



1986

## Contemporary Religious Discrimination Against Creationists in Academia

Jerry Bergman

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc\\_proceedings](https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings)

DigitalCommons@Cedarville provides a publication platform for fully open access journals, which means that all articles are available on the Internet to all users immediately upon publication. However, the opinions and sentiments expressed by the authors of articles published in our journals do not necessarily indicate the endorsement or reflect the views of DigitalCommons@Cedarville, the Centennial Library, or Cedarville University and its employees. The authors are solely responsible for the content of their work. Please address questions to [dc@cedarville.edu](mailto:dc@cedarville.edu).

Browse the contents of [this volume](#) of *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*.

---

### Recommended Citation

Bergman, Jerry (1986) "Contemporary Religious Discrimination Against Creationists in Academia," *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*: Vol. 1 , Article 32.

Available at: [https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc\\_proceedings/vol1/iss1/32](https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings/vol1/iss1/32)

**CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST  
CREATIONISTS IN ACADEMIA**

Jerry Bergman, Ph.D.  
432 South East Ave.  
Montpelier, Ohio

**ABSTRACT**

The writer interviewed over 100 persons who were active in creation work. Most felt that the standard evolutionary paradigm of origins was inadequate and should be "balanced" with alternative positions. The creationists interviewed differed considerably on their views of origins. Many would be identified with the literal twenty-four hour day, non-gap creationist position and a universal Noachian deluge. Most felt that in their academic careers they had faced religious discrimination ranging from derogatory comments to denial of tenure or an earned degree. The writer also reviewed the literature and interviewed about a dozen academic deans and department chairs in the field of science. All felt that openly holding a "scientific creationistic" world view would seriously impede an academic career. Many openly stated that they would not hire or support the candidacy of an out-of-the-closet scientific creationist for a tenured position in academia.

**INTRODUCTION**

It is now well documented that discrimination against creationists is serious and widespread as summarized below (5,6,7,8,9,10,11,15,17,23,26).

**...hardy believers in creation...have been heaped with scorn and  
ridicule. Evolutionists dominated the field so securely that  
creationists were fired, denied tenure and denied advanced degrees  
with impunity in public schools and universities.**

A 1979 Civil Rights Commission report concluded that religious discrimination is widespread and little is presently being done to ameliorate this problem (6). Aside from this report, most civil rights and governmental agencies have done little or nothing to remedy what has developed into a nationwide problem. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has not even published guidelines for dealing with religious discrimination. The current guidelines deal only with reasonable accommodation (see Federal Register, Vol. 54, No. 213, 10-31-1980, pp. 72611-72615). This agency, set up to deal with concerns of racial, religious, and other minorities, has done little to help creationists facing discrimination. They have so far even declined to hold public hearings on the problem. Creationists and conservative Christian educators are now a persecuted minority with little recourse but to endure the discrimination. Admittedly, some of their problems stem from conflicts over specific issues, such as concerns over their proselytizing or the teaching of creation in the public school classroom.

Little if any effort has been expended by most American institutions to enforce the section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which outlaws discrimination based on religion (pg. 29, Section 703). As Roberts concludes (37):

**America has a new bigotry. Traces of it have been around for a long  
time, glimpsed only fleetingly and in widely-scattered places. But  
in 1983, it assumed nation-wide proportions. This is bigotry against  
evangelicals. Two things are particularly frightening about this  
bigotry. Few recognized it, and nobody..[has so far done] anything  
about it. It is difficult to say which is more disturbing. Any  
religious group that defies public opinion and practices non-conformity  
runs the risk of ridicule and rejection. This can quickly turn to  
persecution in time of crisis, particularly if such persecution is  
advantageous of those in power.**

Novak, in a study of this problem, called "antievangelical bigotry" the least understood and "most painful" bigotry in America today (34). He concluded that 1984 "revealed more bigotry against evangelicals, without anybody leaping to denounce it, than against any other group...The attacks have been public, without introducing evidence, often by association."

Scientific creationists are facing serious attack, especially in academia. Haney reports that (24):

It appears from various reports reaching this office, that a trend is developing in the halls of Academe...that Liberalism's great contribution to American education, namely "Academic Freedom," has become a victim of incest, having been raped by its own sires.

