

### References

Ayala, Francisco. 1978. The mechanisms of evolution. *Scientific American* 239(9):56-70.

Moore, John N. 1983. How to teach origins (without ACLU interference). Mott Media, Milford, MI.

## CORRECTLY REDEFINING DISTORTED SCIENCE: A MOST ESSENTIAL TASK

ROBERT E. KOFAHL\*

Received 3 June 1986 Revised 30 July 1986

### Abstract

*From a correct philosophically neutral definition of science the rules of the scientific method and the freedoms of scientists logically follow. Since Darwin's time the scientific community has distorted science by injecting into its definition a particular metaphysical belief system, i.e. materialistic monism. Thus science has been by definition biased against creation, with the result that "unbelievers" are denied their freedoms as scientists, teachers and students and are subjected to discrimination and injury. A reformation of science at the definitional level is an essential task for Christians engaged in science and education.*

### Introduction

For Christian participants in the scientific enterprise the creation-evolution controversy is surely an important concern. The monolithic evolutionary thought system currently monopolizing scientific activity must certainly be challenged. However, an even more fundamental issue with respect to science is the question of what a correct definition of science is, how science has been distorted, and how distorted science can be reformed. As long as a definition of science reigns which incorporates philosophical assumptions inimical to Biblical theism, the creation-evolution question in the scientific arena is of necessity predetermined against creation—by definition.

### Science Properly Defined

Science is simply a method by which fallible humans can examine the natural world and critically test all of their ideas about it. Sir Peter Medawar said a few years ago in a published interview, "There is nothing more to science than its method . . ." If Medawar is right—and he is—a correct definition of science is philosophically neutral at least to the extent that it has nothing to say about what a scientist believes or disbelieves. (Appendix I) A concise, philosophically neutral definition of science is as follows:

Science is human experience systematically extended (by intent, methodology and instrumentation) for the purpose of learning more about the natural world and for the critical empirical testing and possible falsification of all ideas about the natural world.

It is not the purpose of this discussion to analyze the scientific method, but rather to examine the implications of a correct definition of science and the deleterious effects of the currently prevailing distorted definition. Let us now consider the implications of the above concise definition.

### The Rules of the Scientific Method

The definition of science lays upon the scientist the requirement of obeying the rules of the scientific method. The basic rules of the scientific method flow logically from the definition of science and include the following:

1. Scientific hypotheses may incorporate only elements of the natural empirical world, and thus may contain no element of the supernatural.
2. Scientific hypotheses must be so constituted that they can be subjected to empirical test, that is, they must be falsifiable.
3. The scientist must submit his procedures, data and conclusions to critical review by his peers. Provided the scientist functions in accord with the above rules of the method, he has broad freedoms in his practice of science.

### The Freedoms of the Scientist

The freedoms of the scientist flow logically from a correct definition of science. They include the following:

1. The scientist is not required to hold to or reject any particular philosophical-religious belief system. He is free to choose from among such disparate beliefs as atheistic materialism, pantheism, agnosticism, Eastern religions, pure idealism, liberal Christianity, materialistic evolution, theistic evolution, and Biblical special creation.
2. Since peer review, therefore, may not have any element of philosophical bias with respect to the beliefs of scientists, scientists (and also teachers, students, and all scholars) have the freedom, indeed, the right to be judged solely on the basis of their performance under the rules of the method, not at all on the basis of a willingness to surrender their minds to somebody else's belief system, even to that of the majority of scientists.
3. All scientists need not function under the same philosophy of science and conceptual frameworks. These, but not the hypotheses of science, may encompass supernatural elements such as past divine intervention, special creation, or divine teleology in the natural order.
4. There is no restriction on the sources of ideas and hypotheses in science. Other scientists should have no concern about the source of ideas which gave rise to one person's hypothesis, if it deals with the reproducible empirical world and is open to empirical test by any critic or doubter.
5. A scientist is free to adopt or reject any of the following five assumptions which are held by many scientists and other scholars:

\*Robert E. Kofahl, Ph.D., Creation-Science Research Center, P.O. Box 23195, San Diego, CA 92123

- a. That there is no divine teleology in the natural world.
- b. That no divine intervention has ever occurred in the natural world.
- c. That every observable datum has its total explanation in terms of materialistic cause and effect.
- d. That God does not exist and only the material world is real, or at least that the scientist should function accordingly in his scientific thought and research.
- e. That the scientist should adopt the view that his personal faith has no relevance in his scientific endeavor.

