theoretical reasoning. Their assumption is refuted by the proven good resolution of Agfachrome Speed.

Moreover, our vision system includes not only the eye but also the brain, and is active as illustrated simply by the fact that the "blind spot" is not normally apparent to us. It is therefore reasonable to assume that any difficulty inherent in looking through the capillaries and nerves may be actively combated by neural corrective mechanisms that may not be yet well known.

Robert Mann
Consultant Ecologist
PO Box 28878
Remuera, Auckland 1005, New Zealand
robtm@maxnet.co.nz

More Dialogue Desired on Origin Models

In response to the editorial "Beyond the Edge?" (*PSCF* 53, no. 1 [March 2001]: 1), I am writing to encourage *PSCF* to seek and include more articles that are more procreationist. As a "special creation-young universe-worldwide flood" origin belief/model proponent, I find so much "strong anticreation put-down" writing hard to read. The view, "Theistic Evolution: Enough Already," (*PSCF* 53, no. 1 [March 2001]: 5–6) and article, "A Time and a Place for Noah" (*PSCF* 53, no. 1 [March 2001]: 24–40) were a breath of fresh air.

There are only two origin beliefs/models with several sub-beliefs/models. I realize that creationist ASA was taken over, shortly after its founding, by theistic evolutionists/progressive creationists; however *PSCF* needs to balance the evolution origin bias with more creation origin bias. The scientific method does not and cannot offer a proof for either of the two primary origin beliefs/models. Our challenge is to objectively determine which origin belief/model offers the superior explanation/prediction power for origin observations research data and modeling outcomes.

Robert E. Landers
ASA Member
435 Edgar Road
Westfield, NJ 07090

Response to Allan Harvey, "On Natural Explanations"

It's better to be disagreed with than to be ignored, so I am grateful to Allan Harvey for his letter (*PSCF* 53 [June 2001]: 139) in response to my note (*PSCF* 53 [March 2001]: 5–6). Like many readers of this journal, I am a Christian academic who desires to appropriately and effectively present the claims of Jesus Christ to my students and colleagues. It is in that context that I raise questions about two issues: (1) the relevance of provincial discussions of theistic evolution to the secular academy; and (2) the importance of communicating clearly in the secular academy when the issue of origins is discussed. Harvey's letter is mainly concerned with the second point.

Harvey feels that my comments denounce theistic evolutionists and imply that they lack "Christian integrity."

He may feel that way (if the shoe fits as they say), but I was merely suggesting that if we want to follow the scriptural injunction to honor God as creator, we must say what we mean when we talk about origins. It is obvious to the readers of this journal that evolution implies much more than a scientific hypothesis. Whether Christians subscribe to special creation or some form of theistic evolution, the critical point is that God created. If we say evolution when we really mean creation, we imply support for the materialistic world view. When Carl Sagan refers to evolution, he does not mean any thing close to the idea that God created. If you mean that God created but use a term which implies random processes, then yes, that does demonstrate a lack of integrity. Why would you choose to mislead your audience, if not for the sake of "scientific appearances"? That is precisely the dilemma faced by my colleague in the situation described in my March 2001 article. If he refused to write within the context of evolution (random and purposeless processes), he risked losing the opportunity to write a book chapter, even though the topic had little to do with origins.

I am not suggesting that every reference to origins must be accompanied by a sermon on God's creative and providential acts, but an appropriate reference to the creator or God's design lets my students know about my world view. That encourages Christian students as well as students of other faiths, and creates opportunities to discuss my world view with non-Christian students. I see a profound irony in Christian scientists who, in their churches, actively debunk special creation in favor of theistic evolution, but casually refer to evolution in the classroom. Evolution is one of those wagon words which carries a metric tonne of philosophical assumptions, so it behooves us to put the term in context. The only and very simple point I am trying to make is that Christian academics ought to use terms which set them apart from secular humanism and scientific materialism. I personally know many Christian faculty on my campus, but last week when I asked a group of 120 Christian students if they had ever had a Christian professor, only six hands were raised. I take this to mean that there a lot of Christian faculty who are active in their churches but remain invisible on campus. With respect to the question of origins, let me describe how this works in my experience.

I am a food scientist with interests in dairy technology. I think one could derive something like the anthropic principal based only on the intricate physical, chemical, and biochemical interactions that determine the physical stability of milk. It would be completely inconsistent with my faith and dishonoring to the Scriptures for me to tell my students that this fantastic biological fluid came into existence by random processes. That is exactly what many of my students would assume if I referred to the evolution of milk composition and structure. My experience is that students appreciate my candor when I refer to creation or God's design rather than evolution. They appreciate my comfort with expressing my beliefs. Now, back to Harvey's letter.

Harvey considers the "absurdity that would result if this view is taken to its logical conclusion." He asks if atmospheric scientists are lacking Christian integrity when they discuss the weather in naturalistic terms. The rhetorical answer is "of course not," but Harvey is comparing