[A] former Louisiana State Senator...said instances [of]...pro-creationism professors and teachers...being dismissed have begun to proliferate in the past ten years...highly-qualified educators are denied tenure or otherwise discriminated against simply because they hold views or engage in activities which oppose the tenets of...[evolutionism].

Extensive legal research by the author has not revealed a single court case of employment discrimination that has been decided in favor of a creationist (9). Nor has the writer been able to find even a single case of non-"reasonable accommodation" employment religious discrimination successfully litigated by a religious believer in an American Court. Surveys indicate that there are thousands of cases a year of employment termination in which the plaintiff feels he or she has clear evidence of religious discrimination.

As Bergman found, even the judicial system has done virtually nothing about this problem (6):

The only conclusion that can be reached...is that the American courts are not serious about enforcing the rights of religious minorities. Although many of the better cases are likely settled out of court, nonetheless the situation is such that employers are generally aware that they can exercise even blatant religious discrimination with little or no fear of reprisal. This conclusion was supported by a recent report by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

#### THE EXTENT OF DISCRIMINATION

The writer, as part of an ongoing research project, has interviewed over 100 active self-labeled creationists who are, or were, employed in academia. He specifically asked if they had faced religious discrimination and, if so, to delineate their experience. Almost all believed that their creationist beliefs caused at least some career problems. These ranged from open derision to outright firings, and even attempts to rescind earned degrees. Some cases were tragic in their extent, blatancy and consequences (9). The discrimination experiences were grouped in the following categories.

#### Derogatory and Clearly Inappropriate Comments

Examples range from placing obscene or anti-creationist cartoons on the workers' desks to open, blatant, inappropriate direct name-calling. Bolyantz noted that evolutionists often assume that "anyone holding the creationist viewpoint must be illogical, backward, subversive, uneducated, and stubborn" (14). Gross name-calling in print is common in the secular literature (7).

#### Refusal of Admittance to Graduate Programs

It was found that it was not uncommon for a creationist to be denied admission to a degree program even if he/she clearly exceeded published admission standards. In some cases the person denied was able to locate letters which recommended against admission specifically because of the candidates creationist world view.

#### Refusal to Award Degree

Many creationists interviewed, although they clearly met all of the requirements, were openly denied a degree (usually a Ph.D. in the sciences) because of their creation orientation and/or publications.

### Denial of Promotion

Many creationists claimed that although they clearly exceeded the written standards for promotion (high student ratings, more than an adequate number of publications, etc.), were not promoted. In several cases this was openly because of their creationist publications (12,18).

### Denial of Tenure

Many cases of tenure denial that were based primarily on the creationist activities of the candidate were encountered. It was often obvious that bias existed because of their active involvement in the creationists movement. Research has well documented that today a known scientific creationist who does not experience bias in this crucial decision is a rare exception. This view was fully supported by the interviews with creationist professors and others.

In many cases of religious discrimination, the university was open and blatant about such, either claiming immunity or citing various laws or precedents which they felt either rendered them unaccountable or the law ineffective in rectifying their illegal behavior. In one case the university did (1):

...not deny either religious discrimination or [lack of] university specified due process. Its entire case rests on immunity (as a State institution, immune from lawsuits unless plaintiff is given permission by the State to sue itself).

In this case, the university claimed that "as a whole, whatever wrongdoing occurred, it is not liable to damages" (1).

### RESEARCH AND DISCRIMINATION

The writer surveyed twenty-eight professors at a recent science convention about discrimination against creationists. All those interviewed stated that they doubted very much if their department would hire an out-of-the-closet creationists.

Some claimed that they themselves were not opposed to hiring such, but that a creationist would likely encounter problems in their department. One added that it would be objectionable to defend creationism on philosophical grounds, but an attempt to do so using biology would preclude hiring.

Although some prominent creationists have experienced little discrimination, or discrimination that they could prove a prima facie case, almost 70% of those Bergman interviewed claimed to have faced discrimination and 40% believed they had evidence to demonstrate their claims.

Thousands of creationists who have tenure in science areas usually achieve it by one of two ways. One survey found that the most common method is to stay in-the-closet or not to openly identify oneself as a creationists (43%), and the second (38%) is to become a creationist after achieving tenure (9). This study did not locate a single out-of-closet conservative creationist awarded tenure in any state university in the last ten years, and few before. These results take on more meaning in view of the fact that a decade ago tenure was more or less automatic.

