

regard for evidence. The intelligent design community rightly objects to times when their ideas have been dismissed without a fair hearing. But it just doesn't follow from such incidents that all of us Christians who accept evolution do so for any reason other than having been persuaded by the evidence.

To support the idea that our emphasis on theistic evolution is a presupposition, Touryan also writes about the "failure" of origins research—and hints strongly that a more-balanced view would embrace the option of intelligent design. Here we must politely but clearly disagree. In words that one of us has written before on the topic:

It is true that, at present, evolutionary science does not have a clear, detailed, and well-accepted explanation for how the central dogma of molecular biology emerged. But does that mean it is time to embrace ID as a better approach? By analogy, current medical science has not found the cure for cancer. Taken in isolation, this sound bite could lead to the misleading view that existing research directions, developed for decades, are best written off as a failure. This would miss an important context. Many aspects of cancer are now being treated with far greater effectiveness than ever before as a result of ongoing research. However, these cures are not robust (all-encompassing) enough to be summarized in the statement, "we have found the cure for cancer." This status is typical of big questions within science: failure to reach the sound-bite goal should not be mistaken for evidence that the research program has failed.⁵

Notes

- ¹John Maynard Smith and Eörs Szathmáry, *The Major Transitions in Evolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- ²Kevin De Queiroz, "Species Concepts and Species Delimitation," *Systematic Biology* 56, no. 6 (2007): 879–86.
- ³O. G. Woodberry, K. B. Korb, and A. E. Nicholson, "Testing Punctuated Equilibrium Theory Using Evolutionary Activity Statistics," in *Artificial Life: Borrowing from Biology*, ed. Kevin Korb, Marcus Randall, and Tim Hendtlass (Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2009), 86–95, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-10427-5_9; and Albert Somit and Steven A. Peterson, eds., *The Dynamics of Evolution: The Punctuated Equilibrium Debate in the Natural and Social Sciences* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992).
- ⁴Kjetil Lysne Voje, Emanuela Di Martino, and Arthur Porto, "Revisiting a Landmark Study System: No Evidence for a Punctuated Mode of Evolution in *Metarrabdotos*," *The American Naturalist* 195, no. 5 (2020): 899–917.
- ⁵Stephen Freeland, "The Evolutionary Origins of Genetic Information," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 63, no. 4 (2011): 240–47.

Emily Boring, J. B. Stump, and Stephen Freeland

On Galileo and Global Warming

I look forward to perusing *PSCF* for new insights to encourage my faith and worship, and so I was shocked by the lead article "Galileo and Global Warming: Parallels between the Geocentrism Debate and Current Evangelical Skepticism about Anthropogenic Climate Change" by Rachel M. Roller and Louise Ko Huang (*PSCF* 72, no. 1 [2020]: 3–14) in the March issue. From the title and first sentence onward, the young authors prejudice their audience against scientists who disagree with their views on climate change. Evangelical Christians in America are free and diverse in beliefs and denominations. Comparing them to the autocratic, political medieval Roman Catholic Church is unreasonable. They introduce unnecessary prejudice into the discussion by likening critical analysis of causes of climate change to the persecution of Galileo.

Claiming "mounting scientific evidence that human activity is negatively impacting the planet" (p. 3), Roller and Huang present unsubstantiated claims of authority and consensus for their diagnosis of a human cause for global warming. A good source to document the lack of consensus and understand the manipulated and sometimes falsified CO₂ and temperature analysis is *Inconvenient Facts: The Science That Al Gore Doesn't Want You to Know* by Gregory Wrightstone (<https://inconvenientfacts.xyz/>, 2017). Aside from that, the big picture is what geologists never forget: The earth has experienced many cooling/warming cycles over geologic history, also many highstand/lowstand cycles of oceans. In historic time, we are emerging from the Little Ice Age.

Accusations fly: evangelicals accused of not caring for the environment, "behaving like the two men who refused to look through Galileo's telescope" (p. 9), lacking humility, and being driven by political views. Who is responsible for politicizing environmental science and the investigation of climate change? Could this not also be attributed to liberal parties and organizations, instead of blaming it on the conservative leanings of evangelicals? Augustine's maxim of Christian love should have been applied here.

Thank you.

Catherine Lewis
PhD Geophysics

"Galileo and Global Warming" Authors Respond

We would like to thank Catherine Lewis for her comments. One of our primary goals was to spark dialogue between people of faith on the topic of creation care, so we were encouraged that Catherine took the time to read and respond to our article, "Galileo and Global Warming."