

## [My response to the so-called RationalWiki](#)

Author

[Dr. Jerry Bergman, PhD](#)

The so-called RationalWiki [1](#) is an attempt to produce a Wikipedia based on 'Rationalism', a term that some atheists prefer because it avoids the negative stigma associated with the term 'atheism'. One reason I left the so-called Rational Movement was because of the appallingly irresponsible scholarship. The example reviewed here is only one sample of its unprofessionalism. My many publications in this area, many published after I left the movement, include:

"The Relationship Between Religious Belief and Homicide." *The American Rationalist*, January/February 1982, p. 70.

"The Influence of the Religious Belief in an Afterlife on Homicide." *American Atheist* 26(1):17-18, January 1984.

"God, Chance, or Human Factors?" *The American Rationalist* 40(3):36-37, September-October 1995.

"Blood on the Altar: Confessions of a Converted Jehovah's Witness Minister." *The American Rationalist* 42(1):19, May-June 1997.

"The Final Test." *The American Rationalist* 41(6):89-90, March-April 1997.

"Religion and Crime." *The American Rationalist* 42(4):71-72, November-December 1997.

"The King of Fairland." *The American Rationalist* 42(6):105, March-April 1998.

"Religion and Medicine: The Case of Christian Science." *The American Rationalist* 43(5):3-6, January-February 1999.

"Religion and Medicine: The Christian Science Holocaust." *Humanist in Canada* 356(1), Spring 2002.

In this paper I will put the website's words in italics or quotes, often both. The website wrote:

*"He has a doctorate in human biology (1992) from Columbia Pacific University [CPU], a non-accredited correspondence school that the Marin County Superior Court ordered to cease operations in California in 1999."* [2](#)

RationalWiki claims the school was shut down because CPU's "*creationist education (predictably) mirrors creationist "peer review" in creationist pseudojournals for its total lack of rigor.*" [3](#) This is an example of the common name calling in this post. When Columbia Pacific University was formed, no distance-learning school was regionally accredited. Now they all are thanks to CPUs lead. The slur "a non-accredited correspondence school" is typical of the "ethics" used by evolutionists to suppress opposition to their worldview. Some claim the reason they were shut down is others' jealousy over their success. CPU's success actually was a factor in beginning the enormous proliferation of the on-line education movement. I agree with RationalWiki, though, that the main reason was intolerance due to some of the worldviews of the faculty. [4](#)

The website then notes "*Bergman is a prolific writer with, according to Answers in Genesis, over 600 articles (none in peer-refereed scientific journals, of course, but quite a few for Answers Research Journal) and 20 books to his name.*"

In fact, as of this writing, Bergman has 2,026 articles, and many are in peer-reviewed journals. He also has 60 books and monographs.

*"As of 2013 Bergman worked in the Biological Sciences department of Northwest State Community College in Ohio."*

He taught not only courses in the biological science area but also in physics and chemistry. The courses he taught during his 44-year career as a professor included the following: [5](#)

### **UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE COURSES TAUGHT**

*(both graduate and undergraduate)* at the University of Toledo, Bowling Green State University, Findlay University, Medical College of Ohio, Defiance College, Indiana Wesleyan University, Spring Arbor University, Owens College, Northwest State Community College, Jackson Community College, Lorraine County Community College, Terra Community College, and Oakland Community College.





## **SCIENCE**

1. General Chemistry
2. Principles of Chemistry
3. Organic Chemistry I
4. Organic Chemistry II
5. Principles of Biochemistry
6. Physical Science
7. Physics I
8. Physics, Mechanics
9. Physics, Heat and Light
10. General Biology
11. Zoology
12. Botany
13. Microbiology
14. Nutrition
15. Anatomy and Physiology I
16. Anatomy and Physiology II
17. Structure and Function of the Human Body
18. Human Biology
19. Physiological Psychology
20. Substance Abuse
21. Principles of Genetics
22. Principles of Geology
23. Anthropology
24. Human Anthropology
25. Forensics.
26. General Biology I
27. The Human Body
28. Astronomy

## **ENGINEERING**

29. Steel and Concrete Structures
30. Mechanical Systems in Construction
31. Construction Technology
32. Advanced Construction Technology
33. Construction Estimating I
34. Construction Estimating II
35. Fluid Power
36. Fluid Mechanics
37. Statics