Discrimination against creationism and creationists, therefore, is widespread and often irrational. Twelve percent of those interviewed stated that they had received death threats and/or highly emotional, nonverbal feedback and irrational verbalizations against their persons.

### THE LITERATURE'S DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

The author reviewed all published articles that discussed creationism printed from 1973 to June, 1985 (Bergman and Wirth, in press). All of the standard periodical indexes were used, including those that covered the science, social science and popular journals. It was found that in all of the articles published in the scientific, secular and/or liberal mainline religious journals, the current wave of discrimination against creationists was rarely decried. The articles reviewed were either silent on the issue, or openly advocated discrimination in various forms. A few letters did condemn this form of discrimination.

This is in marked contrast to both "fundamentalist" journals, and/or those which are openly and actively supportive of creatism. Of these, the author located sixty-seven that discussed the problem. All either condemned or discussed methods of dealing with the problem of discrimination against creationists, although some letters published in these journals encouraged discrimination. Some discussed the issue only briefly or in passing. This source was more difficult to research because even the better indexes, such as the Christian Periodical Index, or the Catholic Periodical Index, were incomplete, not listing many of the smaller or local religious magazines.

A survey of the journals which would likely publish articles, specifically discussing discrimination against creationists, such as the Journal of Church and State or the monthly published by Americas United for Separation of Church and State, Church and State, found that not one of these journals has published even so much as a brief note relative to even one case of discrimination, degree denial, or firing of a creationist. On the other hand, almost all the so-called new right or conservative religious journals, such as the Moral Majority Report, Christian News, Christian Inquirer, etc. have published articles about this problem. This is ironic in that many of the visible, active "creationists" with graduate degrees in science are not politically on the so-called "far-right." Many belong to conservative Protestant churches--such as Lutheran, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and similar denominations (32).

Further, many of the creationists that the writer interviewed would not be classified as far-right, but were closer to historical mainline Protestantism. Although some were independent Baptists, a slight majority were either Lutheran or affiliated with nondenominational churches. In addition, several were Jews, and many were unchurched. It also became apparent to the writer that, although all of those interviewed considered themselves creationists, they were by no means a homogeneous group in their interpretation of creation. As a whole they were religiously conservative, yet some were middle-of-the-road or even left on some issues. Regarding racial/sexual discrimination and war issues, some would be classified as politically left. While the writer did not specifically assess political attitudes, they were at times discussed in the interviews. A fruitful area for future research would be to explore more fully the political and other beliefs of self-labeled creationists. Many were raised in the so-called "peace churches" which historically have been connected to various social causes such as the anti-slavery movement. Several creationists interviewed were Free Methodist, a church formed partly because of opposition to slavery and which still actively supports the Black, women and other movements.

#### **The Scientific Community's Cry for Open Discrimination**

A major trait of anti-creationist literature is its over generalizing, labeling, and the problem that those who advocate discrimination rarely define even basic terms such as "creationists," or "scientific creationists." Those that attempt to, not uncommonly define them inaccurately. Many of those who classify themselves "creationists," object to the term "scientific creationists." Some prefer simply "creationists," others "abrupt appearance theorists," or even anti- or non-evolutionists. Still others are most comfortable with simply, "a believer in creation," as opposed to "a creationist." Some of the many positions on creationism include progressive, deistic, theological, ex nihilo, and directive creationism. The only common thread that runs through all of these positions is that "God did it;" the major difference between them is "how" (16,20).

These problems with the term "creationism" were summarized by Hick who concluded (25):

... that the word "creationist" has become a label not only for people who believe that the universe is God's creation but also for those who insist that biological evolution has not occurred. I too am a creationist in the sense that I believe that the universe is God's creation, but I believe that God's creative work is progressive and continuous and that biological evolution is a part of it. And so I am sorry that the word creation has become linked with the obscurantist rejection of evolution. The kind of creationism that I and other liberal Christians espouse is neither scientific nor antiscientific. The purview of science only goes back some 15 billion years to the big bang. And, if the big bang should turn out to have been an absolute beginning, then science has nothing to say beyond it, though of course religion does.

