

DISCUSSION

In June 2012, Alper Bilgili from Süleyman Şah University in Istanbul, Turkey, has published in EJST the article ‘An introduction to logical fallacies: Dawkins’ *The God Delusion*’ [1]. The aim of the paper was “both to reveal some of the book’s logical fallacies that constitute perfect examples of weak reasoning and also to contribute to the possibilities of a better, more productive debate.”

In August 2012, Alexandru Volacu from the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration in Bucharest, Romania, came with a reply to Bilgili’s critique of Dawkins [2].

This fact and our wish of improving the journal’s dynamism and attractiveness brought us to the idea of making a *Discussion* section, where to present the most inciting papers together with the reviewers’/editors opinions.

The first *Discussion* section published in EJST is dedicated to the article ‘Systematic analysis of creationist claims: source criticism, context, argumentation and experiential thinking’. The paper was conceived by a team from Finland coordinated by Dr. Petteri Nieminen.

Below you may find the correspondence linked to the subject and then maybe you’ll be interested on reading the article on debate.

Dr. Iulian Rusu

References

- [1] A. Bilgili, *Eur. J. Sci. Theol.*, **8(2)** (2012) 39–46.
- [2] A. Volacu, *Eur. J. Sci. Theol.*, **9(4)** (2013) 123–138.

Submission letter

Petteri Nieminen, MD, PhD, DMedSci, MTh
University of Eastern Finland/Biomedicine/Anatomy
To the Editor of *European Journal of Science & Theology*,

We would greatly appreciate if you would consider our manuscript suitable for publication in your journal.

Creationist claims have been repeatedly analyzed for their scientific content but, despite of this, the same scientifically unsound re-interpretations of data from natural sciences have persisted for decades. We have previously analyzed creationist claims for the presence of argumentative fallacies and experiential thinking and found these aspects to be potentially responsible for the persistence of the claims. In addition, fallacies and experiential thinking patterns, such as confirmation bias and attachment of moral labels to scientific issues, can be significant for the acceptance of creationist claims. Due to this, a systematic method of analyzing creationist claims including source criticism, assessment of experiential thinking, argumentation analysis and analyzing the context of these aspects in creationist writings is presented. The examples reveal a high dependency of creationist writings on moral label attachment by demonization, *ad hominem* fallacies and confirmation bias. The proposed analytical method requires basic knowledge of Philosophy of science and argumentation theory but is readily accessible to scientists, theologians and educators who participate in the debate between evolutionary theory proponents and creationists.

Yours,
Petteri Nieminen

Reviewer 1

Absolutely, this should be accepted and published by us. However, it needs considerable editing to allow it to read better.

Reviewer 2

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I devoured it as soon as I saw the email message, and in my opinion the manuscript is an important contribution that is nearly ready for publication in its present form.

There are a few minor grammatical errors, but just a few - much fewer than usual in the manuscripts that I've reviewed in the past, for which I congratulate the authors. In the attachment, I've noted where those errors are and how they should be corrected.

The authors have presented a well-organized manuscript with well-done tables, a thorough analysis, and a thorough and lucid description of the analysis. I give this manuscript my enthusiastic approval.

There's no need to keep my name or comments anonymous. You have my permission to let the authors know that the comments in this message and in the attachment are from me.

Revision letter

Dear Editor,

Please find attached the files of our revised manuscript '*Systematic analysis of creationist claims: source criticism, context, argumentation and experiential thinking*' that we submitted recently to the *European Journal of Science and Theology*.

We have revised the manuscript according to the lexical and grammatical suggestions of the Reviewer. In addition, we have performed some minor modifications (correcting typographic errors, etc.) that we noticed during the revision process.

We hope you find the revised paper acceptable for publication in the *European Journal of Science and Theology*. We wish to thank the Editor and the Reviewer for the rapid processing of our submission and for the encouraging comments. We look forward to future submissions.

Yours sincerely,
Petteri Nieminen