### **The Definition of Science Has Been Distorted**

It is this author's opinion that Charles Darwin had a hidden agenda for science. There is much evidence for this in his writings. Neal Gillespie (1979) of Georgia State University in his important book, *Charles Darwin and the Problem of Creation*, established the fact that Darwin espoused logical positivism as his philosophy of science. His hidden agenda, then, was to remove from the thinking of all scientists any concepts of special creation, divine intervention, or divine teleology in the natural world. That this agenda has been achieved with almost total global success in the spheres of science, education and scholarly disciplines is obvious to any informed observer. (Appendix II)

Perhaps the most authoritative evidence for the total victory of Darwin's hidden agenda is to be found in a recent official document published in the spring of 1984 by the National Academy of Sciences (U.S.A.). This slick-paper 27-page booklet openly attacking all believers in Biblical special creation is entitled, "Science and Creationism— A View from the National Academy of Sciences." (National Academy of Sciences, 1984) In the introduction Frank Press, N.A.S. director, tacitly approves of those brands of religion which accept evolution into their belief systems. (pp. 6, 7) But the remainder of the document directly attacks believers in Biblical creation.

The closest thing to a concise definition of science appears on page 26 of the N.A.S. document, in the "Conclusion." There it is stated:

. . . the goal of science is to discover naturalistic explanations for phenomena— and *the origins of life, the earth, and the universe are, to scientists, such phenomena— within the framework of natural laws and principles and the operational rule of testability.* (emphasis added)

The emphasized clause states a belief which can be neither proved nor disproved by the methods of science. If it had been attributed to "some scientists" or to "the majority of scientists," there would be no problem. But the belief in a closed materialistic universe is wrongly attributed by the National Academy to "scientists. The clear implication is that this belief is inherent in the definition of science and so is required intellectual baggage for all bonafide scientists. That this conception of science was in the minds of the framers of this booklet is quite clear from the tenor of the remainder of the document. The N.A.S. booklet pictures science as the search for understanding of everything in terms purely of materialistic cause and effect in a closed materialistic universe. Darwin's theory is suffering much rough revisionist treatment,

but his hidden agenda has achieved a stunning universal conquest of all of secular science, education, and other scholarly disciplines.

### **Implications and Consequences of the Distorted Definition of Science**

The reigning definition of science is distorted by the incorporation of a belief system, materialistic monism, a belief utterly inimical to Biblical Christian faith. As long as this definition prevails, the creation-evolution issue is already decided in the scientific arena— by definition. Bible-believing Christians are in effect ruled out of the arena of rational discourse because they believe things which a scientist may not believe. To begin with, their epistemology is frowned upon, repudiated on the basis of *a priori* principles, as is their fundamental approach to questions of origins. This, then, is the ground for all of the opprobrium, discrimination, and overt injury to which Christians have been and are being subjected in science and education. While this status quo continues, Christian believers in creation will be squeezed out of science and education, perpetually held to a tiny minority, denied the full rights of participation in the scientific enterprise. The squeeze will continue to be applied in the secular educational system mainly by indoctrinating students with the distorted view of science. Thus the status quo is self-perpetuating, for indoctrinated students ultimately supply the future corps of teachers and scientists. This has been going on now for many decades, and only a most profound revolution will change the situation.

### **The Remedy for Distorted Science: A New Consensus**

The essential remedy for distorted science is the achievement among scientists and educators of a consensus which reestablishes a philosophically neutral definition of science, including the rules and freedoms logically deduced therefrom as outlined above. Christians involved in science and education must carry the principal burden of the campaign to achieve this consensus. The logical position stated in this paper is very strong, indeed, impregnable. For three years it has been circulated among selected secular academics in the form of a two-page outline accompanied by four pages of explanatory notes and references, under the title, "A Proposal to Eliminate the Deleterious Effects of Religious Beliefs on Science and Education." In February, 1985, this Proposal was presented and defended in Alberta at three secular universities with faculty members in attendance. No difficulty was experienced in maintaining the argument.

Anybody who opposes the proposed consensus to reestablish a philosophically neutral definition of science must defend in public the inclusion in the definition of science of his or her personal metaphysical belief system. Metaphysical belief systems are unprovable and non-refutable by the methods of empirical science. Consequently the opponents are left vulnerable to the charge of dogmatism and bigotry. On the other side, a great beauty of the proposed consensus is that it requires nobody to change his personal beliefs, save one— the belief that anybody's belief system belongs in the definition of science.

It appears that this issue of the philosophical neutrality of a correct definition of science is one in which the secularists in science and education can easily be put

on the defensive. Any public debate exposes the offenses of the opposition against science, against the hallowed principle of academic freedom, and against the most precious rights of individuals in a free society. The ambiguities of the creation-evolution debate are excluded, being immaterial to the problem of defining science.

Indeed, we cannot lose. If the consensus is adopted by the majority of scientists and educators, victory for truth is complete. On the other hand, if and to the degree that the status quo prevails, the bigotry of its defenders will be thoroughly exposed. With such a strong strategic and tactical position and in view of the vital truth that is involved, there is no reason why Christians should not proceed to press this issue and seek to engage the members of the secular establishment in open debate aimed at achieving the proposed consensus at the earliest possible date.