The term as used in this paper refers specifically to those who both deny evolution, and are open about either criticizing or denying most gross biological changes. Persons in this camp also often deny natural selection as the major source of variation. Most of

the creationists who experience difficulty would be more closely identified with the position advocated by the Institute for Creation Research, or the Creation Research Society and other groups who stress a universal Noachian flood, creation in literal twenty-four hour days, etc., although some by no means identify completely with this position. Actually, the most important element in causing problems is being labeled a "creationist." Many if not most professionals who are, in general, creationists are not openly identified with this position, thus do not experience problems. If few of one's colleagues are aware of one's beliefs in this area, one is far less apt to have difficulties.

Nonetheless, many writers have actually openly advocated discrimination and even the immediate termination, of all "creationists." Fezer pens that (19):

...in hiring teachers, or in certifying them as competent...consideration of various factors is appropriate. Where religious beliefs can affect job performance, its appropriate to enquire as to what such effects are likely to be. [And]...those...who call themselves "scientific creationists," by that very self-designation and all that goes with it, demonstrate incompetence [and therefore should not be hired.]

Fezer is advocating an illegal, but common practice. It is not only illegal to terminate an employee on the basis of religion but even to ask in an employment interview the interviewee's "religious affiliation, the name of his or her church, parish, or even the religious holidays that he or she observes because this indicates one's religious affiliation" (38).

Those who are active in promoting religious discrimination are often open and blatant. Patterson advocates that (35):

Creationists often complain that their theories and their colleagues are discriminated against...as a matter of fact, creationism should be discriminated against...no advocate of such propaganda should be trusted to teach science classes or administer science programs anywhere or under any circumstances. Moreover, if any are now doing so, they should be dismissed.

Patterson, although he does not define his use of the term "creationists," concludes that none with this label are qualified to be scientists or educators. After calling their world view "propaganda," he openly concludes that those who advocate this position should be terminated. At the least, he stresses, creationists' transcripts should be "marked" so that schools and employers can easily discriminate if they elect to do so (44). All of this, although blatantly illegal, has in general been tacitly approved by our courts, educational establishment and government. Although as noted, most Civil Rights legislation clearly specifies that employees must be evaluated only on the basis of job criteria that is specifically relevant to the position. Civil Rights agencies have done little or nothing to stop these illegal practices. Patterson, on the other hand, advocates employment evaluation openly based on one's religious beliefs, stressing:

In conclusion, then, I would say: yes, creationism is discriminated against, but this is precisely as it should be. It is the responsibility of teachers and school officials to discriminate against... anyone who advocates...[creationism]. I am glad this kind of discrimination is finally catching on, and I hope the practice becomes much more vigorous and widespread in the future.

This is exactly what is now commonly occurring (40,42). As noted, after extensive research, the writer has not been able to locate a single active out-of-the-closet creationist who was granted tenure in the last decade at any American or Canadian secular college or university. All have been denied and fired (7). Several names have been mentioned as possibilities which, as of yet, have not been researched, but all those investigated in the past were either in-the-closet creationists, or became creationist after tenure was granted. Winder concluded (43):

Creationists can hold faculty positions at secular universities successfully but they must suppress their views [on creation]. There are creationists, including [in] science, here [at his University] but there is not outward manifestation [of their creationism]. Any activity and they would soon be harassed!

## Discrimination Against Students

In discussing whether creationist students should be discriminated against, one well-known science educator approvingly quotes those who conclude that a professor should have the right "to fail any student in his class, no matter what the grade record indicates," and even advocates, "retracting grades and possibly even degrees, if [a person espouses creationism]...after passing the course or after graduating" (22). The article actually claims that it is the university's responsibility to terminate creationists and rescind their degrees! He advocates that even students with excellent grades who produce highly regarded work, should be denied their degree and expelled from the university if it is discovered that they are a creationist! They argue that grades do not necessarily measure competency. A student can memorize material and be able to discern the "correct" answers on tests and still hold a view which, in Frazer's mind at least, is incorrect. They thus should be failed or denied a rightfully earned degree, or if previously awarded, it should be retracted. Zuidema reports that some professors have proposed that:

...grades or degrees of university students who hold special creation concepts after having taken science courses [should be retracted]. In other words, flunk them...retroactively, if necessary!

This proposal, Wirth responds,

...is nothing less than gross religious discrimination...A student's command of a subject in science and can be disassociated from his religious beliefs. In other words, someone with religious beliefs can function as a scientist (45).

