

Financial Secretary: J. Klotz  
 Membership Secretary: G. Wolfrom  
 Quarterly Editor: E. Williams

It was moved and passed that our 1988 meeting be held at Ann Arbor, Michigan, on 14-16, April, 1988.

It was moved and passed that dues for membership

be raised \$1 in each category except Life Membership.

D. Boylan was appointed Chairman of the Constitution Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 1520 hours.

David A. Kaufmann, Secretary

## THE METAPHYSICS OF MODERN SCIENCE

LAWRENCE A. MCGHEE\*

Received 28 November 1986 Revised 1 May 1987

### Abstract

*Chance as a mechanism of evolution is detrimental to true science and the concept of a rational universe. Also observation, falsification, and repetition are not meaningful in a universe ruled by chance. Creationism offers the best philosophy of science. No neutral definition of science can be maintained.*

### Atheistic Materialism

God is refused by materialists because He is metaphysical, invisible and personal. The three tests of modern science, observation, falsification and repetition are likewise metaphysical, invisible and personal. These judgments are made in the inner world of the person and rest on his knowledge, truthfulness and consistency which cannot be proven without reference to metaphysics of the human soul.

The mind of the modern atheistic evolutionist filters out any existence of a supernatural mind and world. (Denton, 1986, p. 66)

The thesis Darwin had developed implied an end to the traditional and deeply held teleological and anthropocentric view of nature. Instead of being the pinnacle and end of creation, humanity was to be viewed ultimately as a cosmic accident.

The atheistic evolutionist affirms the autonomous nature of his own thoughts as his final trust. (Denton, 1986, p. 66)

Despite the attempt by liberal theology to disguise the point, the fact is that no biblically derived religion can really be compromised with the fundamental assertions of Darwinian theory.

His mind is opposed to submission to God. The bedrock of modern science is trust in the purity and accuracy of the trained autonomous reason. Modern science works with the observable and measurable. Some scientists allow that God may exist. He is, however, not important in scientific enterprises and cannot be used as an explanation for any aspect of nature.

### "Neutral" Science

Most macro-evolutionists are materialists and operate by the following "guidelines: (Kofahl, 1986, p. 113.)

- 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.

Robert Kofahl submits an answer to this dilemma by proposing a so-called "neutral" definition of science: (Kofahl, 1986, p. 112)

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.

This "neutral" statement is far from neutral. Science is to be "systematically" extended. Can a chance-based origin render a reasonable product through some rational system? Chance and system are antithetical. The word "purpose" is anathema to dedicated atheistic evolutionists. Materialists only speak of "functions." The word choice is *not* neutral. What is the place of deductive mathematics in "critical empirical testing"? The creationist cannot accept a "natural" rather than a "created" universe. To do so is to give away the battle without a fight. Only one position is correct. There is no neutral place to hide.

### Personal or Impersonal

Kofahl states that "nobody, including Christians should seek to insert his personal belief system into that definition of science." (Kofahl, 1986, p. 113)

He just did! His statement is his personal belief. I believe that it is impossible to avoid personal belief at the foundation of any system. Every theory comes on two legs with a personal face. There is no impersonal science—only a person or persons attempting to promote an impersonal or personal view of the world.

\*Lawrence A. McGhee, M.A. receives his mail at 14019 SE Market Street, Portland OR 97233

A person's mind may have impersonal aspects such as mathematics. This does not make the ultimate in life impersonal. The personal God is an excellent (to speak mildly) mathematician. This does not cause Him to be totally impersonal.

It is my personal belief that Jesus Christ is the personal Creator of the universe, designed for persons. The earth is filled with persons. Since the world was created by a person and is tended by persons, any true knowledge of creation is possible only in fellowship with Jesus Christ, the personal Creator. Persons who promote an impersonal view of the earth and man are allowed this freedom. However, their claim to total truth outside of knowledge of Christ and submission to Him as Lord and Savior will not succeed.

A world of tremendous diversity, power, challenge and beauty has been created. The world is flawed due to man's sin, but still it is so personal that we can know the Maker is not impersonal nor indifferent to qualities such as the beauty of a rose, but is the most wonderful and complex Person we will ever know.

The materialist skirts around the need for a mediator between man and God, existing in Jesus Christ, the eternal One, the Redeemer and personal Creator. "Science"—a body of individuals who "know" the "truth" (at least what is false!) and corporately refuse personal concepts in exchange for recognition as *part* of the 20th Century god—the atheistic evolutionary scientists. Corporately, they will perceive god/nature divinity without reference or reverence for any other group. They take all merit and glory for themselves.

