

Attacking Materialism: a response to Michael Clover

John Baumgardner

7 Mar 1996

The Los Alamos Monitor

globalflood.org/origins-debate.html

Editor:

Michael Clover, in his 2/29/96 letter concerning my lecture in Fuller Lodge entitled "Exposing Evolution as Intellectual Fraud," was on target in stating that I attacked the methodology of materialist reductionism and its underlying materialist assumptions for the nature of reality. On the other hand, his claim that I constructed "strawmen based on quotations taken out of context" and applied "improper mathematical and physical arguments to contrived problems" -- but without providing a single example -- in my opinion betrays a lack of integrity on his part.

Of Mr. Clover I would inquire, just whom was it I quoted out of context? Was it Charles Darwin, or Stephen J. Gould, or George Gaylord Simpson? Was it David Kitts, or Murray Eden, or George Williams? Just whose views did I misrepresent? Indeed, I was being quite careful to quote these men in sense they intended their words to be understood.

And as to improper mathematical and physical arguments, I challenge Mr. Clover to be specific if he is to make such a serious accusation. Does he believe I misrepresented the problem of generating coded language structures within the realm of the laws of physics? If so, let him provide some hint of an answer to this problem. Does he question the evidence I mentioned for persistent facies in the geological record? Does he regard the extended peneplanation or extensive high-energy facies or mass extinction or massive allocthonous coal deposits in the geological record as contrived problems that demand no explanation? If so, why did he not express these concerns during the discussion time after my talk?

Even more amazing in Mr. Clover's letter is his insistence that faith and rationality are contradictory. Does Mr. Clover not realize that every human being has a worldview and that every worldview is predicated on faith-based presuppositions? Is Mr. Clover oblivious to the faith-based assumptions of his

own philosophical framework? If he needs assistance in identifying what these might be, his letter reveals one to be a materialist model for reality. Perhaps his strong reaction to my talk was in part because I showed how simple it is to expose the utter inadequacy of such a belief.

Finally, Mr. Clover's characterization of belief in God as irrationality requires a clear reply. The logic behind such a claim flows directly from Mr. Clover's materialist presuppositions. If materialism (the belief there is no reality apart from what is material) is true, then it indeed follows logically that there is no God and that belief in God is irrational. On the other hand, if the presupposition of materialism is false and God truly does exist, then to be an atheist is the epitome of irrationality. I recommend to everyone some serious study in basic worldview analysis. A person can make major conceptual errors when one is oblivious to one's own faith commitments. Materialist belief, in which we all have been indoctrinated, can be a profound barrier to rational consideration of the abundant evidence God has provided for His reality.

John Baumgardner