The second remedy for distorted science relates to the participation of evangelical Christians in science and education. Dr. George Howe (1986), in a recent letter to this Quarterly, discussed in some detail important errors which Christians should avoid as they undertake to participate as creationists in science, science education, and the promotion of the creation model of origins. We would like to add an admonition to his recommendations. It is essential that Christians in science be perfectly clear on the fundamental principle discussed in this paper, namely, that nobody, including Christians, should seek to insert his personal belief system into the definition of science. It would appear that perhaps lack of clarity in this has led to some of the errors against which Howe has warned us. Science is not in itself a Christian endeavor; it is a human endeavor. Christian practitioners of science should strive to function as Christians in a manner which demonstrates to the world that one can be a better scientist because of his faith in Jesus Christ and in the Word of God.

Toward this end it is necessary that we have the several categories of thought which are involved in our scientific endeavors properly identified and defined. They are the following:

Religious-philosophical faith or world view  
Episteme (philosophy of science, epistemology, motivation, goals, etc.) (Gillespie, 1979, pp. 1-18)  
Conceptual frameworks (systems of theories, fundamental concepts and assumptions for particular scientific disciplines or areas of research) (Jones, 1971)

Scientific hypotheses

Of these categories the first three may incorporate elements of the supernatural. The fourth category, that of scientific hypotheses, may not incorporate any element of the supernatural, as was stated earlier in the list of rules of scientific method. The reason for this is, of course, that the supernatural, being personal, is not subject to investigations by the method of empirical science.

If Christians engaged in science and science education, or in the task of properly relating Christian faith and Biblical revelation to science have these categories correctly distinguished, they will be able to avoid the pitfalls discussed by Howe. If the consensus which we propose in this paper is achieved, Christians should

expect the freedom in suitable technical journals openly to draw conclusions which explicitly relate their hypotheses and empirical data to their conceptual frameworks. The secularists do the same without fear or penalty. In the light of the correct definition of science the current situation is absurd. It is absurd when a man of Dr. Robert Gentry's accomplishments in the study of radioactive halos, for example, can only make the most subtle and oblique references to the connection of his scientific data with unpopular creationist concepts, in this case the idea of a young earth. (Gentry, 1974) But we have a long way to go before this freedom is restored to Christian participants in the scientific enterprise.

### Appendix I

There is no question that the scientific enterprise has profound philosophical and religious implications. Just what these implications are, however, is a matter of dispute, for numerous philosophies of science have been advanced since the advent of modern science in the 16th century: Oppenheimer, J.R., 1962, *Encounter* 19:3-10; Klaaren, Eugene M., 1977. Religious origins of modern science. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.; Ayer, A.J., 1952. Language, truth and logic. Dover Publications, New York; Harre, R., 1972. The philosophies of science: an introductory survey. Oxford University Press, New York; Whitehead, A.N. 1925, 1953. Science and the modern world. Macmillan, New York, pp. 1-18; Jaki, Stanley, 1974. Science and creation: from eternal cycles to an oscillating universe. Neal Watson Academic Publishers, New York, pp. 276-305; Schoepflin, Gary L., 1982. Perceptions of the nature of science and Christian strategies of nature. *Origins* (Geoscience Research Institute, Loma Linda, CA) 9:(1)10-27. For Christians, of course, the correct philosophy of science is grounded in Biblical truths and principles.

### Appendix II

The following references illustrate this global conquest of science by the distorted definition favored by Darwin: Gillespie, N.C., 1979. Charles Darwin and the problem of creation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 1-18; Monod, Jacques, 1974. On chance and necessity, in: F. Ayala and T. Dobzhansky, editors. *Studies in the philosophy of biology*. University of Calif. Press, Berkeley, pp. 357-359; Simpson, G.G., 1960. The world that Darwin gave us. *Science* 131:967, 968; Jastrow, Robert, 1977. Until the sun dies. W.W. Norton, New York. (See pp. 60-63); Huxley, J., 1960. in: Sol Tax, editor. *Evolution after Darwin*, Vol. 3. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. (See pp. 45, 46); Curtis, H., 1979. *Biology*, 3rd edition Worth, New York. (See pp. 11, 19, 28, 754, 945); Crick, F.H.C., 1979. in: *Scientific American* 241:224; Brennecke and Amick, 1978. *Psychology and human experience*, 2nd edition Glencoe Publishing, Encino, CA (See pp. 2-4, 14, 81, 94, 98.)

### References

- Gentry, Robert V., 1974. *Science* 184:62-66; Gentry, Robert V., et al., 1974. *Nature* 252:564-566.  
Gillespie, N.C., 1979. Charles Darwin and the problem of creation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.  
Howe, George F., 1986. Keeping our models separate—Biblical creationism distinct from creation science. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 22:141-2.  
Jones, A. J. 1971. The nature of evolutionary thought. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*. 8:44-9.  
National Academy of Sciences, 1984. Science and creationism—a view from the National Academy of Sciences. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.