The truth is that all human beings are living memory patterns with a past through which they may receive new insight regarding the *meaning* of that past. As long as *any* man lives, there is interaction between the static past memories and the dynamic, approaching future. This dialogue is always individual, personal. In it men meet God and worship or refuse Him and worship Satan and self. This is life's final choice.

This personal truth meets corporate knowledge of God's rational world and in all cases affirms or denies the results of our experiments—performed by individuals and interpreted by individuals. A hypothesis is falsified by the established body of truth, not by a mere statement from a television commentator, but rather, objectively. Slowly we are learning how creation works and how we can control her. We find truth by the foil of falsehood and the logic of God. Truth itself is a rational term . . . the chance-based world of evolution has no ground for testing truth.

Science is not done by something called "science," but by persons with names who follow a belief pattern of inductive reasoning to diverse ends. That belief pattern has changed from Newton's day:

As Molnar points out, the function of reason was no longer to determine that thing and thought reliably fit together but rather to 'transform the world in the process of comprehending it.' The goal is to develop absolute intellect which will correspond to absolute being . . . for the scientist. (Ancil, 1985, p. 116)

It has been claimed that nobody, including Christians, (and God Himself one supposes!) should seek to insert his personal belief system into the definition of science. Science is being defined as an impersonal

pursuit, supposedly accomplished by persons who are im-persons—the only true persons. This is scarcely a neutral position as stated earlier.

### Rational Universe

The epistemology of materialism based in chance and that of creation by God, the rational Creator, are in opposition. There can be no neutral definition of science. At the very first step—that of defining the subject matter—we have "nature" or "creation." The world is either "chance-driven" or rationally ordered. There is either "functioning" or "purposing."

At the foundation of science is a hidden need for God as the guarantee of a reasonable universe. Without the ground of an intelligent Creator, the keystones of modern science—observation, falsification, and repetition—have no meaning. Of what use are our experiments if no reliable, rational structure exists outside our minds. Our present chance-driven minds have no anchor. The world becomes a Sartrean absurdity from which there is indeed "No Exit."

According to materialists, the external world does not present a true rational aspect. The best we can do is test for the possibility that the proposal is false. To the materialist, man's observations are the highest possible intelligence on planet Earth. There is no other mind—no other test or check.

In a certain sense one could call the contingent "irrational." It is individual (once-only, unique, irreplaceable). The contingent is changeable in succession. It is happenstantial. It is a here-now-happening, this-once-only . . . irrecurrable, new every time, and as such unpredictable, unforeseeable. (Stoker, 1973, p. 155)

Statistical nature and contingency, rejecting fixed truth, is the "establishment" of non-truth with, curiously no concern for the individual, the unique, the rare because a rational ground of meaning has been removed. No longer is there one eternal structure in God's mind upheld by Him as a measure both of truth and behavior. "Thinkable ideas may well involve no real, rationally occurring, object and/or event." (Ancil, 1985, p. 116) The division between fantasy and reality is breaking down, since the real has been "ungrounded."

Nature is considered to be rational—reflecting the rationality in the person's mind—not the rational in nature itself but as the evolutionist manipulates nature and *makes* it rational. Let us not make haste to deify the evolutionary establishment, remembering that Bertrand Russell stated at the beginning of this century:

. . . only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair, can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built . . . Such in outline, but even more purposeless, more void of meaning, is the world which science presents for our belief. (Russell, 1927, p. 4)

Despair at the top now means despair at the bottom as we near the end of a century and a half of evolutionary scientific dominance and control.

In order to ground oneself in the truth, it has been assumed that, though we do not understand completely, there is, prior to any experiment, a body of truth resting in concepts which clear a given field of objects. The world has existed for ages and rests in the

supra-rationality of a rational God. Man has been “thinking God’s thoughts after Him” for three centuries. This method has assumed the rationality of the creation and that the immutable God guarantees the maintenance of order in the universe.

Moreover, the seemingly intractable difficulty of explaining how a living system could have gradually arisen as a result of known chemical and physical processes raises the obvious possibility *that factors as yet undefined by science* may have played some role. (italics mine) Such a concession is, of course, the thin end of a very dangerous wedge . . . the whole framework of Darwinian evolution is threatened. (Denton, 1986, p. 27)

### Chance

Macroevolutionists often come close to recognizing order at the base of reality rather than the chance-based meaninglessness. Then, recognizing the implications, they shy away. The dilemma they have is neatly expressed by Denton, 1986, p. 270.

