

## GRACIOUS SCIENCE AND INTERFERING SCIENCE

LAWRENCE A. MCGHEE\*

Received 7 January, 1980

*It is argued that the concept of truth is a moral one. Science is considered to have to do with truth. Consequently science is a moral activity, that is, one to which moral standards and criteria apply. Some consequences of this viewpoint are suggested.*

In all disciplines of human knowledge and action it is impossible to proceed without presuppositions. Some of the more important and common are: that truth exists, that the external world exists, that the thinking person exists. The importance of presuppositions appears when we consider that every one of the 'common' ones just listed has been challenged by one or another thinker. Human actions are not 'instinctive'. They are guided always by an underlying foundation of presuppositions.

It is the purpose of this paper to challenge one such presupposition in the world of science, to show its deleterious cultural effects, and to propose grounds for a better clearing along with renewed meaning to the entire enterprise. The presupposition and its implications is that scientific endeavor is 'amoral' or 'value-free' with the corollary that valuing only appears when scientific results are put into practical technical applications.

The thesis is that *all* human actions and thoughts have a value structure or else none have. Man is fundamentally a choosing and deciding being. There is no action or thought process which is a-moral, without a productive or non-productive value for both the self and others.

For example, in the scientific community the very adoption of the empirical, materialistic scientific method as the criterion (often the *only* criterion) for truth is a value judgment and a decision in the face of other options in both past and current human history. Furthermore, it is a value judgment to approach the world mathematically. For instance, it is considered worthy and important to know the rate of acceleration of the force of gravity. Obviously, that rate prevailed prior to Newton's mathematical clearing of it. Millions of men *still* do not consciously understand the rate and live well without that knowledge. Finally, there is nothing observed in the world which would give rise to a necessary understanding of the object of science as "to ameliorate the condition of man, by adding to the advantages which he naturally possesses." (Elements of Natural Philosophy, 1808)

Scientific endeavor speaks much of truth and rationality in the world, however, the final dominance of truth and the very existence of rationality are challenged by such concepts as 'evolving' laws of nature and the Hegelian concept of truth . . . both leading to imprecision of knowledge and a new ontology.

We conclude that men constantly take actions and constantly think and, in *all* of these actions and thoughts, they are valuing and selecting out of many options the way they will go—furthermore they are con-

stantly called upon to answer for their ways. For every missile built, someone wants to build a hospital or a freeway.

In the scientific community, the moral nature of *every* action (choosing this experiment over that, choosing to use this drug for cancer or that) is established by the fact that science cannot function without truth claims. Truth is a moral issue; therefore, *all* scientific endeavor, *theory* or practice, is moral. Only if truth is a-moral can science claim to be a-moral.

Let us move from this general position statement to an examination of three structures of the current scientific enterprise: leading current presuppositions, leading current goals, and leading current final ends or purposes.

There are five major categories in the realm of presuppositions. Two of these appear to be virtually unquestioned, while the other three are under hot dispute at this hour of history.

1. All men see the same world. This sounds innocuous but it is hardly so. This means that all men looking at an action of their own or others will concur upon and understand it in the same way. There is only one way to *truly* see the world. That way is the empirical, disinterested and detached 'I think, therefore I am' ego of Descartes. Most especially it asserts that the mind of man is not fallen and does not see reality with distortions. (The depth of this problem becomes clear when we see evolutionists looking at the *fallen* world and making pronouncements and judgments about its past and its future based in this non-revelatory perspective. Without revelation, the sin structure of current entropic reality will be overlooked or justified.)

2. The mathematical approach to the seen is pre-eminent. Poetry is acknowledged to be 'nice' and a 'cultural accompaniment' and Proverbs has some 'interesting' ideas—but when the nitty-gritty is sought—give me the numbers. "I guide my life by the numbers, not the Spirit". This is the motto.

3. The function of the scientific establishment is to 'ameliorate the human condition.' Again, unfallen minds are assumed and it is further assumed (contrary to the historical record!) that we *know* what ameliorates the human condition—usually some form of "men live by bread and things alone."

In addition, the amelioration of the human condition assumes that the environment (not the human heart!) is hostile to humanity and must be constantly interfered with to better it. Despite the abundance of sunlight, air and green plants without which we would live not a day—the environment is 'hostile'! One suspects this is a Satanic deception to take our mind from the real problem—the heart of everyman.

\*Mr. Lawrence A. McGhee's address is 14019 S.E. Market, Portland, Oregon 97233.