## **PSYCHOLOGY**

48. Social Psychology
49. Child Psychology
50. Development Psychology
51. Introduction to Psychology
52. Psychology of Adjustment
53. Adolescent Psychology
54. Industrial Psychology
55. Abnormal Psychology
56. Physiological Psychology
57. Educational Psychology
58. Human Growth and Development
59. Psychology of Giftedness
60. Transactional Analysis
61. Introduction to Counseling
62. General Psychology
63. Forensic Psychology

## **SOCIOLOGY**

64. Juvenile Delinquency
65. The Sociology of Deviant Behavior
66. The Sociology of Mental Illness
67. Social Problems
68. Sociology of Religion
69. Introduction to Sociology
70. Introduction to Corrections
71. Sociology of Marriage and the Family
72. Criminal Justice Organization and Administration
73. Public Bureaucracies
74. Sociology of Aging
75. Cultural Diversity

## **EDUCATION**

76. University Seminar
77. Curriculum for Gifted Students
78. Teaching the Gifted Child
79. Working with and Understanding Gifted Children
80. Assessment and Evaluation in

*“Bergman is known to be rather skilled at public debates, where he can Gish gallop at will and opponents don't have the time or opportunity to debunk all of his claims, misrepresentations, and fundamental misunderstandings.”*

The claim that Bergman “can Gish gallop at will and opponents don't have the time or opportunity to debunk all of his claims, misrepresentations, and fundamental misunderstandings” is purely name-calling in an attempt to excuse the fact that the case against evolution, defined as “from the goo to you by way of the zoo” is overwhelming. “Gish” refers to Duane Gish, a Berkley Ph.D. in biochemistry who was a very successful, anti-evolutionary debater.

### ***From the website: Scientific qualifications***

- *B.S. Major Areas of Study in Education, Psychology, Biology, Wayne State University, Detroit.*
- *M.Ed. Psychology and Counseling, Wayne State University, Detroit.*
- *Ph.D. Evaluation and Research with Minor in Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit.*
- *M.A. Social Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Ohio.*
- *M.S., B.S. Biomedical Science, Medical College of Ohio.*
- *Masters of Public Health, Northwest Ohio Consortium for Public Health (Medical College of Ohio, Bowling Green State University, University of Toledo).*
- *Ph.D. Human Biology, Columbia Pacific University. (San Rafael, California)*

*“One of Bergman’s favorite tactics is to redefine words. For instance, Bergman claims that he has scientifically proven that there is no such thing as vestigial organs, therefore evolution is false. He accomplished this by redefining “vestigial” to mean “having no function at all;” thus, all he had to do was to demonstrate that alleged vestigial organs did or potentially did anything whatsoever. [6](#) Of course, this is not the definition of “vestigial.” That did not prevent Bergman from writing a book about it (with George Howe).”*

The revised book is titled *Useless Organs: The Rise and Fall of a Central Claim of Evolution*. [7](#) Bergman used the standard definition as well as other definitions of the term vestigial. It is widely acknowledged in the literature that the over 100 organs

once defined as vestigial are not in any sense vestigial. A standard definition in biology is an organ or part of the body that is “degenerate, rudimentary, or atrophied, having become functionless in the course of evolution” and “the adjective vestigial derives from the Latin word *vestigium*, meaning ‘footprint, trace.’ It’s most often used in biology to describe something that either didn’t finish developing or has become, through evolution, pretty much useless. ... A penguin’s wings, on the other hand, are not vestigial because it has found another use for them — to help it swim.” [8](#) Bergman has taught anatomy at the college for over a decade and not one organ was claimed to be vestigial in the books he used and those he reviewed for his class. Nor was the term in the index.

*“Bergman has predictably enough argued that evolution leads to Hitler.”*

This conclusion is well-documented in the literature. [9](#) My role was to summarize the published peer-reviewed literature. Obviously, other factors were involved in Hitler’s motivation. The fact is, if Hitler had been a creationist and accepted the view that all humans were descended from our first parents, thus there is only one race, the human race, WWII would have been very different, if it would have occurred at all.

*“In fact, one of his primary debate tactics is character-assassination of Darwin. [10](#) According to Bergman, “Charles Darwin’s major goal in developing his theory was religious; he wanted to “murder” god (his words).”*

Again, all I did was to summarize the literature and Darwin’s goal was very clear.

