percent of DNA is used for coding protein assembly, and the 98 percent of non-coding DNA has been designated “junk DNA” by DNA scientists. The evolutionists were quick to jump on this as a powerful argument against intelligent design, since a god or a supernatural intelligence would certainly not leave so much non-productive trash in the DNA molecule. To evolutionists this so-called junk DNA was a clear indication of evolution and natural selection. But in 2012, the Encode Project, which stands for the Encyclopedia of DNA Elements, launched by the US Human Genome Research Institute in 2003, as a follow-up to the Human Genome Project, produced an impressive series of over 30 papers published in some of the top scientific journals. Their findings shocked the scientific world. They had discovered that the “junk DNA” contained millions of gene switches for turning genes on and off to produce the proteins that were needed at precise times. According to Time Magazine's September 6, 2012 edition, in an article entitled *Junk DNA—Not So Useless After All*, the so-called “biological waste-land” has suddenly become the new and exciting frontier of genome research. And, of course, scientists are excited about the potential of such research for curing diseases, and that is exciting I admit, but should not the scientists take a step back and ask themselves some searching questions about Darwinian Evolution in light of all this complexity. In another article, I read that one DNA scientist admitted that prior to the Encode reports, he thought he basically understood DNA, but now he feels like he is just beginning all over again to understand it.

Another result of the Encode project is the discovery of a second code within the coding section of DNA written on top of the code which instructs for protein assembly. This second software language instructs the cell on how genes are controlled. The second language was written on top of the other which is why it remained hidden so long. This discovery was made by a University of Washington research team led by Dr. John Stamatoyannopoulos.

So in just the last few years, scientists have discovered millions of switches in the non-coding section of DNA, and a second language in the coding section of DNA. Gentlemen, I am only asking you to allow questioning of Darwinian evolutionary theory in the classroom using science only, as I have been doing just now, and not referring at all to religion or Christianity. I ask this due to its weakness in addressing the origin of life—how it developed from non-living matter. I submit that Darwin's book, *On the Origin of the Species*, published in 1859, does not address the origins of living matter from non-living matter as its title implies. And it is ironic that millions of people, who have never read the book, mistakenly believe that it does.

**But if we allow you to do that, Mr. Galilei—to question Darwinian evolution—it will lead to religion in the classroom which is anathema to sound science.**

It may have implications for faith, that is true, but that should not be allowed to quench the search for truth, nor should any scientific theory be off limits to rigorous debate due to implications of any kind.

**It is too great a risk for impressionable, young minds, and we need more of our youth going into science instead of the ministry.**

Mr. Pope, neo-Darwinism—the vertical evolution of organisms due to genetic mutations—is coming under increased attack not only from creationists, but also from evolutionists. The leading geneticists now realize that mutations occurring in a species after it has developed can only produce very minor changes—not nearly enough to advance and equip that life form or its offspring with a survival benefit leading to a higher life form. To do that, the genetic mutation must originate during the early development of the embryo. For decades scientists have been doing experiments manipulating gene mutations in the embryos of fruit flies. But what they have created are weird, pathetic, damaged creatures which are blind or crippled, or with legs growing out of their heads, or with an extra set of wings, etc. And all these mutations have resulted in early death. For example, the extra set of wings did not have the necessary muscular, circulatory, nerve systems, etc., and simply obstructed the operation of the normal wings, so the fly could not fly. So now geneticists are facing what Georgia Tech geneticist John McDonald has called a “great Darwinian Paradox.” It is this and I paraphrase: genes that are variable in an organism only effect minor changes in form and function, whereas genes that govern major changes necessary for vertical or macro-evolution...and I'll quote now, “apparently do not vary, or vary only to the detriment of the organism.” As Dr. Meyer summarized it and I quote, “The kind of mutations we need for major evolutionary change we don't get; the kind we get we don't need.”

**Dr. Spencer, do you want to answer this?**

**Yes, thank you. Mr. Galilei, the scientists are speeding things up as they excitedly search for answers and thus the damaged fruit flies etc. But that is the beauty of Darwinism. These changes took place slowly over eons of time and thus did not damage the organisms but rather improved them.**

Dr. Spencer, I must respectfully disagree. Developmental geneticists are now realizing that is not the case. They have learned through all these genetic experiments that all the major systems of every organism are functionally interrelated. If you make a change in one system by means of a mutation, you must make changes in many other major systems also because they all developed in the embryo dependent on one another. And they must be done at the same time—not little by little over long periods of time. Let me put it another way as Dr. Meyer did. When a new car is nearing the end of its production on the assembly line, minor changes can be made such as painting it a different color, or changing the seats, etc. But if, during the early assembly of the car, an engineer makes a change in the blue print for the length of the piston rods in the car's engine, without also making necessary changes in the crank shaft, the engine will not run. And it is the same way with living organisms. In order to effect a significant change in an organism, there must be multiple, coordinated mutations, not simply a mutation in a single gene.