The problem of the origin of life is not unique—it only represents the most dramatic example of the universal principle that complex systems cannot be approached gradually through functional intermediates because of the necessity of perfect co-adaptation of their components as a pre-condition of function.

Any explanation of “things” may do—with “chance” as the metaphysical foundation. If the explanation “makes sense” to the mind proposing it, that is enough. It need not be the one true explanation. It is for this reason that Bible scientists add four important beliefs to those enshrined in observation, falsification and repetition: (Ferst, 1983, p. 118)

- a. Observation and experimentation are limited devices . . . [it is impossible to conduct controlled experiments regarding the past.]
- b. The supernatural is figured as an explanatory principle . . . [final purposes may be teleological.]
- c. Science is, among other things, a moral enterprise
- d. The Bible is the absolute authority on truth.

Materialistic scientists reject the Creator as the intelligent source of the complex patterns of the world—patterns such as DNA and the enzyme for making DNA *both* produced by DNA! The Creator is replaced by chance as the “non-guide” to the “non-purposeful” existence of everything. The assertion that “the combination of one sperm with a certain egg . . . happened . . . by chance.” (Howe, 1971, p. 11) forfeits all meaning at the very foundation of existence. It is simply a refusal to acknowledge God’s wisdom, technical knowledge and absolute power. Because we cannot follow the complex action of fertilization we “cop-out” and use the cover word “chance,” rather than giving glory to God for our existence.

“Chance” is an irrational “pattern” of meaningless flux to us, but not to God!. “Nothing” ever *is*, everything merely *becomes* on the path to true being and knowledge. (Ancil, 1985, p. 115) “Ever learning but never able to acknowledge the truth.” (I Timothy 3:7) The drive to achieve knowledge fusion with the flux of

nature seeks to absorb all chance into the scientist’s “fluxing” knowledge. The goal is for man to become deity over nature.

We always build truth and knowledge hierarchies. They are really without ground in the twittering world of chance. Chance has no hierarchy! But the created world does. Some solutions to problems are eloquent, complete and correct, conforming to God’s rational world, for example, Ohm’s Law—simplicity in the heart of complex electronics, illustrating that chance is a foundation for nothing. Thus creationism actually becomes a far better basis for real science than evolutionism.

“Chance” is used for reference to the origin of all things (thus avoiding giving glory to God), while the present struggle is to find a man-made explanation for all phenomena. This explanation is to be projected by the autonomous mind of man with the highest evolutionary wizardry. The last gasp of Enlightenment man is a world under total humanist control, using autonomous “freedom” to grasp domination of the planet.

Assuming the experiment can be repeated is impossible in a chance-driven universe. “Nature” may not “operate” or “function” in the same way the next time. Perhaps we will breed the “hopeful monster” to give the transitional forms so sadly lacking in the real world. Perhaps a test animal will behave in an entirely new way “for no reason.” Perhaps a new disease such as AIDS will occur “for no reason.”

It is not possible to repeat anything in the “real” world, perhaps an 80 percent repetition rate in the controlled laboratory environment. With a chance foundation, how do we know we are repeating “enough” of the experiment to justify passing the repetition test? If matter gives rise to consciousness, as per Teilhard de Chardin, truly anything goes from experiment to experiment. Is the repetition of a similar flux sequence of events, without any inner permanent structure undergoing the processes of existence, possible? Only if God is the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow can modern science have any meaningful foundation. The “Now” generation, worshipping contingency, is the only “foundation” offered in our chancy world.

The laboratory is purposively isolated from the hurly-burly world. On a chance basis, why is the experiment isolated? Traditional reasons were based in rational considerations. The new irrational “rational” science with evolutionary chance as the “non-guide” cannot claim that an isolated experiment is the true one. The experiment is “true” only if it occurs in the hurly-burly world in which no two moments are the same. No longer do we have grounded configurations isolated to test the truth. There is no ground for a falsification test in a chance-driven world. How can “chance” be false? This is a case in point of how macroevolutionism can lead to faulty experimental science.

Concepts representing reality are the source of mental health and cultural stability.

Evolutionists suggest that the laws of nature are not descriptions of objective reality but subjective statements prescribed for or imposed on the world. (Ancil, 1985, p. 117)

We “make” the laws of nature and believe in chance! These concepts are “in-here” rather than “out-there.” Chance, however, is not an entity, but a too-complex process for reason to understand. The word “chance” or Jesus Christ, the Creator and Sustainer, may be applied to these situations depending upon the faith of the person. It was a change in this position which led Charles Darwin to his revolutionary challenge to the Christian faith.