“Other things Bergman attributes to Darwin are:

- He was active in “converting” all he could to his theory of origins.
- Darwin plagiarized most of his major ideas.
- Darwin was a racist of the worst kind and believed the lower races (the Blacks) would go extinct.
- Darwin was opposed to helping the sick, but realized this idea would not go over well.
- Darwin felt a wife was better than a dog (really!).
- He was severely mentally and physically ill, likely an agoraphobic. [6](#)

- As a young man he was sadistic and loved to kill animals with anything he had: guns, sticks, even hammers!”

He does not state but implied all of these claims are without foundation when they are all well documented in my book. The literature supporting all of these points is unassailable and no amount of misspeak can alter this history. [11](#)

*“even if these claims were true, it is hard to see how they would undermine the scientific theory of evolution.”*

Except they speak to his motivation in developing a theory which was intended to murder God, and the fact is, he was incredibly successful in achieving this goal. Before Darwin, almost every naturalist was a creationist. After Darwin, over 90 percent of all naturalists have rejected a creator God and a large percentage are atheists.

*“According to Bergman, everything is irreducibly complex, perhaps with the exception of sub-atomic particles. For instance, a carbon atom has a specific number of protons, neutrons, and electrons, and if you change those, it is no longer a carbon atom.”*

Correct. You have either a carbon isotope or a carbon ion if the 6-6-6 set is changed. I am unable to understand how anyone can deny this fact aside from ignoring reality.

*“He considers himself one of the victims of persecution by “Darwinists,” after he was denied tenure and dismissed from Bowling Green State University in 1978 “solely because of my beliefs and publications in the area of creationism.” He attempted, unsuccessfully, to take the university to court over religious discrimination....According to the courts, however, Bergman was terminated because of ethics, namely that he claimed to have credentials in psychology when, in fact, he “had no psychological credentials.”*

The claim that he “had no psychological credentials” is obviously incorrect given the list of degrees listed in this RationalWiki post (M.Ed., Psychology and Counseling, Wayne State University, Detroit; Ph.D., Evaluation and Research with Minor in

Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit; and M.A., Social Psychology, Bowling Green State University). He worked under the license of William J. Beausay, Ph.D. until he was licensed in the state of Ohio. The court testimony proving religious discrimination was very clear. The monograph published by Phi Delta Kappa was a major issue. Some of his colleagues at Bowling Green State University (BGSU), where he was then teaching, likewise disagreed with the monograph. As a result, he experienced often irrational personal antagonism from academics that he formerly believed were scholarly and objective persons. Long, and sometimes emotional, conversations resulted in which he saw another, very nasty, side of some of his colleagues. As far as he knew, none of them had read the entire monograph or even any part of it, a fact that openly came out in court—not one person testified that they read the monograph. [10](#) This bitter experience revolutionized his previous naïve ideas about the objectivity of academics, a view inculcated within me during my graduate training in the area of measurement and evaluation.

I was a candidate for tenure at BGSU when the monograph was published. [12](#) Tyner, discussing the reasons for my subsequent loss of tenure, wrote “most often mentioned [in court and the court documents in the Bergman case] is a Fastback written for the Phi Delta Kappa educational organization titled ‘Teaching About the Creation/Evolution Controversy.’” [13](#) As is clear from court documents, my peers openly denied my tenure on the basis of this and similar publications. BGSU Professor Gerald Rigby wrote that he was very concerned about my tenure case because it suggests the

relevancy of a religious-orthodoxy test for tenure at this University.

Insofar as Dr. Bergman’s views on religious matters, be they correct or incorrect, conventional or non-conventional, .... were taken account of by those casting tenure votes. ... the record speaks quite clearly to this point—such views were considered in the decision process. ... [T]he Fastback, “Teaching About the Creation/Evolution Controversy,” which Dr. Bergman authored for Phi Delta Kappa, entered into the decision .... I have read this presentation . . . [and] find myself supporting the “conventional wisdom” about evolution, [but] this little booklet is a superbly done consideration of the issues involved. I can find no fault with Dr. Bergman’s analysis and presentation; it is excellently written (as are all his publications I have been privileged to read), soundly reasoned, and eminently fair in its approach. No one could legitimately cite this as

support for... adverse judgment on Dr. Bergman's scholarship ... the University is a forum for exploration and exchange of ideas. Even the most unacceptable ought to have a fair hearing in a University, and the advocates of all views ought to .... receive the opportunity to explore, expound, and advocate their ideas. [14](#)