**Mr. Galilei, you are in such a minority. Why should we listen to you and other creationists when the vast majority of scientists believe in evolution?**

Mr. Darrow, I have here a list of over 1000 scientists, many with doctoral degrees, from every scientific discipline, who have signed a form entitled, “A Scientific Dissent from Darwinism.” I will read the statement they signed and I quote: “We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for

Darwinian theory should be encouraged.”

**Mr. Galilei, I am appalled that you would try to mislead the public in this way. All reputable scientists totally support Darwinian evolutionary theory. I don't know of such a list and, for the record, let it be shown that Mr. Galilei's list of supposed doctoral scientists is highly suspect to say the least.**

Mr. Bishop, I would like to submit this scientist dissent list to be included in the record of this hearing. These are scientists from leading universities and research centers not only in the United States but from around the world. The reason so many reputable scientists are signing this dissent statement is due to the many weaknesses in Darwinian theory now coming to light, some of which I am exposing in this hearing.

**Absolutely not. Mrs. Blake, you will not include Mr. Galilei's list in the record, is that clear? Very well, let's move on.**

Mr. Bishop, if you will not include the list in the formal record of this hearing, then I have no other choice but to hold up the website address to the cameras where our viewers can peruse the list for themselves and make their own decision. Here is the link. Just snap a picture of it, or research “Scientists Dissent List” and click on Discovery Institute's PDF version.

<http://www.discovery.org/scripts/viewDB/filesDB-download.php?id=660>

**Get that sign down...security—get that sign from him...don't zoom the cameras in on that...**

Remember—Scientists Dissent List.

**Bring the sign to me. Mr. Galilei, if you try another stunt like that you will bring this hearing to an abrupt end, and by so doing it will not bode well for your case. Mr. Priest, I believe you have a question.**

**Yes, thank you. Mr. Galilei, we are simply asking you and other creationists to be reasonable. The evidence against creation is very clear to the majority of scientists and to most people. You are simply on the wrong side of history. Creationism is an out-dated philosophy in light of modern science.**

Mr. Priest, so far in this inquiry, I have been stating the intelligent design position with science, and answering every question from your panel with science. But the members of the board, and you just now, have primarily been using one mantra during this whole discussion—namely the majority of scientists argument. And that argument is becoming very weak when 1000 doctoral scientists are willing to sign a dissent from Darwinism form. The creationist scientists can no longer be classified as a small minority of kooks.

**Mr. Galilei, even if that list were valid, and that is highly questionable, it is still a small minority among the world's scientists, and it is foolish to go against such a well-entrenched scientific theory.**

There you go again—using the same old, tired mantra. Mr. Priest, what do you see? **You are holding up a picture of an early telegraph system, but may I remind you that we are asking the questions here.** I understand, but please bear with me a moment. One might say that this telegraph system consists of a sending station, transmission wires, a receiving station, etc. and even go into great detail of how the components work. And one might even be convinced that it all came about by chance over eons of time—although I could not be, but perhaps you could—**please Mr. Galilei, skip the sarcasm.** But there is a key component missing in all this description of the telegraph system that is completely separate from the components itself. It is the Morse Code. This code consists, as you know, of dots and dashes that stand for letters and a series of these coded letters make up words and the words of course can make up sentences and paragraphs. In other words, the code is separate from the telegraph components. It is a language for communication. I could use the code to communicate the sentence “empirical science is science observed” by using the telegraph apparatus, or by using smoke signals, or by tapping on a wall. All codes that we know of are designed by minds. Therefore, the medium is not the message, but simply a means to transmit the message. The DNA code can be compared to letters on a page. Letters don’t have to be in any precise arrangement, or they can be arranged to communicate a Shakespearean play. And that is the same with the DNA code. The nucleotides don’t have to be arranged like they are, but somehow they are arranged to communicate information far more complex than a Shakespearean play. One may not even believe in the God of the Bible and still see that a super-intelligent mind had to design all this. I believe that anyone can detect design. I don’t have to have a PhD in geology to tell that a pebble shaped by the random action of environmental forces over time is different from an Indian arrowhead which was shaped by intelligence.

