

License

A piece of typst code which documents some criticisms of creationisms via literature review.

Copyright © 2023

This program is free software: you can redistribute it and/or modify it under the terms of the GNU General Public License as published by the Free Software Foundation, either version 3 of the License, or (at your option) any later version.

This program is distributed in the hope that it will be useful, but WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY; without even the implied warranty of MERCHANTABILITY or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. See the GNU General Public License for more details.

You should have received a copy of the GNU General Public License along with this program. If not, see <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/>.

Introduction

We first look at some common criticisms of creationism. One classic work is done by Penncock (Pennock 2003). At the time of publishing, Penncock was at the Lymann Briggs School and Department of Philosophy, Michigan State University according to the publication. The document is more of a manifesto laying out strategies for scientists to defend good science, which is in his work, defined as the theory of evolution.

Criticism 1: Creationists use Argument from Ignorance

Penncock states that creationists use “argument from ignorance”. Argument from ignorance is a classic logical fallacy where a person thinks A is true because of the lack of visible evidence that contradicts A (Walton 2010). Walton seems to be an expert in this field and has specialised in these sorts of logical fallacies. Though he himself has published literature stating that there are certain cases in which argument from ignorance is non fallacious (Walton 1992). That however, is out of scope for the time being.

In the context of creationism, one argument which a creationist might fallaciously make is “we cannot know for sure how the world came to be, or that we cannot be sure that evolution has produced the biodiversity that we see today, therefore there must have been a God who made all the biodiversity”. Anecdotally, I may have heard of some who hold to this view. It’s a little cringy, though I hold on to the same axiom at the end of the day. Process is important though, and one ought to take care of how these thought processes arise. Personally, I don’t agree with this line of reasoning either.

I might make the assertion or axiom that things that look “intelligent” should be “intelligently designed” as an axiom. Axiom 2: I would make the observation that physics from quantum mechanics to relativity seem to have a certain mathematical beauty to it. Axiom 3: Mathematical beauty hints at intelligence. If one presupposes these axiomatically, one can arrive at the intelligent design conclusion without the logical fallacy of argument from ignorance. Lennox, an apologist and mathematician might agree with these axioms (Lennox 2009).

Though of course, the axioms themselves are not universally agreed upon. Beauty is subjective and potentially another philosophical can of worms altogether. We shall not discuss it yet.

Bibliography

Lennox, John C. 2009. *God's Undertaker: Has Science Buried God?*. Lion Books.

Pennock, Robert T. 2003. "Creationism and Intelligent Design." *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics* 4, no. 1. Annual Reviews 4139 El Camino Way, PO Box 10139, Palo Alto, CA 94303-0139, USA: 143–163.

Walton, Douglas. 2010. *Arguments from Ignorance*. Penn State Press.

Walton, Douglas. 1992. "Nonfallacious Arguments from Ignorance." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 29, no. 4. JSTOR: 381–387.