Dr. Wallace DePue, then a Full Professor at BGSU, wrote that he was

shocked to learn that Dr. Jerry Bergman had been dismissed .... because of his religious beliefs, namely his espousal of creationism. It is clear to me from reviewing information and talking to individuals about the case that Dr. Bergman, in violation of the University Charter, articles 1, and .4C, was dismissed solely because of his religious beliefs .... The University Charter clearly guarantees academic freedom, so termination on the grounds of espousing creationism in one's publications is surely a violation of this article. [15](#)

A BGSU colleague, Dr. Gusweiler, testified in court that a mutual colleague, Dr. Jim Davidson, "showed me a pamphlet from Phi Delta Kappa that Dr. Bergman had written on creationism. ... He threw it on my desk and said this is what Jerry was teaching. ... He was very adamant it [the pamphlet] was based on religious views and Jerry was teaching religion in the classroom." [16](#) It was clear from my conversations with Dr. Davidson that he never read the Fastback.

After a one-week-long trial, the court upheld the tenure denial, deferring to the judgment of his colleagues. The court never listed which of his over 200 publications in print or in press then were troublesome. Only the Fastback was at issue. [17](#) My publications included a textbook in the field that I taught [18](#) as well as articles in numerous journals. [19](#)

I since have learned that courts virtually always side against persons who question evolution, particularly in tenure disputes. One study of 78 important discrimination decisions found that the court sided with the University 88 percent of the time, and none of the cases where the professor prevailed involved religious issues. [20](#) When it became known that the monograph was part of the reason I lost my position, I received scores of letters, such as the following:

That you were sacked from a University for having written such a book is a sad commentary on the attitude of our education system. I have known that there is a bias that makes it tough for anyone who wants to open up the evolution subject for critical analysis, but your experience brought home the viciousness of the system.

Your book is well-balanced and fair, well-reasoned, and logically assembled. If anything, it gives too fair a deal to the evolution side. In short, it is a very good treatment of the subject, and that its message is getting good distribution, so the effort has been worthwhile. I trust that your present College provides you with a more pleasant atmosphere. [21](#)

It was obvious that Bergman would lose in this case because, in the over 200 court extant cases, all of the creationists lost. Not a single one prevailed in court. [22](#) I challenge RationalWiki to locate a single case of an out-of-the-closet creationist professor that prevailed in one of these cases. Statically one would have a better chance of a Jew surviving in Nazi Germany. [23](#)

In Bergman's case, the *National Education Association* evaluated and concluded that due process was not followed when he was terminated for illegal reasons, namely his religion, what they called fundamentalist Christianity. Bergman was one of the most productive in his department. He had excellent student evaluations and, at that time, had published over 40 articles in peer-reviewed, scholarly literature and a textbook published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

The university's concerns brought out in court included the fact that he had a list of allowable research paper topics which included religious issues. Another concern was that he had published articles in openly Christian journals, and some of his articles had raised questions about the orthodox evolutionary belief, namely molecules-to-man evolution. Further, although he taught evolution, his peers felt he did not teach it with enthusiasm and the personal commitment as a true believer in the theory.

The district court civil rights case was presided over by the late Judge Nicholas J. Walinski of Toledo, Ohio. It was obvious that the judge was intoxicated during the trial and repeatedly made illogical statements, such as referring to the jury when it was a bench trial. At the time of the trial, Walinski was convicted by Judge Andrews in Toledo Municipal Court of his second drunken-driving conviction in fifteen months.

The charges stemmed from a two-car injury accident that occurred near Judge Walinski's West Toledo, Ohio, home. Walinski was ordered to complete a twenty-eight-day detoxification and alcohol rehabilitation program. He died at age 72 on December 24, 1992, of acute myocardial infarction. A well-known risk factor for heart disease is heavy drinking.

Judge Walinski obviously was not always fully aware of what was going on in his own courtroom. The judge's attitude about the case was stunningly clear when he rudely shot back at the attorney representing the professor, David Latanick, hired by the National Education Association to defend the professor. When attorney Latanick was attempting to explain the rules of academia, Walinski stated: "I am getting an education in academia, but I would rather not get educated, and I'd rather get rid of this case." The entire case was about academia, and to judge an academia case, a judge must learn about the rules and norms of academia. One of the most important rules is academic freedom, a rule the judge stated he would rather not learn about.