**Mr. Galilei, so far, at least in my view, your comments are not nearly persuasive enough. The vast majority of scientists are all in agreement. The evidence is overwhelming! They are as sure of this as your ancestor who saw through his telescope the movement of the planets around the sun in the 1600’s.**

May I address that, sir?

**If you must.**

Now scientists are also seeing through a *telescope*, an inverted one called the electron microscope, and making discoveries just as startling and which also challenge the orthodoxy of our day, but in science instead of religion.

**Mr. Galilei, you have completely ignored the fact that among life origins scientists there is no dispute. These are scientists who devote their lives to the study of evolution and have made tremendous advancements in understanding evolution since Darwin. There are no doubts or criticisms of the theory among them. Shouldn’t we and the students listen to them instead of religious bigots like you who are simply trying to force your religious views on the rest of us?**

Mr. Priest, it is simply not true that these scientists have no criticisms of the theory. It is presented in the classroom and to the general public as if there is overwhelming evidence for the theory, and this is my point. The students are not being told that there are many criticisms and doubts about the theory among the top evolutionary scientists. I have here—let me hold it up—a book written in 2003 containing 17 articles by top evolutionists, all eminent scientists, in which they discuss difficulties and weaknesses of the theory. None of these scientists are creationists. They are expecting, or rather

hoping, that one day natural causes will explain many of their criticisms—but they are pointing out weaknesses and discrepancies in the theory among themselves, and such criticisms from eminent evolutionists are being hidden from our students and the general public. The book admits that evolutionists have largely ignored how living organisms originated from non-living matter. **What is that book again, and who wrote it?** This is *Origination of Organismal Form* by Gerd B. Muller and Stuart Newsman. You can get this from Amazon.com. My point is that evolution is being presented as if there is overwhelming evidence for it and no dispute about it, and that is not the case. There are criticisms like this throughout the scientific literature and this is not being told to our students. I believe it is dishonest to cover this up and students are being hurt by doing so. As far back as 1980, at a world conference of leading evolutionists in Chicago, the scientists concluded and I quote: “Evidence from fossils now points overwhelmingly away from the classical Darwinism which most Americans learned in high school.” This was in *Newsweek* magazine, November 3<sup>rd</sup> issue, 1980. And yet the textbooks still have not been changed!

**Mr. Galilei, these scientists still believe in evolution. Why present such things to the students? It might weaken the theory in their eyes whereas these scientists can handle such things until they come up with the answer. After all, they know it’s true, so why put doubts in the students’ minds?**

Sir, with all due respect, I can hardly believe that you, an educator, would say such a thing...and so insult the intelligence of our students as you have just done. Sir, science thrives on disputes and challenges to theories—with comparing theories to evidence. In every other scientific discipline, disputes and arguments pro and con are encouraged. In fact, scientists love to argue. But such debate is not allowed with regard to evolution. Let me ask you, if a theory is strong, should it not be able to withstand scrutiny and critical evaluation? If evidence weakens a theory it should not be withheld from the students or the general public. In so doing you are actually weakening science. Most scientists accept evolution as factual, but a growing, impressive number of scientists, as I mentioned earlier, are growing skeptical of the evidence. **Then why are not more scientists speaking out about their doubts about the theory?** They are speaking out now and you will see it more and more, but it is a courageous stand for them to do so. **Why is that?** Because if they do sir, they fear being fired from their teaching posts or their research positions or their companies and lose their reputations, their salaries, their pensions and put their families in dire straits. For example, Dr. Nancy Bryson, Roger Dehart, and others were removed from their teaching positions for discussing weaknesses in Darwin’s theory. Their stories are on the Internet. The National Science Teachers’ Association forbids any criticism of Darwinism. Scientists realize they may also lose membership in certain state and national scientific associations such as AAAS, the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Who would want to take that chance? Look what is happening to me right now because I spoke out. You are deciding whether or not to fire me. Instead of the school board inquiry, these proceedings should be called the school board inquisition!

**Absurd...absolutely absurd!**

Is it? I will go even further. The reason that most scientists in our major universities and research institutions believe in evolution, is that creationists are not even hired in the first place. It is similar to the way Christian actors are treated by the film industry in Hollywood. If they discover that an actor or actress is a Christian or even a creationist, they are black-balled from getting parts. It's goodbye film career.

**I don't agree with that analogy, but let's move on. Mr. Galilei, many parents complain to us that intelligent design is not science. How do you respond to this charge?**

Well, I do not agree. If Darwin states in his theory that there is no design in nature -- that all apparent design is an illusion -- then it is perfectly legitimate science to bring forth any evidence that points to a design. You can't have it both ways. You can't propose a theory that states there is no design and then cry foul when the other side shows that design exists.