Further, many educators have stated in print that they feel that it is openly irresponsible for a university to grant a creationist a Ph.D. degree. Flacks openly concludes that (21):

It is a pathetic commentary on our universities that grant doctorate degrees...without fully determining a candidate's true understanding of universal knowledge and logic...The alleged concept of "scientific" creationism is not only an illogical contradiction in terminology but an absurd fiction.

Thus, he concludes, creationists should not be awarded advanced degrees. The reason for this discrimination, many of its proponents claim, is not concern over religion, but competency. An anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this paper (which was rejected by the journal on the grounds that creationists should be discriminated against) said:

...the opposition [to creationists] rests instead on a conviction that 'creationism'...precludes neutrality/objectivity, adequate methodology, and the integral nature of science (physics, astronomy, geology, biology). There is a perceived way to best do science and see one discipline in the context of others...Must a department accept someone whose 'creationist' case seems erroneous methodologically and factually simply because one pleads 'religious or academic' freedom?

...Departments evaluate people not only on knowledge and expertise but on their research and on its likely fruitfulness. They see creationists of the 'young earth' or 'anti-evolution' sort as incapable of sustaining a research program on these bases. Religious freedom is not a ground for academic incompetence in research (and creationist research has, I think, very little to show for its labors). Freedom carries responsibility to one's colleagues, profession, and research.

G. Merle Bergman is more specific (2):

I am aghast at the suggestion that...[a creationist was fired] because of his religious views, as expressed in his writings on the subject. Obviously nothing could be further from American tradition and constitutional principles than that a man be denied opportunity on the basis of his religious thought.

On the other hand, I have to ask myself how practical it is for a creationist to impress scientifically minded men and women with his objectivity...which is certainly a prime virtue for any teacher. I

could not myself consider that a teacher had much of a grasp on reality if he or she believed that the creationist view of the universe was a realistic one. There is no point in reviewing the reasoning on both sides... Suffice it to say... that from the point of view of science, evolution is proven many times over, whereas creationism is... a left-over from very primitive folklore.

Whether or not the world view and belief structure of creationists is correct is irrelevant in this discussion. Our primary concern here is freedom of religion and belief and the right to work and pursue one's education regardless of one's religious views, as the law and the American Constitution guarantee. And this includes the right to do research and go where the results of one's research lead. Influential segments of the academic community in Galileo's day concluded that he was incorrect and thus incompetent. For this reason, to the embarrassment of scientists today, some endeavored to ruin his scientific career (3,4).

When we permit infallible value judgments as to the correctness of a person's view on controversial topics (as surely is the case with creationism), to terminate a person's career, we are opening the door to discrimination against any person who disagrees with the beliefs of the administrative or power structure (41). Yet, G. Merle Bergman concludes (8):

I think... faculty [firing a creationist is] a reflection of their view that [these people are] too far removed from reality to be able to direct young people along objective paths. The issue is whether this view is a reflection of religious prejudice. They are not judging the man's right to hold and to express religious views different from their own, but his ability to define reality. That that ability is colored by his religious outlook merely muddies the waters.

He actually concludes that creationists are not able to "define reality" or, in psychiatric terms, are insane! This is the same ploy used in the Soviet Union to confine those who object to communism in psychiatric hospitals. Although Zuidema stresses, it is not religion, but competency, that is of concern; yet the veracity of the scriptures has historically been of central concern to most Christians. As the above anonymous reviewer concluded:

The crux of the matter, obviously, is that the question of competency to teach science, evolution concepts being essential to an understanding of the life sciences, might arise. One critic... has even questioned whether faculty... who accept Scripture literally are qualified for faculty or administrative positions. Isn't the integrity of scholars at the heart of this [controversy]?

The above line of reasoning has horrendous implications. As McGuigan said of one creationist's discrimination case now in the courts:

Conservatives, supporters of academic freedom, and friends of liberty in general will be watching this case carefully, more than a little nervous about their own futures if such a miscarriage of justice is not overturned.