The loss in Christian faith and in essences was no mere coincidence. Darwin eventually came to believe then, that only individual differences were real, not species or genera. The organism began to be seen in terms of its “relation” to its environment alone; it was no longer thought to have an inner structure, nature, or essence which identified it with its “universal” or type . . . When the existence of things is denied, in favor of “facts” or “relation” the universe becomes unintelligible, an intellectual rubbish heap. For it is essences that secure to a world of change, the coherence and permanence needed for its scientific investigation and philosophical interpretation . . . We may ask with Plato’s *Cratylus* that if all things are mutable how is anything knowable? The position of the subjectivist/nominalism/evolutionist, then, is one which undermines our ability to know; . . . it is a position of auto-knowledge in that it focuses solely on flux as the only “reality” and in its quest for the abolition of distinctions which are necessary for knowledge. (Ancil, 1985, pp. 117-8)

Invisibility and metaphysical character pervade the entire walk of our finite existence. Whether or not our existence is a walk into intelligent fellowship with the Invisible One, Jesus Christ, the Creator, or into random chaos is a mental attitude each man must choose.

#### Evolutionism vs. Creationism

The shift from evolutionary science to creationism is grounded in a shift of perception as follows:

1. From belief in man’s perfecting the world to recognition that the world is corrupting and decay-

ing with most of man’s efforts used to sustain and care for the entities of the earth as they undergo entropic processes.

2. From chance to reason as the source of the profuse life and microevolution to recognition that life’s complexity precludes chance origin of life—no matter how many millions of years are available . . . a high view of the world’s complexity.
3. From a pattern in which all creatures evolved from a simple (really a complex) cell to recognition that all creatures were created at the same time by the most subtle and awesome mind conceivable.

No experiment can establish which pattern or paradigm is true. The decision rests on the probability of each model’s explanation of the world’s phenomena. The decision is critical and life-changing. Rather than being a bumbling evolving ape-derived man, we are the fallen image of the almighty God. We are creatures with eternal life with the Lord of Glory to be our destination.

Questions dealing with the nature or definition of science, for example, clearly are not matters of scientific data and cannot be answered “scientifically” . . . One of the major issues underlying the question of origins is the problem of epistemology, the theory of knowing. (Ancil, 1985, pg. 114)

#### References

- CRSQ—*Creation Research Society Quarterly*.  
 Ancil, Ralph E., 1985. On the importance of philosophy in the origins debate. *CRSQ* 22:114-22.  
 Denton, Michael, 1986. *Evolution: a theory in crisis*. Adler & Adler, Bethesda, MD.  
 Ferst, Barry, 1983. What Bible-Scientists can learn from Bible-Science. *CRSQ* 20:116-20.  
 Howe, George F., 1971. Chance, probability and the will of God. *Biblical Research Monthly* 36(7):11-13.  
 Kofahl, Robert E., 1986. Correctly redefining distorted science: a most essential task. *CRSQ* 23:112-4.  
 Russell, Bertrand. 1927. *A free man’s worship*. Selected papers of Bertrand Russell.  
 Stoker, H. G. 1973. On the contingent and present-day western man in Dooyeweerd, H. editor. *The idea of a Christian philosophy*. Wedge Publishing Foundation. Toronto.

## PANORAMA OF SCIENCE

### Horsetails (*Equisetum* sp.): Design or Evolution?

On a recent research trip, one of the authors collected a sample of a horsetail plant from Red Rock Canyon State Park near Weatherford, Oklahoma and the C.R.S. Grassland Experiment Station. Two magnified views of the stem of this plant are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Plants of this group are called “horsetail” because clusters of branchlets borne at regular whorls along their stems give them a full and tail-like appearance. Their genus name is *Equisetum* which means horse and bristle or spike—by extension, “horsetail.”

These plants store silica (SiO<sub>2</sub>) in the inner walls of their outer “epidermal” cells—see Figure 3. *Equisetum* plants are thus one of the few botanical genera that

have cell walls impregnated with glass (Corner, 1964). They store certain other minerals and have received some attention as plants that can be chemically tested to locate veins of such minerals beneath their roots—Stern (1985, p. 375).

The presence of SiO<sub>2</sub> in the walls of cells in the deeply ribbed stem produces a scratchy texture. Hence handfuls of these stems were used by native Americans and pioneers to scrub pots and other objects because of the gritty character of the horsetails. They were often called “scouring rushes” because of this characteristic and like the true rushes, horsetails are often found growing in moist habitats worldwide. Creationists may see the providence of a Designer in providing such plants for the use of man.

Horsetails present some serious problems to macroevolutionists. Although some modern species of *Equise-*