

February 2025

My Response to the So-Called RationalWiki

By Jerry Bergman, PhD

The so-called RationalWiki 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." I once accepted the so-called rational worldview and was very active in this movement. One reason I left the so-called Rational Movement was because of their appallingly irresponsible scholarship used to attack Christians and creationists of all stripes. The example reviewed in this article is from a post on the RationalWiki website entitled "Jerry Bergman."¹ The post is an assault on my professional career and on the institutions with which I have worked over the years. This is only one sample of RationalWiki's unprofessionalism.

When I accepted the so-called rational worldview I wrote many articles supporting this view, some published after I left the movement. These include the following:

"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.

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

"Blood on the Altar: Confessions of a Converted Jehovah's Witness Minister." *The American Rationalist* 42(1):19, May–June 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 have put the website's words in italics or quotes, often both. RationalWiki wrote: *He [Bergman] 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.*¹

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."² This is an example of the common name-calling in this post. Journals that do not support evolution are regularly called pseudojournals. When CPU was formed, no distance-learning school was regionally accredited. Now they all are thanks to CPU's 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.³

¹ "Jerry Bergman." *RationalWiki*, https://rational-wiki.org/wiki/Jerry_Bergman Last edited 2024 Jul 18

² "Columbia Pacific University. *RationalWiki*, https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Columbia_Pacific_University Last edited 2024 Feb 22

³ Bergman J (2024) *Censoring the Darwin Skeptics: How Belief in Evolution is Enforced by Eliminating Dissidents*,

revised 3rd edition, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA. An entire chapter, Chapter 20, is devoted to CPU plus Appendices A, B, and C, pages 425–508. Included is a list of several hundred successful graduates, many teaching at major colleges and universities.

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.¹

In fact, as of this writing, I have 2,026 articles, and many are in peer-reviewed journals. I also have sixty books and monographs.

“As of 2013 Bergman worked in the Biological Sciences department of Northwest State Community College in Ohio.”¹ I have taught not only courses in the biological science area but also in physics and chemistry. The courses I taught during my forty-four-year career as a professor are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. 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.

<p>SCIENCE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>ENGINEERING</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 38. Engineering Materials <p>SCIENCE/MATHEMATICS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 39. Mathematics for Business Analysis 40. Introduction to Business and Economic Statistics 41. Introduction to Statistics 42. Advanced Statistics 43. Statistical Analysis 44. Basic Computer Programming 45. Computer Concepts 46. Introduction to Computer Systems and Programming 47. Introduction to Social Science Research <p>PSYCHOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>SOCIOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>EDUCATION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Education 81. Test and Measurements 82. Research in Education 83. Applied Management Project (Master’s Thesis) <p>PHILOSOPHY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 84. Introduction to Philosophy 85. Critical Thinking 86. Pathophysiology (In Preparation)
---	---	---

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.¹

The claim that I "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 PhD in biochemistry who was a very successful, anti-evolutionary debater.

From the RationalWiki website:¹

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. 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*.⁴ I used the standard definition as well as other definitions of the term vestigial. It is widely acknowledged in the literature that the over one hundred 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.⁵

I have taught anatomy at the college for over a decade and not one organ was claimed to be vestigial in the textbooks I used and in those I reviewed for my anatomy and physiology classes. Nor was the term in the index of the many anatomy and physiology books I reviewed.

*"Bergman has predictably enough argued that evolution leads to Hitler."*¹

This conclusion is well-documented in the literature.⁶ My role was to summarize the published peer-reviewed literature. Obviously, other factors were involved in Hitler's motivation. The fact is that if Hitler had been a creationist and accepted the view that all humans were descended from our first parents—that there is only one race, the human race—then 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. According to Bergman, "Charles Darwin's major goal in developing his theory was religious; he wanted to "murder" god (his words)"¹

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

Other things Bergman attributes to Darwin are:

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*.