**Let me jump in here if I may. OK Mr. Darrow, go ahead.**

**Mr. Galilei, you have become obsessed with all this. Listen...I know that you believe that...this Jesus...is the only way to truth, but we are living in the enlightened 21<sup>st</sup> century, and there is simply no place for your bigoted views—I am sorry I have to be so blunt. We are finally on our way toward a post-modern, pluralistic society characterized by diversity and tolerance. There is simply no more room for your intolerant views on truth.**

Mr. Darrow, the problem with your world view is that you do not recognize the fact that there cannot be conflicting truths. Truth, sir, is intolerant—it simply cannot coexist or tolerate untruth. If a poisonous snake bites you, and only one antidote serum will save you, would you protest that the doctor is being intolerant of the other antidotes? Jesus said He is the way, the truth, and the life. He is the only antidote that can cure sin, broken lives, and...

**Enough of this! Let's return to the subject at hand. What are some other supposed weaknesses in the theory in your view? I am giving you a chance here to help yourself, because so far, you are clearly not making much headway with the board.**

Mr. Bishop, it's not just my view. It is discussed and debated by top evolutionary scientists but done so in scientific journals and articles which are above the radar screen so to speak of the general public. For example, the explosion of life in the Cambrian rock is mystifying scientists. Suddenly, the fossil record shows most of the complex life forms we see today, including nearly every phyla, abruptly appearing in the Cambrian primordial strata, which evolutionists believe is 530 million years old. This is the lowest strata in the geologic column where they believe the simplest life forms originated. But there are no ancestor fossils in the rock layer below the Cambrian, the pre-Cambrian layer, which could provide evidence that these forms evolved from earlier organisms. All these animal forms just suddenly appear! And what also bothers the evolutionists is that these complex life forms should, according to Darwinian theory, be appearing much higher up in the geologic column. The evolutionists are scratching their heads and asking each other, 'what are these complex life forms doing here?' This is a huge problem for them. Even Darwin recognized this as one of the biggest challenges to his theory and devoted a whole chapter to it in *Origin of Species*. But he felt that in the future science would find the ancestor fossils below the Cambrian layer. But over a century and a half later there is still no evidence in the fossil record to explain this in terms of evolution. This discrepancy between the lack of evidence in the fossil record and what is presented in textbooks as fact is a serious lack of honesty. Later on, as students discover that they were deceived and that evidence was falsified, they will lose trust in their educators. When one goes to the Internet to learn more about this, the pro-evolutionary articles dismiss any controversy and downplay the harm to their theory. But it's just a lot of rhetoric as they rely on the

public's misplaced trust that the majority must be right. So they simply keep repeating the same old mantra that there is plenty of evidence, etc. But the probing student will not be so easily deterred. For example, this book I referred to earlier, *Origination of Organismal Form*, in discussing criticisms of the theory, leads off with the Cambrian explosion problem. It is throughout the scientific literature. It is just undeniable.

**Mr. Galilei, I am sure there is a logical answer to the Cambrian explosion, because how could evolution survive if you are correct about all these weaknesses to the theory? You sound like the child in middle school who, upon being introduced to evolution, innocently but ignorantly asks, "where did the rocks come from?"**

Actually, sir, that is a very logical and astute observation and one that I am still asking evolutionists to this day... without a satisfactory answer. **OK, I am warning the spectators...outbursts of laughter will not be tolerated in this trial...I mean inquiry.**

Allow me to explain what I mean.

**We are all ears, Mr. Galilei.**

Thank you, sir. What I meant was that there is so much evidence of fine-tuning in the universe, which Einstein also observed. For example, if the strong and weak nuclear force was just a bit stronger or weaker, the universe would consist totally of hydrogen gas or heavy elements, and in either case there would be no stars or planets. Therefore, the rocks on earth as well as our rocky planet and others in the universe came about only because of this extraordinary fine-tuning. Moreover, if gravity were just a little stronger, the only life which could survive would be the size of a pea; but if gravity were just a bit weaker, no life could survive at all.

**Mr. Galilei, what you have described is simply earth having hit the cosmic jack pot due to time, chance, and accident of atoms.**

Well, scientists used to believe that there were about twenty factors that made life possible on earth. But now, they agree on approximately 100 fine-tuning factors for the earth and universe that make life possible, and that list is growing—not every year, but every month! Now scientists are discarding the old notion that for life to begin on another planet, just add water. The chemistry that makes life possible is far more complex than that.

