

The Anti-scientific Argument

"Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation." Robert Jastrow, *The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the Universe* (1981), p. 19.

"If one proceeds directly and straightforwardly in this matter, without being deflected by a fear of incurring the wrath of scientific opinion, one arrives at the conclusion that biomaterialists with their amazing measure of order must be the outcome of intelligent design. ... problems of order, such as the sequences of amino acids in the chains ... are precisely the problems that become easy once a directed intelligence enters the picture. (Fred Hoyle & N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Astronomers, Mathematicians & Cosmologists*, University College Cardiff, *Evolution from Space*, J. M. Dent & Sons 1981, and in *The Omni Lecture, :And Other Papers on the Origin of Life*, Enslow Publishers 1982, p. 27-28)

Our website receives emails arguing the "Anti-scientific Argument." This argument sets itself forth as preserving the integrity of science by excluding anything supernatural. But its effect is simply to prevent science from examining anything that it cannot measure empirically. In reality, science points to a reality that is much larger than this.

The argument:

"Science, by definition, CANNOT posit a supernatural force [a Creator] as an explanation, because science has NO MEANS of empirically testing supernatural events or causes. Therefore, it is OUTSIDE the realm of science."

The un-refuted response:

The argument is circular

If science, by definition, cannot posit the existence of a Creator, then science cannot be used to prove that a Creator does not exist.

For instance, if I determine that *no matter what I observe*, I shall never observe X or anything that X does, then I cannot turn around and argue, "Ah ha! In all of my research I have never observed X or anything that X has done, so I have now proven that X is not the cause of anything."

As long as evolution refuses to admit the possibility of special creation and refuses to look at the evidence on both sides, evolution cannot be used to logically argue that special creation did not occur.

It is grossly circular to *refuse to posit* the existence of something and then to allege that one has thereby proven that it doesn't exist. Doing that is presuming an answer before making the argument.

Evolutionary science has therefore disqualified itself from arguing that a Creator ever did or didn't do anything. So, evolutionary science cannot logically argue that God is not an adequate explanation of what has been observed in nature.

As long as evolution could adequately explain what has been observed, it could argue that its explanation was the best explanation. But now, when unobserved accidental mutations and survival of the fittest cannot offer a credible explanation for how, for instance, a hundred thousand immensely complicated chemical formulae became inscribed in a *language* into the arrangement of atoms in a molecule, supernatural creation becomes the more credible explanation.

Why have any presupposition at all about a Creator?

What business does science have in positing either the presence or the absence of a Creator? Why not simply look at the evidence and conclude whether the evidence alone indicates the existence of a Creator?

The reason why evolutionists will not do this is because evidence for intelligent design is all through nature, and evolutionists know that chance mutations and dying animals can come nowhere near explaining what has been observed.

Scientists who have the courage to posit neither the existence or the non-existence of a Creator may well become creationists.

Science should be free to observe whatever it observes and to posit any theory that best explains what has been

observed *after* the observations have been made. Whether the answer points to a Creator should not be determined by how much the answer offends the theological convictions of scientists - or how much it is politically or monetarily expedient.

Evolutionists simply do not believe that science should be free to test (and debate) all theories. Evolutionary scientists do not seem to care what the evidence says, because their minds are made up before they even look at the evidence:

"*Even if there were no actual evidence in favor of the Darwinian theory ... we would still be justified in preferring it over rival theories [creationism].*"

Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (NY Norton, 1986), 287, emphasis in the original.

So, even where the observations of science point toward a Creator, evolutionary scientists exclude Creationism *a priori* because it conflicts with a theological position that a Creator must not, under any circumstances, exist.

What is this reasoning that forecloses a particular opinion because it conflicts with the theological position that God does not exist? What is this reasoning that no matter what the evidence may be, one avenue of thought is forbidden *ab initio*? Is this rational, honest inquiry? It is not. It is neither rational nor honest. It is dogma in its purest form.

How can the opinions of scientists like this have any credibility whatever in the creation / evolution controversy? It is like discussing the implications of DNA with a man who will not consider the possibility that atoms exist.

But they argue so adamantly that there

is no evidence whatever that God exists. Oh, really? What about a computer the size of a pinhead that computes at the rate of a *billion* organized computations in 1/1000 of a second? See [Honeybee](#). Or what about a computer the size of a cantelope that stores the memories of a lifetime in the electrical orientations of trillions upon trillions of molecules - and INDEXES them? See [Memory](#). These things could not have come from accidental mutations and dying animals, no matter how much time the evolutionist chooses to imagine.

Let us reason together

If you were *really* objective and if you really divested yourself of all preconceived opinion about God, would you really conclude that things like a human brain were produced by millions of unobserved accidental beneficial mutations and dying animals? I think not.

But would you acknowledge what you do not believe in order to preserve your reputation and your income? Probably so.

Written by Charles R. Chesnutt, Sr.
Mr. Chesnutt's professional website is [Chapter7-11.com](#)
See also [biblebooks.co](#)

Any refutation to this page will be posted here without substantial alteration.

Note: from September of 2008 through January of 2009, viewers have viewed all of the pages of this website approximately 30,000 times. Not one has offered a refutation to this page.

CLICK TO GO TO [CreationDesign.org](#)