⁴ Bergman J (2024) *Useless Organs: The Rise and Fall of a Central Claim of Evolution*, revised version, Bartlett Publishing, Tulsa, OK

⁵ "Vestigial." *Vocabulary.com* <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/vestigial>

⁶ See Richard Weikart (2004) *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany*; Leon

- He was active in “converting” all he could to his theory of origins.⁷
- Darwin plagiarized most of his major ideas.⁸
- Darwin was a racist of the worst kind and believed the lower races (the Blacks) would go extinct.⁹
- Darwin was opposed to helping the sick, but realized this idea would not go over well.¹⁰
- Darwin felt a wife was better than a dog (really!).¹¹
- He was severely mentally and physically ill, likely an agoraphobic.¹²
- As a young man he was sadistic and loved to kill animals with anything he had: guns, sticks, even hammers!¹³

RationalWiki does not state, but implies, that all of these claims are without foundation when they are all well documented in my book. The literature I reference supporting all of these points is unassailable and no amount of misspeak can alter this history.¹⁴

“Even if these claims were true, it is hard to see how they would undermine the scientific theory of evolution.”¹ Except they speak to Darwin’s 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, most every naturalist was a creationist. After Darwin, over ninety 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.*¹

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.”¹

The claim that I “had no psychological credentials” is obviously incorrect given the list of degrees listed in this RationalWiki post (MEd, Psychology and Counseling, Wayne State University, Detroit; PhD, Evaluation and Research with minor in Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit; and MA, Social Psychology, Bowling Green State University). I worked under the license of William J. Beausay, PhD until I 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 my colleagues at Bowling Green State University (BGSU), where I was then teaching, likewise disagreed with the monograph. As a result, I experienced often irrational personal antagonism from academics that I formerly believed were scholarly and objective academics. Long, and sometimes emotional, conversations resulted in which I saw another, very nasty, side of some of my colleagues. As far as I 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.¹⁵ This bitter experience revolutionized my previous naïve ideas about the objectivity of academics, a view inculcated within me during my graduate training in the area of measurement and evaluation.

⁷ Sulloway F (1982) Darwin’s Conversion. *J. Hist. Biol.* 15:325–326.

⁸ Darlington CD (1959) The origin of Darwinism. *Sci. Am.* 200(5):60–66, p. 62.

⁹ Darwin C (1871) *The Descent of Man*, John Murry, London, 201

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 168

¹¹ Browne EJ *Charles Darwin: Voyaging*, Princeton University Press, NJ, 379

¹² 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.

¹³ FitzRoy R (1839) *Narrative of Surveying Voyages of His Majesty’s Ships Adventure and Beagle, Between the Years 1826 and 1836, Describing Their Examination of the Southern Shores of South America, and the Beagle’s Circumnavigation of the Globe*. Henry Colburn, London, 26

¹⁴ See the references in my book *The Dark Side of Darwin*, New Leaf Press, Green Forest, AR. Worldcat lists it in 237 libraries so far. Revised edition published in 2015.

¹⁵ The monograph was “exhibit C” number 19189 in a US district court case number C80-390, that involved the monograph.

I was a candidate for tenure at BGSU when the monograph was published.¹⁶ 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.’”¹⁷ 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. ...The 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.¹⁸

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.¹⁹

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.²⁰

It was clear from my conversations with Dr. Davidson that he had never read the Fastback.

After a one-week-long trial, the court upheld the tenure denial, deferring to the judgment of my critics and ignoring my many supporters, several quoted in this paper. The court never listed which of my over 200 publications in print or in press then were troublesome. Only the Fastback was at issue.²¹ My publications included a textbook in the field that I taught²² as well as articles in numerous journals.²³ I since have learned that courts virtually always side against persons who question evolution, particularly in tenure disputes. One study of seventy-eight important discrimination decisions found that the court sided with the university eighty-eight percent of the time, and none of the cases where the professor prevailed involved religious

¹⁶ See Trial Transcript, *Gerald Bergman vs. Bowling Green State University*. US district case number C80-390, p. 293.

¹⁷ Tyner MA (1985) Bergman: The professor who lost his job. *Liberty* 80(1):5

¹⁸ Affidavit of Dr. Rigby, dated October 24, 1983.

¹⁹ Affidavit of Dr. Wallace DePue, dated September 16, 1983.

²⁰ Deposition of Judith Ann Gusweiler taken in Toledo, Ohio, 18 October 1982. Case No C80-390, pp. 330, 334.

²¹ I now have twenty-one publications in the American Sociological Association journal.