The major means of proving employment discrimination is disparate treatment, meaning unequal application of the rules. In other words, everyone must be treated alike regardless of race, sex, or religion. This requires comparisons of the person denied tenure with the faculty that were granted tenure. Specifically, to prove disparate treatment in employment requires making comparisons with similarly situated persons not in the protected class. No comparisons on the appropriate criteria were made in court, and all efforts to do so were successfully blocked by Judge Walinski. This was made clear by Judge Walinski stating, "we are going too far afield with *what they did with somebody else.*"

Discrimination can be determined only by comparing performance and/or evidence of not giving the professor due process. The judge refused to allow any comparisons with other professors, the only way to prove discrimination. Thus, he refused to enforce the legally required standard in this case, even though race or sex discrimination are proven by focusing on these very factors.

In summary, Judge Walinski was clearly not competent during the trial. He was diagnosed as an alcoholic who displayed bizarre behavior on the bench, such as openly stating in court that he did not care to become informed about the professor's case but would "rather get rid of this case." This is grossly improper behavior for a judge who must, as a matter of law, be impartial. This judge had no business being on the bench. For valid reasons, he was removed soon after this case

was tried.

Nonetheless, in spite of overwhelming evidence of his gross incompetence, an appeal of the case to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld Judge Walinski's obviously irresponsible decision. The court ruled "Dr. Davidson testified that plaintiff's misrepresentation of himself was the reason for the denial of tenure. He stated that Dr. Bergman said he was a psychologist when he had no psychological credentials. Dr. Wiersma indicated difficulty in documenting the actual existence of plaintiff's books. *Plaintiff argues that any such allegations of misconduct can be disproved by him.* [why was he not given the chance to respond to their concerns?] Nevertheless, the evidence reveals that the tenured faculty members were genuinely concerned about plaintiff's ethics and that their confusion over his actual qualifications was premised on the difficulty in verifying his vita." (820 F.2d 1224 lines 45-47; emphasis added). Concern is not evidence of wrongdoing. What if the authorities were "genuinely concerned about if the plaintiff robbed the bank." Who would rule, since they were sincere, therefore, he is guilty of robbing the bank? To hell with the evidence.

### **Documents Submitted as part the Appellate Court Case (A refers to the affidavits, D to the depositions, and T the court transcripts).**

A dozen signed notarized affidavits supported Bergman's claims, all which were ignored by the court. The testimony of his colleges, which was totally ignored, is printed below. The administrator Dr. Bergman worked most closely with, Dr. Horton, Associate Dean of the college, stated that Dr. Bergman was one of BGSU's

most talented and creative professors. I've known him for six years and find him to be very personable and one of the most stimulating conversationalists that I have ever met... Dr. Bergman has an insatiable thirst for knowledge coupled with the desire to write and disseminate his scholarly efforts... he is the most prolific writer on our faculty of almost 200 members. He writes well on a variety of subjects and has an excellent publishing record in refereed and non-refereed journals. Dr. Bergman also maintains good rapport with his students. He likes to teach and does it well. In short [Dr. Bergman] is a creative, flexible person who teaches . . . and writes well . . . (A-59). [24](#)

The Dean of the college, Dr. Elsass, stated that Dr. Bergman was currently the

most prolific faculty author in the college [and] I must concur with positive endorsements received from Dr. Reed and PPPG Council ...[that he has] demonstrated and documented fulfillment of basic criteria-effective teaching, scholarly and creative productivity and service (A-36).

Another faculty member Dr. Bergman worked closely with, Dr. Girona, wrote that he has:

read a number of his [Bergman's] publications and find them thoroughly researched, well thought out, and well-written ... His test and measurement book was excellent.... I felt that he had achieved what few test and measurement books had been able to accomplish, namely to convey the essentials (and more so) of the field in a very readable fashion, avoiding much information...which is commonly taught but usually absolutely useless in the field. The textbook is truly an innovation, and such a radical departure from the mainline test and measurement books that it may have trouble becoming accepted. I am certain, though, that in time this approach will become more and more common. In short, Dr. Bergman is a trailblazer (A-33).

Dr. Charlesworth stated Dr. Bergman was

...a gifted, versatile and energetic person who has devoted his career to scholarly pursuits. His papers are well-researched, thorough, scholarly, interesting and thought-provoking. He carries on a vast correspondence with other scholars in this country and abroad, seeking and exchanging ideas and information. He was clearly the most productive member of the entire department (A-100).

