

How the “Game of Science” Is Played

by Dennis Lange

In a “Wall Street Journal” article, Sharon Begley wrote, “the National Academy of Sciences says science ‘is limited to explaining the natural world through natural causes’ and that it ‘cannot use supernatural causation in its explanations.’”¹ Similarly, the internet Skeptics Dictionary says, “Scientific explanations are in terms of natural phenomena rather than supernatural phenomena, although science itself requires neither the acceptance nor the rejection of the supernatural.”² One man said, “You can’t explain nature in terms of the supernatural.” Another wrote, “Supernatural means beyond nature. Science only explains nature.” Since God is beyond and above nature, being the Creator of it, we see that the rules of science forbid it from including God in an explanation for anything in nature. God is pushed outside of scientific investigations before any investigation even begins. Evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould called the separation of religion and science NOMA, saying that the two had different realms in which they operate. Religion can comment on God, but science cannot. Richard Lewontin, professor of Zoology and Biology at Harvard University said, “It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated.”³

Although it is claimed that science does not require rejecting God, we can see that some scientists openly battle the idea of God. Evolutionist Dr. George Wald wrote that “scientists **cannot** accept, on philosophical grounds, the idea of God creating life.”⁴ Lewontin spoke of the **struggle** between science and the supernatural and then said, “Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we **cannot** (each emphasis mine, D.L.) allow a Divine Foot in the door.”⁵ Not only is it the rule of the game of science that God must be excluded, open antagonism to the idea of God exists. It is a struggle between science and the supernatural. Scientists cannot accept God as the explanation for all that we see. The Divine Foot cannot be allowed in the door! An evolutionist wrote, “The irony is devastating. The main purpose of Darwinism was to drive every last trace of an incredible God from biology. But the theory replaces God with an even more incredible deity – omnipotent chance.”⁶ Yes, it is **claimed** that science does not require rejecting God but we see that science actively tries to drive God from all that exists.

With those rules of the science “game” and its antagonism toward God in mind, we now examine a couple of related claims of science. Both are expressed by the Skeptics Dictionary: “Science does not assume it knows the truth about the empirical world *a priori*. Science assumes it must discover its knowledge.” The second is that “science requires neither the acceptance nor the rejection of the supernatural.”⁷ Neither one of these claims is true. In fact, the rules of science prohibit it *a priori* from discovering knowledge, from discovering the truth about our world.

It is an accepted fact that design indicates a designer. Just as a plan necessitates its planner and architectural drawings necessitate the architect that drew them, design means a designer exists. Definitions of design include: (1) a mental project or scheme in which means to an end are laid down and (2) deliberate purposive planning.⁸ Something that is designed was planned with an end in view. The one who purposefully planned and put things together to fulfill his plan is the designer. Paul Ricci, an atheistic philosopher and professor, has written that ‘...it’s true that everything designed has a designer...’⁹

Scientists realize that design necessitates a designer. So, they frown on discovering design in nature because the existence of the great Designer, God, would appear at their door if they did admit design. Therefore, scientists, in keeping with the rules of the game of science, routinely speak of the **appearance** of design. In other words, a woodpecker with a beak capable of drilling wood, the muscular ability to create the drilling motion, an extra-long tongue to reach into holes and pull out insects, the muscular ability to control the tongue, backward and forward toes to hook sideways into trees, stiff tail feathers to prop itself against tree trunks, feathers to keep chips and debris out of its nasal passages, and a shock absorber between its bill and skull just **appears** to be designed. Aldous Huxley wrote, “Organisms are built as if purposefully designed, and work as if in purposeful pursuit of a conscious aim. But the truth lies in those two words ‘as if.’ As the genius of Darwin showed, the purpose is only an apparent one.”¹⁰ A few pages later, Huxley slipped, as many godless evolutionists do, and said, “This is, I fear, a tiresome list; but it will at least serve as a reminder of the range of design to be found among the machines for living that we call organisms.”¹¹ While claiming that only the appearance of design exists in nature, he quickly spoke of “the range of design” in living organisms. One cannot have it both ways.

In his book The Blind Watchmaker, Richard Dawkins wrote, “The complexity of living organisms is matched by the elegant efficiency of their apparent design.” According to him, it just appears to be design, but it’s not. Then, in the very next sentence, he said, “If anyone doesn’t agree that this amount of complex design cries out for an explanation, I give up.”¹² Complex design is not apparent design. One cannot have it both ways. But Dawkins would speak of “design” (using the italics to qualify it) and the appearance of design, and then say, “Our brains were designed to understand hunting and gathering, mating and child-rearing: a world of medium-sized objects moving in three dimensions at moderate speeds.”¹³ Either our brains were designed or they only appear to be designed. Dawkins must make up his designed mind and stick with it.

