

# Christianity, Science and Freedom of Religion II:

## A response to R.N. Rogers

---

John Baumgardner

24 Jan 1997

*The Los Alamos Monitor*

[globalflood.org/origins-debate.html](http://globalflood.org/origins-debate.html)

Editor:

Mr. Rogers, in his 1/17/97 letter, steadfastly denies he was proposing atheism as official Laboratory policy or advocating control over free religious expression. What then exactly was Mr. Rogers intending when he "asked Sig Hecker for help in defending science" and then censured him because he would not condemn creationism and creationists in his official capacity as laboratory director? How else can this be interpreted than an attempt to pressure laboratory management to enforce a type of thought control on laboratory staff?

If this is not the correct inference, then Mr. Rogers should spell out precisely what he had in mind when he asserted that "higher authorities should return the laboratory to scientific (i.e., anti-creationist, from the context) management as quickly as legally possible?" How can Mr. Rogers possibly maintain he was not pressing for an official laboratory policy that would impose viewpoint discrimination against those who insist there is adequate objective evidence in favor of a Creator?

Indeed, if Mr. Rogers is really and truly concerned with the 'honest application of the scientific method' as he claims, he should focus his scrutiny on the scientific case for evolution. As I have argued before, evolution is not science, but fraud. Darwinists have not a clue how biogenesis can or did occur. Neither do they have a mechanism for macroevolution. Neither do they have a scientific explanation for the systematic lack of Darwinian intermediates. Nor does evolution provide a solution for the Einstein gulf between matter and language, that is, to the problem of how matter can assign meaning to language symbols. Nor does the evolution perspective offer any clue as to how matter and the laws of physics arose.

In reality evolution is nothing but the atheist excuse for rejecting the Creator, and it cannot be defended with honest science. If Mr. Rogers is persuaded otherwise, I challenge him to provide a rational scientific, but evolutionary, explanation to even one of the basic origins issues I mention in the preceding paragraph. If he cannot do this, he should have the integrity to back away from his assertion that evolution is more than a hypothesis and admit it is instead in the category of belief and supposition.

John Baumgardner