Another one of Dr. Bergman's colleagues, Dr. Wood stated that he has

read several of Jerry's articles that related to areas of interest to me. He is an interesting and amazingly active and wide-range writer. Although I do not always agree with every one of his interpretations, I have always found

him to be happy to discuss our differences and [he] exhibits a clear understanding of my position (A-56).

Dr. Leslie Chamberlin, chair of Dept. EDAS and one of the most prolific authors at BGSU with whom Dr. Bergman co-authored several articles, wrote:

Dr. Bergman is truly a research-minded faculty member who works quite diligently at certain areas in research including those of crime and delinquency, suicide ... Jerry Bergman is a prolific writer ... a member of many professional associations ... [and] my association with [him]... has been pleasant and informative. We have written many professional articles together... my observations ... (is) that he works well with students. They ... relate to him and he has good rapport with them. I've had many conversations with Jerry during his years at BGSU and have found him to have a humanistic attitude towards others ... (A-60-63).

Dr. Ron Coté added:

Jerry impresses me as consistently polite, empathetic, and sincere. Professionally, he is exceptionally competent, tireless, and persistent; his publications record is probably the most impressive in our college. As an academic, he is very intelligent, interesting, and informed (A-74).

In his affidavit, Dr. Coté added that the reasons Dr. Bergman's colleagues voted against his tenure was probably

varied and undeterminable...criticisms... seemed to center on irrelevant points such as appearance, philosophy. Dr. Bergman, on at least two major criteria, has achieved notable success: motivation of students and publications ... The expressed, most significant criteria of any university has always been publications. Dr. Bergman cannot be found lacking in this area. Substitute criticisms apparently have been made for personal, unprofessional reasons ... Dr. Bergman would seem to be eminently qualified for ... tenure. Not to grant such a continuation ... seems to me extremely unjust and prejudicial [and] unprofessional and not in keeping with university criteria for continuation of employment .... personally I am very much concerned about the loss of such a colleague; his abilities are a

valuable asset to this university (A-66-68).

Dr. Fyffe stated that he read many of Dr. Bergman's publications, and

...His record of professional service is known by me to be excellent. Based upon my three year's service upon the *College of Education's Personal Policy and Professional Growth Council*, I am utterly amazed that tenure could be denied. Few faculty members ...had a record of performance which matches Jerry Bergman's. He has published in excess of 100 times...I can find no explanation for refusal of tenure. It would be difficult to find faculty at the full professor with such varied accomplishments, let alone a man at the lowest academic rank (A-69-70).

Dr. Bill Reynolds concluded that Dr. Bergman is,

...an ...above [average] teacher with a variety of publications to his credit. I have valued at least two of his publications as average and above. He is diligent in maintaining office hours and frequently consults with students. ... Dr. Bergman is a functioning faculty member whose performance seems to be above average... (A-71-72).

And the thorough UPAO report concluded that

Dr. Bergman was clearly the most productive member of the department both in the quantity and quality of his publications in both refereed and unrefereed journals. [and] ... over a dozen colleagues came forward to support Dr. Bergman with official affidavits stating that his teaching and research was clearly outstanding and that the main, if not the only, reason for his termination was his religious beliefs, publications, and interests (A-26-27).

All of this testimony was ignored. It is clear that regardless of the evidence, the termination would be upheld by the court. No creationists has ever prevailed. The judge claimed that Dr. Bergman's colleagues questioned the "quality" of his publications, yet the court record clearly shows that *almost all of his colleagues have never read a single one* and, nearly all of those few who claim they did at best only glanced at early drafts of a few articles written in Dr. Bergman's first few years at

BGSU, and had essentially no substantial comment to make about them except undocumented and vague meaningless concerns such as “methodology.” Valid criticism requires that one specify which article is being referred to, and the specific methodological or other concerns. Dr. Bergman’s 300 in-press or in-print publications (now 2026), most of which he published, or at least wrote, while at BGSU, were reviewed by acknowledged experts in the field (at the minimum, by the editor, and most refereed journal articles are reviewed by two and sometimes three reviewers; his measurement book was reviewed by eight individuals). Given a conservative estimate of an average of three reviewers for each article, his publications were favorably reviewed by over 900 authorities.