Persons who advocate currently unpopular views in science and other academic disciplines (such as the non-Marx economic view by sociology, government, and history faculty) have always faced serious problems. In general, though, conservative Christians are now facing the most serious problems. Thus Wildman stated (42):

...the persecution of practicing Christians has already begun, albeit not in a physical manner... [there are already many] cases in which educators who subscribe to the creation theory have suffered because of that intellectual belief. These cases have not been heavily reported in the national secular media, although... had the individuals been dismissed from a Christian school for teaching evolution they would have made major headlines... The irony of [these]... cases... is the silencing of academic freedom by those who supposedly support [it] ... and the condoning of... the persecution of those who dare to believe in creationism because of intellectual honesty. We do, however, indeed find it odd that the creation theory cannot be taught in schools because it is "religion," but the evolution theory is openly taught—



sometimes not as theory but as fact—despite the fact that it is a basic tenant of the humanist religion. (See Humanist Manifesto I: "Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.")

The justification for religious persecution has always been the presumption that those persecuted deserve it because their view of reality is incorrect or erroneous, often called heresy. If one is able to justify discrimination on the grounds that the victims are not "accurately able to assess reality," or their view is based on metaphysical pre-suppositions as opposed to an examination of empirical data, one could use this reasoning to discriminate against any religious beliefs. All sacred positions are to some degree based upon a view of reality which is less than fully empirically supportable (36). Faith, the bridge between empirical reality and belief, is an especially important aspect of the Judeo-Christian-Muslim world view. For one to categorically state that someone's view of reality is wrong, and thus this justifies denial of employment and consequently denial of life's basic necessities, is an horrendous conclusion.

The Mormons believe that all humans have always existed and in the afterlife will become gods; that Adam and Eve were literally created in Independence, Missouri and that, in spite of what many scholars have concluded are its many inaccuracies and errors, the Book of Mormon is inspired by God (27). They also would have a poor grasp of reality, according to those quoted above. Thus, should not all Mormon teachers also be terminated.

Likewise Catholics, in that they believe, in contradiction to all chemical analysis, that the Eucharist literally changes the bread and wine into the physical body and blood of Christ, obviously do not have much of a grasp on reality. Thus, all Catholic teachers likewise should be terminated. The explanation that transubstantiation causes "substantial change," which scientists today cannot study, or "accidental change," in Aristotelian terminology, one could easily conclude is a rationalization to cover an irrationalization.

Jews, believing that they are God's chosen people, that it is morally wrong to eat pork (a perfectly nutritious food if cooked properly) and that someday a "savior" will come to earth from heaven, some feel obviously do not have a very accurate grasp of reality. Thus, should they also be terminated from their teaching positions, denied degrees, etc.? One could argue in the same way about all religious faiths, including atheism which Melton defines as a religion in the American liberal tradition (31).

In the Soviet Union, this exact reasoning is utilized to justify discrimination against all theistic positions. The signing of a statement swearing that one is an atheist is required to teach in a Soviet university (30). To them it is obvious that anyone who holds a religious viewpoint, even a liberal one, obviously does not have an accurate grasp of reality and thus is "not in a position to influence young people along objective paths" and therefore should not be allowed to be teachers regardless of their academic record. All religious views, they have concluded, are myths impeding an objective grasp of reality. One must obviously first ask "Who is qualified to be the judge of such things as the world views of others?" Bergman tries to answer this as follows (11):

Even if one holds controversial views which are directly related to one's teaching or occupational assignment, it is generally conceded that, if one can accurately articulate the opposing position (such as a young earth creationist who can accurately explain and present the data, reasoning, etc., used to support the old earth position), then one cannot charge incompetence, and discrimination should not take place.

One's private religious views, whether right or wrong, are usually irrelevant in the work place. A person can be a highly competent mathematician, and yet hold views on astronomy or parapsychology not commensurate with the contemporary scientific consensus. Should these persons also be terminated? Some professors of the authors acquaintance follow astrology, or give credence to ideas that many authorities feel have been clearly refuted. Should they all likewise be terminated? Who is going to be left? Our foremost concern should be religious freedom and freedom of conscience. Where there are genuine differences of opinion, concerns relative to one's teaching qualifications may be discussed. One should be evaluated, though, primarily upon one's knowledge and expertise in one's area of specialty, not one's religious views or scientific conclusions.