**Mr. Galilei, what do you see here?**

Mr. Scopes, you are holding up a diagram of the human eye? **Go on.** Well, it shows the parts of the eye such as the cornea, the lens, the muscles, the vitreous humour, the optic nerve, the retina, etc. **And when looking at this diagram of the eye, do you see a design?** Yes, I do sir. **You realize, of course, that you are required to teach Darwinian evolution in our state, and that to tell your students that this is a design, or to infer it in any way, is in violation of the rules of the state Board of Education.** But I see no reason why I could not ask the students if they see a design. Let me tell you what else I see. **Really, Mr. Galilei, I think we have been duly impressed by your eighth grade level description of the eye – but do go on.** I see an optic nerve that has a million hair-like nerve fibers inside it, and all these nerve fibers are connected to the brain. Now, when the eye points at



something, a message is sent to the brain telling the brain how far away the object is. Then the brain sends a message back to the tiny eye muscles connected to the lens instructing them to curve the lens perfectly to bring the object into focus. And all this happens in the twinkling of an eye, if I may use that expression. **Mr. Galilei, that was quite unnecessary and there is no need for sensationalism during this inquiry.** Sir, may I read a quote by Darwin from the *The Origin of Species*? **Yes, but don't dare twist his meaning.**

In his chapter entitled "Difficulties with the Theory" Darwin writes: "To suppose that the eye (with so many parts working together)...could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I must confess, absurd in the highest degree." Of course, he still believes that it must have happened and that in the future science would come up with a naturalistic explanation, but he admits that it is a serious challenge to his theory. Incidentally, evolutionists still can't answer the question of how the eye, as it was slowly evolving over eons of time, could know when it was getting closer to sight. And unless all the parts are exactly positioned and working flawlessly, blindness is the result. A 30%, 50%, or even 95% evolved eye does not produce 30%, 50%, or 95% sight efficiency. Rather, it produces no sight at all. There is only blindness. How does natural selection work in such a case when it can't detect improvement and therefore does not know when sight is becoming, well, within sight you might say? **Quiet! No laughter is permitted. If it continues I will empty the room!**

**Mr. Darrow, did you have a question for Mr. Galilei?**

**Yes, thank you. Mr. Galilei, many parents are very concerned that if intelligent design is permitted in the science course, that the high standards will be lowered and our students will not be as prepared as students in other countries in years to come. In fact, our country will suffer and fall behind in technology. They are concerned that intelligent design is not science. How do you respond to that?**

Mr. Darrow, Isaac Newton was a Christian who believed that God made everything and the scientist's job was to figure out how he did it, and he didn't do too shabby in science. Einstein also came to believe that there is so much order in the cosmos that there had to be a God. For the best education, students should see both sides of a question and debate it. They should not be force fed, only to find out later that there was a huge cover-up. They should be allowed to examine all the pros and cons of any theory and arrive at their own conclusions. They should know that the leading evolutionary scientists are scratching their heads as they try to fit the evidence into a 150 year old theory.

**Mr. Galilei, do you have any final remarks before we vote?**

Yes sir. I have mentioned the late Harvard paleontologist and leading evolutionist Stephen J. Gould. He was noted for saying that orthodoxy is as stubborn in science as it is in religion. Because of this orthodoxy, it is my view that when Watson and Crick discovered the genetic code in 1953, evolution should have self-destructed except for the fact that it had become dogma. Gentlemen, a code is staring you in the face. A code so advanced that it makes any man-made code or any of our computer software code look like child's play. A code cannot invent itself. Even if you could believe that the computer came together by an accident of atoms over millions of years, you would still have to deal with the computer software programs and languages that operate the computer. How then did the code, the genetic code, come into existence? I believe that if Darwin had been here in 1953 to see this discovery, he would have become a creationist. He would be incredulous that you are hanging on to his outdated theory.

**Mr. Galilei, that is your opinion, which you and a small minority of scientists are entitled to, but we must side with the majority opinion which is so obviously the correct one.**