No faculty in his department has served as a reviewer for a national journal, most not even for local ones (and those few who did *accepted* several of Dr. Bergman’s articles for publication!). Persons who have not been selected to serve in this capacity cannot make the claim of being qualified. The faculty are thus questioning the judgment of nationally recognized experts. Furthermore, in that Dr. Bergman has over twice the level of graduate education (credit hours) as does any other member of his department, one must question if they can judge his work. Dr. Bergman’s election to the graduate faculty, which was a “special privilege” (T-729), also demonstrates high evaluation of his work by his colleagues (T-728). Dr. Reed, his formal evaluator, testified that his research, service, and teaching performance were all average or above average.

He rated his research and scholarship “very highly...the most prolific” in the department (T-270-271). It is irresponsible to substitute the judgment of persons who have not read Dr. Bergman’s publications for those regarded by their colleagues as experts in the area and selected to review articles. Furthermore, can those who have not demonstrated a skill properly sit in judgment of those who have? As Dr. Zeller noted (A-37-39):

Many of Dr. Bergman’s colleagues in his department ... have such inadequate publication records that there is serious question about their scholarly abilities (i.e., they have not published a single article in a reputable journal in their entire career). What is the reaction to ... a relatively young faculty member who has published dozens of books and hundreds of articles? Such a person will, I believe, be threatened by the appearance of a young, bright, hard-working colleague. ... unproductive

faculty members will seek to eliminate productive faculty ... from the faculty so that their own relative unproductivity is not made apparent ...they will seek to deny...tenure to their... productive colleagues. I believe that this occurred in the Bergman case...

And Dr. Girona concluded (A-32) that he believed

there is clear professional jealousy of Dr. Bergman. He published more than our entire department combined, and many of our colleagues have rarely published anything. Publishing is one of the most important activities in the university, and was constantly stressed in our department. Most of my colleagues felt inferior to Dr. Bergman, and concluded that their likelihood of publishing was low and thus seemed to put forth little effort.

Dr. Phillips concluded that research is of primary importance in the department (D-41-44) and Dr. Carpenter testified forcefully that the faculty

Should have reached their decision on the basis of evidence, and if they didn't have evidence on which to base their decision, . . . then I can't see [how they could arrive at a decision although] that would imply ... that the faculty member, in absence of any other indication, should . . . be supported (T-377-378).

To defer *carte blanche* to the faculty's "judgment" effectively negates the *Civil Rights Act* in an academic situation. *Nemenwirth v. U. of Wisconsin* (769 F. 2d 1235; 1985) noted the basis for their decision must be scrutinized (that would require, for example, that *all* the faculty had read most of Dr. Bergman's over 300 publications, could intelligently comment thereupon, and had visited his classroom—which not one of his critics did (A-232). How can discrimination ever be proved if all the faculty have to do is simply give the person denied tenure a putative "hearing" which does not have to comport to even minimal due process? The hearing should be examined to determine whether or not it comported with the law and the university's own rules.

## Summary

The U. S. Supreme Court also refused to hear the case, supporting the ruling by a judge who was obviously inebriated during the trial. Again, the courts supported censoring the sacred worldview (theistic religion) and allowing only the secular worldview (atheistic evolution) to be presented. Both worldviews answer the three main questions of life (Where did we come from?, Why are we here?, and Where are we going when we die?). The secular worldview says we evolved from the natural selection of genetic mutations, we are here to survive and pass on our genes, and when we die we are gone forever. The sacred worldview says we were created by God, we live to serve God and our fellow humans, and when we die we go to our eternal reward, Heaven or Hell.

The courts have ruled that only information in favor of evolution can be presented in the public schools and information opposed to evolution is not allowed because it is seen as indirectly or backdoor teaching creation. Teaching information in favor of creation is not allowed, given that this only RationalWiki side of the story can be taught. Thus, information presented here in favor of Bergman cannot be presented. This is pure unadulterated indoctrination, not education. In the words of Harvard Ph.D. in cell and developmental biology, Nathaniel Jeanson: “Today creation scientists like me are prohibited from running academic labs. They are also denied government funding for their projects. They are forbidden from publishing in mainstream peer-reviewed journals. In short, creation science is excluded from every stage of the scientific process.” [25](#)

- [1](#)

[https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Jerry\\_Bergman#cite\\_note-12](https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Jerry_Bergman#cite_note-12).

- [2](#)

[https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Columbia\\_Pacific\\_University#Creationism](https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Columbia_Pacific_University#Creationism) .