## **What Must Be Done**

Few persons or organizations have concerned themselves with the rights of various religious minorities, and even fewer with those of creationists (and some who have experienced difficulties would be more accurately classified as progressive or liberal creationists). The academic community now seems to be becoming more open and blatant relative to this form of discrimination. Laws are useless unless enforced and the government, as we have noted, has so far in most cases refused to enforce existing laws relative to this form of religious discrimination. They often do not aid creationists or those with a conservative religious orientation in general. As the Anonymous reviewer quoted above concluded:

**...governments and universities have not enforced existing laws because religious discrimination is really not the basic issue...Creationism of many sorts has proven to be astoundingly unfruitful as a research program and so distortive of factual material that it is unclear how that material can be competently taught.**

Can we truly call our society free if Meikle's call, quoted below, is implemented (29)?

**It is the responsibility of professional societies to discriminate against [creationists]...by separating them from teaching through exposure and removal. It is the responsibility of the public school system to do likewise.**

The solution to this problem is best summarized by Wildman, who in his public presentations (42),

**...has been telling his audiences that unless the Christian community becomes involved in the struggle for [religious freedom] and does so quickly, that those being born today will be physically persecuted if they desire to practice their Christian faith. "I fully understand how radical this statement sounds, but it is an intellectually honest statement—not one to shock."**

The only thing preventing denial of employment for many creationists is tenure. As Zuidema found (45):

**"Academic freedom" and "tenure," those twin hollies of academia, have been restraining factors by keeping state university faculties from openly challenging...their creationist colleagues. Yet some brave souls have sought confrontations.**

The appropriate response to this problem is to bring to the attention of the authorities the commonality and seriousness of this problem. Religious discrimination is illegal and thus vigorous efforts need to be made to fight it, both on the part of those discriminated against and the various law and policy enforcement officials. This will help to ensure that the law is taken seriously and enforced. Increased public awareness is immensely important in dealing with this problem. In addition, several precedent court cases would reduce the likelihood that employers in the future discriminate against creationists. If the likelihood of terminating a creationist and losing a case is high, forcing payment of wages, damages, lawyer's costs, etc., most employers would think twice before discriminating. They clearly perceive, and presently correctly so, that the likelihood of a conviction in a religious discrimination case is extremely low. For this reason they are now often not hesitant to discriminate. They can now often cover their tracks, generally have available highly paid attorneys, and often are able to win cases by skirting around the law.

To their credit, many individuals are concerned about the civil liberties and rights of individuals, even those that they personally disagree with. In reviewing several religious discrimination cases, the author found that it is not common to find that some persons active in defending the rights of religious minorities clearly disagreed with the beliefs of those whom they defended. Their support comes from their conviction that all persons have the right to hold a set of beliefs, however unpopular, if they are sincerely held and are not openly detrimental to the welfare of the population as a whole. The belief that we are created beings, deliberately designed by God, is hardly detrimental to the community's welfare, and it could be argued that it is functional in facilitating behavior which is supportive of community order and functional morality.