Other scientists speak of the organization within the human body (who organized it?), of the rules and regulations by which cells operate (who made those rules?), of the well-planned structures of the body (who planned them?) and, of the engineering of the human body (who was the engineer?). The Duke of Argyll, in a conversation with Charles Darwin, pointed out the “wonderful contrivances” in nature, saying they were “the effect and the expression of mind.” Darwin said, “Well, that often comes over me with overwhelming force; but at other times it seems to go away.”¹⁴ Design in nature is so obvious that Francis Crick warned, “Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what

they see was not designed, but rather evolved." ¹⁵

Since scientists can look at something and say that it is NOT designed, that means they have to know what design IS, and be capable of saying, "That IS design."

Suppose, in a casual conversation with a scientist, the subject of glass eyes was discussed, including how real some of them look. Then, a picture of an eye was placed before the scientist and the scientist was asked, "Was that eye intelligently designed?" In order to give the correct answer scientifically, the scientist must first ask, "Is that a glass eye or a human eye?" If the answer is a glass eye, he can say that it was intelligently designed. If the answer is that it is a human eye, he must say it is NOT intelligently designed; it only appears to be. All men would see a glass eye and know immediately that it **was** intelligently designed. But scientists are forced *a priori* to say that the human eye was not. Thus, the claim of science to be open for investigation is false.

Either God exists or He does not. But science has established rules for its game so that 50% of the possibilities cannot be examined, so that 50% of the possibilities are ruled out *a priori*. Naturally, by the rules of its game, science attracts and breeds atheists. Since science must look at the human eye and say it only has the appearance of design, it is not open for investigation as it claims to be. Science cannot objectively examine for design, but must avoid looking for it. Moreover, science by its own rules must declare that there is no design in nature because scientists, admitting design, would be admitting a designer. But that would take them one step closer to admitting the existence of God and they cannot allow a supernatural explanation. However, in their ruling that design does not exist, they go to the position where there is no God and thus become unscientific by their own rules, dabbling in the metaphysical while claiming they do not. When design is **not** included as a possibility as one looks at the human eye, etc., then science **is** rejecting the supernatural.

Imagine not being able to admit that something was a plan because one would be admitting a planner. Or imagine not being able to admit that papers were architectural drawings because one would have to admit an architect. Scientists place themselves in that situation, however, by the rules of the game of science. They are unable to look at something and declare that it was designed because that would be admitting it had a designer. Isaac Newton was named the greatest scientist of all time, but by the rules of science he wasn't scientific because he looked at the world and believed in a Designer – God.

I am not a prophet, but I will make a prediction. Since design is so evident in nature, scientists eventually will be forced to admit design, giving up the theory of evolution. But rather than admit that God was the designer, they will instead look increasingly to the skies, hoping for aliens to show up in flying saucers. In the movie "Expelled", Ben Stein asked atheist Richard Dawkins, "What is the possibility that intelligent design might turn out to be the answer to some issues in genetics or evolution?" Dawkins replied, "It could come about in the following way. It could be that at some earlier time somewhere in the universe, a civilization evolved by probably some type of Darwinian means to a very

high level of technology and designed the form of life that they seeded with perhaps this planet. Now that is a possibility and an intriguing one. And I suppose it's possible that you might find evidence of that if you look at the details of our chemistry and molecular biology, that you might find a signature of some sort of designer. And that designer could well be a higher intelligence somewhere in the universe. That higher intelligence would have had to come about by some explicable or ultimately explicable process. It couldn't have jumped into existence spontaneously. That's the point."

The **point** is that atheist scientists like Richard Dawkins simply cannot believe in the existence of God as the designer of this wonderful world in which we live. But Dawkins would believe in super-intelligent aliens on some distant planet. As science reluctantly gives up Darwinism as the explanation for life on this planet, it will turn in desperation to the heavens, looking for little green men instead of God.

¹ Begley, Sharon, "Wall Street Journal": <http://www.naturalism.org/begley.htm>

² Carroll, Robert Todd, Skeptics Dictionary: <http://skepdic.com/science.html>

³ Lewontin, Richard C. [Professor of Zoology and Biology, Harvard University], "Billions and Billions of Demons", Review of "The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark", by Carl Sagan, New York Review, January 9, 1997.

⁴ Huse, Scott, Collapse of Evolution, (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983) intro. p.3.

⁵ Lewontin, *ibid.*

⁶ Roszak, T., Unfinished Animal, (1975), pp.101-102.

⁷ Carroll, Robert Todd. *ibid*

⁸ Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1972).

⁹ Ricci, Paul, Fundamentals of Critical Thinking, (Lexington, MA: Ginn Press, 1986), p.190.

¹⁰ Huxley, Aldous, E I A, p.7

¹¹ *ibid* p.11

¹² Dawkins, Richard. The Blind Watchmaker, (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1996), xiii

¹³ *ibid*, p.2

¹⁴ Darwin, Frances (1902), The Life of Charles Darwin (London: Senate, 1995 reprint), p.64

¹⁵ Crick, Francis. What Mad Pursuit: A Personal View of Scientific Discovery, (London: Penguin, 1990), p.138