²² Bergman J (1981) *Understanding Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA

²³ *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; The Clearing House; Journal of Family Therapy; Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior; The Guidance Clinic; Texas Secondary Education Research Journal; Journal of Educational Public Relation; and College Press Review*

issues.²⁴ 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.²⁵

It became obvious that I would lose in this case because, in the over 200 court extant cases I researched in detail, all of the creationists lost. Not a single one prevailed in court.^{26,27,28,29} I challenge RationalWiki to locate a single case of an out-of-the-closet creationist professor that prevailed in one of these cases. Statistically one would have a better chance of a Jew surviving in Nazi Germany.^{30,31}

In my case, the National Education Association evaluated and concluded that due process was not followed when I was terminated for illegal reasons, namely my religion, what they called fundamentalist Christianity. I was one of the most productive professors in my department. I had excellent student evaluations and, at that time, had published over forty 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 I had a list of allowable research paper topics which included religious issues. Another concern was that I had published articles in openly Christian journals, and some of my articles had raised questions about the orthodox evolutionary belief, namely

molecules-to-man evolution. Further, although I taught evolution, my peers felt I 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 smoking and 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 me, David Latanick, hired by the National Education Association to defend me. 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. Although the problem was the general competency of the judge, when this was documented in detail, the appeals court ignored this issue when Judge Walinski's decision should have been thrown out.

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

²⁴ Amacher R, Meiners R (2004) *Faculty Towers: Tenure and the Structure of Higher Education*, The Independent Institute, Oakland, CA

²⁵ Letter from J.W.G. Johnson to Jerry Bergman, dated October 10, 1982.

²⁶ Bergman J (1984) *The Criterion; Religious Discrimination in America*, Onesimus Publishing Co., Richfield, MN

²⁷ Bergman J (2008) *Slaughter of the Dissidents: The Shocking Truth About Killing the Careers of Darwin Doubters*; revised version 2012; third edition 2014, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

²⁸ Bergman J (2016) *Silencing the Darwin Skeptics* revised edition 2023, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

²⁹ Bergman J (2024) *Censoring the Darwin Skeptics: How Belief in Evolution is Enforced by Eliminating Dissidents*, revised 3rd edition, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

³⁰ Rigg B (2002) *Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

³¹ Rigg B (2009) *Lives of Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: Untold Tales of Men of Jewish Descent Who Fought for the Third Reich*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

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 my 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 Case³²

A dozen signed notarized affidavits supported my claims, all of which were ignored by the court. The testimony of my colleagues, which was totally ignored, is printed below. (In the court documents cited below, "A" refers to the affidavits, "D" to the depositions, and "T" to the court transcripts.)

The administrator that I worked most closely with, Dr. Horton, associate dean of the college, stated that I 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).

The dean of the college, Dr. Elsass, stated that I 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 I worked closely with, Dr. Girona, wrote that he had:

...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.

³² Gerald Bergman v. Bowling Green State University et al. 820 F.2d 1224 In the United States Court of Appeals For the Sixth Circuit. Case 86-3031.

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 that I 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 my 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 the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision and one of the most prolific authors at BGSU with whom I 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...[are] 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 my colleagues voted against my tenure were probably that

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 [sic] 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 my publications, and

His [Bergman's] record of professional service is known by me to be excellent. Based upon my three years' 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 I am

...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 University Professor for Academic Order 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....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 have ever prevailed. The judge

claimed that my colleagues questioned the “quality” of my publications, yet the court record clearly shows that *almost all of my 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 my 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. My 300 in-press or in-print publications (now 2,026), most of which I published, or at least wrote, while at BGSU. These publications 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. My measurement book was reviewed by eight individuals). Given a conservative estimate of an average of three reviewers for each article, my publications were favorably reviewed by over 900 authorities.

No faculty in my department has served as a reviewer for a national journal, most not even for local ones, and those few who did *accepted* several of my 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 I had over twice the level of graduate education (credit hours) of any other member of my department, one must question if they can judge my work. My election to the graduate faculty, which was a “special privilege” (T-729), also demonstrates high evaluation of my work by my colleagues (T-728). Dr. Reed, my formal evaluator, testified that my research, service, and teaching performance were all average or above average. He rated my 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 my 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. (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 my 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 US 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 my favor cannot be presented. This is pure unadulterated indoctrination, not education. In the words of Nathaniel Jeanson, Harvard PhD in cell and developmental biology:

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.³³ 

³³ Jeanson NT (2025) I wasn't supposed to be there. *Answers* 20(1):53–57, p. 54