## REFERENCES

1. Beard, E. N. (Ed.), "Members' Notable Notes," Universitas, October 1985, p. 3, Vol. 16, No. 7.
2. Bergman, G. Merle, "The Professor Who Lost His Job," Liberty, Vol. 80, No. 3, May-June 1985, p. 28.
3. Bergman, Jerry, "The Establishment of a Heliocentric View of the Universe," Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 33, No. 4, Dec. 1981, pp. 225-230.
4. Bergman, Jerry, "The Scientists," Liberty, Vol. 78, No. 1, Jan. 1983, pp. 7-10.
5. Bergman, Jerry, "Religious Discrimination in Academia," Universitas, April 1984a, p. 2.
6. Bergman, Jerry, "Religious Discrimination in Academia," Christians in Education, Spring 1984b, p. 16.
7. Bergman, Jerry, "The New Minorities to Hate," Contrast, Vol. 3, No. 2, March-April 1984c, pp. 1-5.
8. Bergman, Jerry, "Discrimination Against Creationists Is Becoming More Insidious," The Christian News, Feb. 4, 1985a, p. 7.
9. Bergman, Jerry, The Criterion, Richfield, MN, Onesimus Publishing, Inc., 1985b.
10. Bergman, Jerry, "Creationists In the Classroom: Endangered Species," Vision, Aug.-Sept., 1985c, pp. 3-4.
11. Bergman, Jerry, Review of "History of Modern Creationism," In Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 37, No.3, Sept. 1985d, p. 187-188.
12. Bergman, Jerry, "Denial of Promotion," Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 1, Fall 1985e, p. 2.
13. Bergman, Jerry and Wirth, Kevin, The Creation/Evolution Controversy, New York: Garland Publishing Co., in press, 1986, Vol. I and II.
14. Bolyanatz, Alexander H., "The Creation/Evolutionary Controversy...More Heat Than Light," Anthropology Newsletter, Vol. 25, No. 7, 1984.
15. Braun, Marcus, "Creation vs. Evolution," Sword of the Lord, Oct. 18, 1985, p. 14.
16. Bube, Richard, "We Believe in Creation," Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 23, No. 4, Dec. 1971, pp. 121-122.
17. Bytwork, Alvin. God's University Battles, in press 1986.
18. Carnes, Tony, "Denial of Promotion Response," Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 1 Fall, 1985, p. 3.
19. Fezer, Karl D., "More from Kofahl," Creation-Evolution Newsletter, Vol. 4, No. 4, July-Aug., 1984.
20. Fischer, Robert, God Did It, But How? LaMirada, CA: Cal Media, 1981.
21. Flacks, William L., "The Professor Who Lost His Job," Liberty, Vol. 80, No. 4 July-Aug., 1985, p. 28.
22. Frazier, Kendrick, "Competency and Controversy: Issues and Ethics on the University/Pseudoscience Battlefield," Skeptical Inquirer, Vol. 8, Fall 1983, pp. 2-5.
23. Gentry, Robert, Religious Discrimination in Science, in press, 1986.
24. Haney, Ken, "Academic Freedom's Double Standard," Christian Times, June 28, 1985, pp.4,12.
25. Hick, John, "A Liberal Christian View," Free Inquiry, Fall 1985, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 40-42.

26. Keith, Bill, "Rampant Persecution of Creationists Reaches Epidemic Proportions," Creation, July, 1984, pp. 10-11.
27. Key, Thomas, D. S., "A Biologist Examines the Book of Mormon," Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 37, No. 2, June, 1985.
28. McGuigan, Patrick, "Creationist Scholar Fights for Liberty," Conservative Digest, Oct., 1984, p. 41.
29. Meikle, William, Letter to Jerry Bergman, dated Jan. 10, 1985.
30. Melnick, James, Personal interview, 1983.
31. Melton, J. Gordon, The Encyclopedia of American Religions, Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing Co., 1978.
32. Morris, Henry, History of Modern Creationism, San Diego, CA: Master Books, 1984.
33. Melkin, Dorothy, The Creation Controversy, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1982.
34. Novak, Michael, "Religion In Politics," ADL Bulletin, Vol. 42, No. 1, Jan. 1985, pp. 3-4, 10-12.
35. Patterson, John, "Do Scientists and Scholars Discriminate Unfairly Against Creationists?" Creation-Evolution Newsletter, Fall 1978, pp. 19-20.
36. Reeder, Diane, "University Creationists Speak," Christian New Herald, March, 1984, p. 3.
37. Roberts, John E. "Bigots Attack Fundamentalists," Pulse, March, 1985.
38. Schultz, Duane, Psychology and Industry Today, New York: MacMillan Co., 1982.
39. Scott, Eugene and Henry P. Cole, "The Elusive Scientific Basis of Creation Science," The Quarterly Review of Biology, Vol. 60, No. 1, March, 1985, pp. 21-30.
40. Shofstahl, Charles, "Professor Persecuted for His Faith," Christian Inquirer, Feb. 1985, p. 26.
41. Tyner, Mitchell, "The Professor Who Lost His Job?" Liberty, Vol. 80, No. 1, Jan.-Feb.-1984, pp. 4-6, 26.
42. Wildman, Don, "Creationist Educators Suffer Persecution," NFD Journal, Oct., 1984, pp. 22-23.
43. Winder, Gordon, Letter to Jerry Bergman, 1984.
44. Wirth, Kevin, "A Call for Dialogue," Origins Research, Vol. 7, No. 9, Fall-Winter, 1984, p. 2.
45. Zuidema, Henry, "How to Rock A Campus Without Hiring," Liberty, Vol. 79, No. 6, Nov.-Dec., 1984, pp. 16-18.