- [3](#)

[https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Columbia\\_Pacific\\_University#Creationism](https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Columbia_Pacific_University#Creationism) .

- [4](#)

*Censoring the Darwin Skeptics: How Belief in Evolution is Enforced by Eliminating Dissidents*. Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press. 2024, revised 3rd edition, 566 pages. An entire chapter, Chapter 20, is devoted to CPU plus

Appendices A, B, and C, pages 425-508.

- [5](#)

Included is a list of several hundred successful graduates, many teaching at major colleges and universities.

- [6a6b](#)

I relied heavily on the work of Dr. Ralph Colp MD who made Darwin's Health a career. He was assistant professor of psychiatry at Columbia University. His books include *To Be an Invalid*. University of Chicago Press. 1977; and *Darwin's Illness*. University Press of Florida. 2008.

- [7](#)

*Useless Organs: The Rise and Fall of a Central Claim of Evolution*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Bartlett Publishing; revised version, 2024, 332 pages.

- [8](#)

<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/vestigial#:~:text=The%20adjective%20vestigial through%20evolution%2C%20pretty%20much%20useless>

- [9](#)

See Richard Weikart. 2004. *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany*; Leon Zitzer. 2016. *Darwin's Racism*. A 778-page, well-documented book; A.E. Samaan. 2020. *From a "Race of Masters" to a "Master Race": 1948 to 1848*; Richard Weikart. 2022. *Darwinian Racism: How Darwinism Influenced Hitler, Nazism, and White Nationalism*.

- [10a10b](#)

The monograph was "exhibit C" number 19189 in a U.S. district court case number C80-390, that involved the monograph.

- [11](#)

See the references in my book on Darwin.

- [12](#)

See Trial Transcript, *Gerald Bergman vs. Bowling Green State University*. U.S. district case number C80-390, p. 293.

- [13](#)

M.A. Tyner. "Bergman: The Professor Who Lost His Job." *Liberty* 80(1):5, 1985.

- [14](#)

Affidavit of Dr. Rigby, dated October 24, 1983.

- [15](#)

Affidavit of Dr. Wallace DePue, dated September 16, 1983.

- [16](#)

Deposition of Judith Ann Gusweiler taken in Toledo, OH, 18 October 1982. Case No C80-390, pp. 330, 334.

- [17](#)

I now have 21 publications in the ASA (American Sociological Association) journal.

- [18](#)

*Understanding Educational Measurement and Evaluation*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.

- [19](#)

*New Directions in Teaching, Quarterly Journal for the North Carolina Association for the Gifted and Talented, Journal of Scholarly Publishing, Sociological Analysis, Ohio Reading Teacher, The Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, Journal of Instructional Psychology, American Secondary Education, Journal of Gifted, Creative, and Talented, The Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, Suicidology and Life Threatening Behavior, Art Education, Clearing House, Journal of Family Therapy, Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, The Guidance Clinic, Texas Secondary*

- [20](#)

R. Amacher and R. Meiners. 2004. *Faculty Towers: Tenure and the Structure of Higher Education*. Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute.

- [21](#)

Letter from J.W.G. Johnson to Jerry Bergman, dated October 10, 1982.

- [22](#)

*The Criterion; Religious Discrimination in America*. Richfield, MN: Onesimus Publishing Co., 1984; *Slaughter of the Dissidents: The Shocking Truth About Killing the Careers of Darwin Doubters*. Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2008. Revised version, 2012. Third edition published in 2014, 482 pp; *Silencing the Darwin Skeptics*. Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2016. Revised edition, 2023, 396 pages; *Censoring the Darwin Skeptics: How Belief in Evolution is Enforced by Eliminating Dissidents*. Southworth, WA: Leafcutter Press, 2024. Revised 3rd edition, 566 pages.

- [23](#)

Rigg, Bryan. 2002. *Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas; Rigg, Bryan. 2009. *Lives of Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: Untold Tales of Men of Jewish Descent Who Fought for the Third Reich*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

- [24](#)

“A-” refers to an **affidavit** submitted to the court, “D-” to the court **deposition**, and “T-” to the **transcript** of the court trial. Thus these documents were all part of the court record.

- [25](#)

Jeanson. Nathaniel. 2025. "I wasn't supposed to be there." *Answers* 20(1):53-57, p. 54.

- 48 views

[View PDF](#)