

Understanding the Boundaries of Science, Part 4

By: Jason Limbaugh

ELEMENTS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Fifth, alternate hypotheses must be tested. One aspect of the scientific method that scientific pretenders conveniently and constantly overlook is this matter of alternate hypotheses. It is an essential piece of the scientific method. When was the last time you saw or heard of an evolutionist exploring any other possible explanation for what they see in the fossil record? You don't ever see it. That is because these people are not scientists, they are naturalists. Thus, it is not surprising that they ignore critical components of the scientific method. One of the common claims regarding science is, "Science is trustworthy because it is objective." Well, part of that objectivity should and must include the serious investigation of alternate hypotheses. If science is seeking objectivity and honestly going where the evidence leads, disproving one's own hypothesis can be as important as proving it. Without the honest and open investigation of other possible explanations for life, variance in the fossil record, etc., science as it relates to origins once again proves itself to be almost void of actual science, resting all its propositions on naturalistic presumptions. Without the investigation of alternate hypotheses, "science" becomes a naturalistic agenda. Anyone with an agenda can easily go out into the world and line up pieces in an anecdotal fashion to tell the story they want it to tell. Just go sit in a courtroom to see this in action.

CONCLUSION

One of the common responses to all of this is that creationism doesn't fit the criteria for science either. This is exactly right. When we are dealing with origins and creation, we are dealing with metaphysical questions and unobservable events that are simply beyond the scope of science. As of right now, philosophy probably offers the most compelling questions and answers in this debate. Science, by stealth, manipulation, and lies, has almost completely hijacked the conversation.

The atheist philosopher Bertrand Russell, in his essay *The Value of Philosophy* states, "As soon as definite knowledge concerning any subject becomes possible, this subject ceases to be called philosophy, and becomes a separate science." So why do so many atheist philosophers support science overstepping its boundaries and speaking to subjects higher than its pay grade? Because science acting on its own behalf is insufficient to the task and philosophers who argue for God produce the better argument. Only by acting in concert can two deficient schools of thought overcome the intuitions of the human race.