4. This is an outworking of number three in the effort of "progress" to perfect and control the imperfect and chaotic 'mystery' of things outside the self so that, by dominating them, it shall be proven that their existence did not arise from an intelligent source other than the human mind. Philosophical absurdity is allowed here in the interest of emotional revolt against the Creator . . . the absurdity that a chance, chaotic, meaningless environment could accidentally throw up a creature interested in ordering and rationalizing it and finding meaning for it. (Could this problem be the source of the speculation that we came to the earth from another world—where presumably evolution was not so chaotic?)

5. The final presupposition of science ruled early day science before it abandoned its roots in desacralized creation and entered in blind *hubris* and apostasy into a Creator-less reality. I refer to the understanding that the study of the created world gave glory to its Creator. The end of science in this model is "to think God's thoughts after Him." Now it is to impose whatever the imagination of man can conceive on a meaningless, random chaos. In its final outworking, this view leads to absurdity, nihilism, and gigantic *hubris*.

On the foundation of this presuppositional structure, we have a deep rift in the scientific community regarding goals and final ends or purposes. This rift exposes the valuing structure of all science for the law-abiding structure of the universe cannot exist in a structureless, chance-grounded understanding. There are two quite different understandings of ends possible as one faces the *same* basic data regarding the universe.

1. To make evolving man the Lord over both "nature" and the "unfortunate" ignorance of his more "backward" and "gentle" fellowmen . . . those who have not adopted the vicious no-holds-barred use of

science for tyranny. This dominance will be gained by constantly improving the functioning (*never* purposes) of the mechanical and human 'parts' in a grandly grinding ant-hill with no destiny but to be crushed to make way for a grander one. With this goal, it is assumed that life has only short-range gratification aims and there is no eternal *telos* for existence.

2. To understand the majestic wisdom of the Creator in His Creation and to live graciously within the contours of a fallen creation with thanksgiving to God for His proleptic deliverance in Jesus Christ from the Second Law of Thermodynamics. (The evolving man solution has no solution to the 2nd Law—in fact, the massive use of energy to improve function merely sets the world up for a gigantic collapse in which we are now beginning to participate.)

The final ends or *telos* of human existing on this planet take their foundations from this difference in *spiritual* attitude running right through the heart of the scientific enterprise. On the one hand, we have men whose spirit seeks to use science for power, greed, dominance, lust and who seek to glorify man and live with grand exploitation of 'nature' as though they were gods. This is interfering science.

On the other hand are those scientists of humility before the majesty of the Creator of the universe who understand by revelation what man's true condition is and that, at his best, he reaches nowhere near the glory of God. These scientists seek to glorify the Creator in their work and to live graciously before Him, manifesting the fruits of the Spirit, while they and all believers await the deliverance of the earth from the vanity of the Law of Entropy through the Personal Appearance of the Lord of the Universe, Jesus Christ, the Righteous. This is gracious science.

## A CRITICAL LOOK AT PLATE TECTONICS AND CONTINENTAL DRIFT

CLIFFORD L. BURDICK\*

Received 18 January, 1980

*Years ago, at the University, I was asked to lead the negative side of a debate on continental drift. We won; not, I hasten to add, because of my leadership, but, I believe, on the strength of the arguments presented. Since then much new evidence has come to light, which can at least be interpreted in favor of drift and plate tectonics. Consequently, there has been a drift toward their acceptance. However, the head structural geologist at a university, with whom I discussed this, was not ready to adopt the theory. "Be not the first by whom the new is tried, nor yet the last to lay the old aside". He cited Wesson, who enumerated some 75 objections to the hypothesis, which as yet have not been answered.<sup>1</sup>*

Half a century ago Alfred Wegener put forth his hypothesis of continental drift. This idea arose from the fact, first noted by Sir Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century, that the outlines of the continents appear almost capable of being fitted together like pieces of a puzzle. Wegener proposed that the present continents are the separated parts of a vast, original land mass which was called Pangea.

In the modern theory Pangea is supposed to have begun to break up and its parts to drift apart about 200

million years ago. The northern part, called Laurasia, comprised what are now North America, Europe, and Asia. The southern part, called Gondwana, comprised the lands which became South America, Africa, India, Australia, and Antarctica. The various pieces are believed to have travelled thousands of miles to their present positions. The most astonishing journey proposed in this theory is that of India, which is assumed to have moved about 4,000 miles to bump into Asia proper and thrust up the Himalayan ranges and Tibetan plateau.

Great expenditure of energy surely would be required to move continents; and the British geologist, Arthur Holmes, tried to account for the motive power needed

\*Clifford L. Burdick, D. Sc., is an Exploration Geologist. His address is 924 N. 6th Ave., Tucson, Arizona 85705.