Mr. Bishop, throughout history it has been the minority that has courageously countered the conventional wisdom of the majority and achieved the most notable breakthroughs. It has been said that history teaches that man learns nothing from history. **That was Hegel. Do you really think you're qualified to teach us a history lesson Mr. Galilei?** Only with regard to the fact that the conventional wisdom of the majority can blind even the most brilliant minds. Consider the case of the English surgeon Joseph Lister, who, in the 1860's, began using the antiseptic known as carbolic acid (phenol) to sterilize surgical instruments and clean wounds. He theorized that micro-organisms called germs, which he began to investigate after studying the work of Louis Pasteur in France, were causing the many deadly infections in post-operative patients—an idea he claimed was inspired by God. His germ theory was ridiculed and ignored by the majority of surgeons for many years, even though his sterile operating procedures were dramatically reducing deaths. Surgeons, who did not even wash their hands before surgery, and after each surgery just wiped their bloody hands on their aprons while calling for the next patient, considered him ignorant. History is full of similar examples. Take my illustrious ancestor, Galileo, another prime example. He invited the religious leaders to look through his telescope and see the truth for themselves, and many did so. But the conventional wisdom of the day, the orthodox position if you will, blinded them to the truth they were clearly seeing with their eyes.

**Mr. Scopes has a question...go ahead sir.**

**Thank you. Mr. Galilei, are you implying that the evolutionist scientists and these board members are blinded by orthodoxy...that the indoctrinated religious leaders of the 17<sup>th</sup> century have become the life origins scientists of today...that Galileo's telescope has become the microscope, which you have referred to as an inverted telescope, and that we can't see the truth before our eyes? And that you, a small time high school science teacher, are combating a modern day inquisition similar to the one your ancestor faced? Are you implying that history is repeating itself and that you can see, but we are blind?**

You have said it.

**That is preposterous! I can't believe we have to sit here and listen to...to this...to these delusions...**

May I make a final statement?

**Mr. Galilei...hold on, please...we can't continue with all this commotion...please...everyone quiet down! Mr. Galilei, we really must wrap this up, so make it brief. You are really trying our patience.**

I will be brief. In my sciences classes, I have drawn an analogy between the Morse Code and the telegraph system and the genetic code found in the DNA molecule. If the telegraph system along with the Morse code were transported back in time to the year 1700, the people who chanced upon it would not have concluded that the telegraph apparatus invented itself and then invented the code. On the contrary, they would have correctly figured that the same intelligence that created the code also invented the telegraph system. As I said previously, every code we know of was invented by a mind.

And when the DNA code was discovered in 1953, the scientists at that time should have reasoned in the same logical manner unless they had been indoctrinated to believe the Articles of Faith in the religion called Evolution. Here is one of those Articles of Faith: The DNA molecule and genetic code were not created by a mind but by an accident of atoms. Codes can invent themselves. Don't doubt – only believe.

Gentlemen, in all other scientific disciplines, everything is held up to scrutiny and skeptical analysis. Critical evaluation is imperative—nothing is sacred. But not in the science of macro-evolution. It is a sacred cow. It has left the realm of science and has become a given. With designs in nature staring us in the face on all fronts, evolution has changed from an empirical discipline to a dogmatic discipline. That leads us to another evolution Article of Faith: All apparent design in nature is an illusion. By extension, this means that if you think you see a design, you are deluded.

**Mr. Galilei, are you aware that there are no national or international scientific organizations that hold your views on intelligent design?**

Yes I am, and I am also aware, as I mentioned earlier, that if any scientists in those organizations question the party line, they may no longer be a member of those organizations.

**Quiet...please...refrain from laughter. Order...we will have order...**

Let me end by quoting Bruce Alberts, former president of the National Academy of Sciences—not an intelligent design proponent. In his introduction to the scientific journal *Cell* in 1998, a special review issue for which he was editor, he stated: “We have always underestimated cells. Undoubtedly we still do today. But at least we are no longer as naive as we were when I was a graduate student in the 1960's...The chemistry that makes life possible is much more elaborate and sophisticated than anything we students had ever considered...Indeed, the entire cell can be viewed as a factory that contains an elaborate network of interlocking assembly lines, each of which is composed of a set of large protein machines.”

With all due respect gentlemen, we humans are like ants looking at the computer. Even one of the smallest living organisms, for example a bacterium, is so incredibly advanced that it boggles our mind. And incidentally, most bacteria are beneficial, even essential to life on earth. For example, without bacteria to decompose dead bodies, garbage, etc., we would drown in a sea of waste matter in no time. They are the great recyclers of nature. But to continue, as Dr. Michael Behe, the author of *Darwin's Black Box* explains, the bacterium has a flagellar filament that is much like a propeller on an outboard motorboat. There is a hook region that acts as a universal joint to connect the propeller to a drive shaft which in turn is attached to a rotor, and the entire unit is attached to the anterior cellular membrane by a stator, somewhat like the clamp that attaches the motor to the boat. This amazing molecular motor, fueled by a flow of protons, can reach speeds of 100,000 rpm. It can stop, start, reverse and propel the bacterium 15 body-lengths per second. If scaled up, that would be like a six foot tall person swimming at 60 mph. It is remarkable beyond words to express...it is such an exquisite design that...that...**Mr. Galilei, are you finished sir? This board is not interested in your emotional outbursts.** Excuse me, I apologize...but allow me to just say that as Dr. Behe puts it, even in these simplest life systems, if you were to take away even one of these parts, say the universal joint or the clamp, the organism isn't 90% less functional or 80% less functional – rather it is completely non-functional. It's like a mouse trap that is missing the spring, or the hammer, or any one part. It doesn't function at all. It's what he

