SCIENCE, IGNORANCE, AND BIAS

Scientific technology has blessed our lives immeasurably. Scientific inquiry is a perfectly legitimate pursuit. In fact, God ordered man to subdue the earth and to have dominion over fish, fowl, and land animals (Gen. 1:28). God thus authorized the experimentation and observation necessary to scientific studies. Clearly, the Bible believer has no cause to oppose genuine science.

I do oppose many of the outlandish claims of over-zealous scientists who utter assurances that they know certain things that are merely hypothetical and theoretical. Yet, about all one has to do to be almost worshiped nowadays is to claim to be a “scientist.” Legion are those to whom science has become creator, sustained, and deity with a priesthood of infidel scientists. The bias toward a Godless explanation of origins is pronounced in the news media, in public schools and universities, and in official government agencies.

The renowned National Geographic Society operates on the presupposition of organic evolution. The giant Smithsonian Institution in Washington steadfastly refuses to even permit a creationist exhibit. A few years ago the American Humanist Association issued a statement asserting that its signers know that life emerged on earth in its present form by a process of evolution and not by a Supreme Being.

Some time ago I read a review of a book titled, Encyclopedia of Ignorance. It was compiled by fifty-eight scientists, of all things. The editors admit it is far from complete: “Compared to the pond of knowledge, our ignorance is Atlantic.” (In other words, they admit they are so ignorant they are ignorant of how ignorant they really are.) In the long list of things scientists say they do not know is how the universe came into being. Strange as it may seem, at least one man helped compile the
encyclopedia and signed the Humanist evolution statement. It at least borders on self-contradiction to admit that one does not know how the universe originated, but also to sign a statement boldly declaring that he knows there was no Supreme Being involved. How can such a man still be called a “scientist”? Sorry, but one cannot have it both ways. One cannot both know how it happened and not know how it happened.

These matters well illustrate the extreme bias of materialistic philosophy that approaches every question with the assumption of atheism and/or agnosticism. We dare not forget that scientists are mere fallible human beings, many of whom have succumbed to the most tragic fallacy of all—denial of God.
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