calls “irreducible complexity.” If reduced any further the organism is broken and totally dysfunctional – with nothing for natural selection to select.

My point is that even the simplest life systems are so extraordinarily complex, and there are no prior life forms leading up to them...they suddenly just appear in the fossil record as complete...they are just there, suddenly! Don't you see? There is no evidence of gradual, incremental changes over long eons of time, and Darwinian evolution must be a gradual process – not a sudden one. Darwin himself said that if systems were found that could not have developed slowly through small steps that gradually improved the system, his theory would absolutely break down. You can't build a system gradually with small improvements when there's no function until it's complete. You do see this, don't you? **Mr. Galilei, in such a short time do you expect me to become a creationist?** Short time or long, I hope that you will become like me except for these doctrinal chains you have bound me with.

**Sir, we have been more than patient with you. You must wrap this up.**

I am concluding now, yes. I will conclude with another Article of Faith: Life origins science can only be explained in terms of Methodological Naturalism (MN). This is a fancy term meaning “nature is all there is so you may only look for natural explanations.” Now, once this definition was forced upon us by the Department of Education, any attempt to show otherwise is out of bounds. By joining the Darwinian claim to MN, it became insulated from being tested. If the theory's main claim is that there is no design in nature, and no one is permitted to come forward with a design they perceive, then the theory can never be refuted because only evidence supporting it is permitted. It would be comparable to studying global warming but setting rules whereby only natural causes could be considered: such as the sun becoming hotter or cyclical weather patterns in history—but prohibiting any discussion of man-made pollutants causing a green house effect or the damage done by cutting down the rain forests. By framing the global warming theory in this way, no evidence for man-made causes of pollution could ever be considered. Incidentally, an increasing number of scientists are adopting the position that solar activity is the primary cause. The solar flares greatly increased during the 1980's and 1990's causing global warming, but after 2000 have practically ceased, causing the present cooling trend. Many people are surprised to learn that the Bible predicts global warming in the end times due to the sun heating up, as well as man's pollution of the earth, and I believe the solar flares will become active again soon.

Personally, I believe solar flares are the primary cause. But as a scientist, I would oppose any attempts to restrict the discussion to include only solar activity. As Angus Menuge says, such a one-sided approach is a “failure of full disclosure.” In logic, it is known as the “fallacy of suppressed evidence,” which in turn makes a conclusion seem much more certain than it actually is. I am merely asking for the right to show weaknesses and scientifically viable alternatives to Darwinism—to subject it to the same rigorous scientific scrutiny as every other scientific discipline must submit to. If you do not allow this, then it is my firm belief that science will suffer. All scientific theories must be tested against the evidence, and if evidence is being falsified, that must be brought to light.

Years ago, I too was an evolutionist. But the students in my class asked me questions that got me thinking. For example, they noticed that the science textbook used strong declarative verbs such as “we know”—“we have tested”—“the data shows”, etc. But when macro-evolution is discussed in later chapters of the same book, while the instruction is very dogmatic, the verbs are actually softened and become “should have”—“could have”—“must have,” etc. Students are smart and they pick up on such things. They asked why the verbs had become so weak in comparison to the verbs used in earlier

chapters? This and other such questions got me thinking and I determined to find the answer. That led me to more closely investigate the claims of evolution and subject it to the same rigorous scrutiny expected of every other science. No more free passes. The results of my investigation shocked me. There was falsified evidence everywhere, and no data to support the claims which I had always taken for granted. All valid science is what we call “operational science” or reproducible science. But in evolution, I discovered to my dismay, that much of it was “historical” or fictional science based on stories. Time and again I saw that there was discordance between the dogmatic rhetoric of the evolutionist and the actual evidence. Over and over, as I studied the scientific journals and read books on evolution I asked myself “Where is the data?” It was really unbelievable, but there was none.

**OKaaay...with that taken care of, we will now give you one last chance... excuse me Mr. Bishop, where is the data?...to recant, I mean desist...where is the data?...from all criticism of Darwinism and never imply to the students...that intelligent design is a credible alternative to it. Will you immediately conform to the board’s rules?**

No, I will not. Here I stand! And I want to state that the teaching of evolution is a religion whose tenets of faith I have just outlined for you. It has left the realm of science and has become orthodoxy.

**Then it is the ruling of this board that you must stand down sir. Your teaching certificate to teach science in our district is hereby withdrawn. These proceedings are over.**

## Interview with James Galilei

CCN News: Mr. Galilei, that was quite a courageous stand you made in there. However, it appears you have lost your career.

Galilei: Yes, I guess so. Questioning Darwinism is heresy and results in excommunication.

CCN News: What are your plans now?

Galilei: Well, I suppose I will have to find another line of work, unless perhaps I can find a private Christian school or college where I can teach science.

CCN News: You quoted the late Harvard paleontologist, Stephen J. Gould, as saying that orthodoxy is as stubborn in science as it is in religion. Can you name any other fields of science where that is evident?

Galilei: Why yes. Just recently such orthodoxy came to light in the Global Warming scientific community when leaked emails exposed how scientists were made to falsify the science to back the orthodox position. People don’t realize that scientists are like everyone else. They have a family to support, mortgages, college expenses, etc., and at times they simply cannot afford to go against the established position. Political correctness is very much alive in science these days, and orthodoxy is choking the truth now just as it did in the days of my famous ancestor. When people hear that most

scientists back a certain position they should not automatically assume it must be true. I hope my stand today will be a wake-up call to people about the choke hold that political correctness has on science, and that it will encourage more scientists to speak up, although I know they are risking their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor if they do so to invoke another courageous stand in history. Well, perhaps not their lives yet...but many university professors are feeling the need to be tenured before they speak out or sign a dissent from Darwinism list.

CCN News: Mr. Galilei, does it really matter what people believe about evolution? Is it really all that important?

Galilei: I believe it is. For example, Karl Marx credited Charles Darwin's theory as being a major influence for his doctrine of communism. In fact, the two became good friends. The reason is that since man is just 'an accident of atoms' in evolutionary theory, with no life after this one, the state is far more important than man because it can exist for hundreds of years, whereas man only exists for approximately seventy years. Therefore, human rights are inferior to the rights of the state. However, as C.S. Lewis argued in his book *Mere Christianity*, in a society that believes in God, the sanctity of life, and the immortality of the soul, the individual is far more important than the state, because the soul goes on for eternity. And, of course, the main reason is that many people, as well as many scientists, have rejected the Bible because they feel that evolution shows it to be simply a collection of fables, and thus they ignore it and also ignore coming to Christ for their salvation. So yes, I would say that it is very important what people believe about evolution. It matters very much.

CCN News: Mr. Galilei, thank you for your time and we wish you the best in the future.

Galilei: Thank you.

## SOURCES

Many of Mr. Galilei's scientific answers to questions and comments came from the following:

Cohen, I.L., *Darwin Was Wrong—A Study In Probabilities*, New Research Publishers: Greenvale, N.Y., 1984.

Meyer, Stephen C. & Allen, Peter W., *Unlocking The Mystery Of Life*, Illustra Media: La Habra, Ca., 2004.

(This is a computer animated DVD that takes you inside the living cell to explore the fascinating complexity of the cell's systems and protein machines. It can be ordered from their website at [www.illustramedia.com](http://www.illustramedia.com)).

Meyer, Stephen C., *Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive Origin of Animal Life and the Case for Intelligent Design*, HarperCollins Publishers: New York, N.Y., 2014.

Parker, Gary E. & Morris, Henry M., *What Is Creation Science?* Creation Life Publishers: San Diego, 1982.

In addition, Mr. Galilei paraphrased some of the testimony made by eminent scientists appearing before the Kansas State Board of Education in May, 2005. The hearings on science standards were conducted to promote the teaching of evolution and origins objectively. The scientists are as follows:

William S. Harris, Ph.D. Biochemist & Developer of the Omega 3 Index for which he has gained international standing.

Bruce Simat, Ph.D. Professor at Northwestern College. Biochemistry and Human Physiology.

Michael Behe, Ph.D. Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University. Author of *Darwin's Black Box*.

Nancy Bryson, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Kennesaw State University.

Angus Menuge, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy at Concordia University, Wisconsin.

Excerpts from the Kansas State Board of Education hearings with the testimony of 16 other world-wide science experts is on DVD and may be ordered from [www.explorationfilms.com](http://www.explorationfilms.com).