

## Scientific Interpretation Needs Open Mind

The basic worldview, the philosophical stance of a culture or individual, will necessarily shape the type of questions asked in the empirical realm as well as the kinds of answers accepted. Philosophy, defined as a system of beliefs about reality and the nature of truth and morality, and the process of how we know, acts as a screen to reject any fact or observation that does not fit the system. It is very difficult for any individual to work outside of his or her worldview. In the naturalistic worldview any explanation outside natural processes is automatically rejected, even if the observations and empirically derived facts pointed away from naturalistic explanations. Now a greater body of scientists are rejecting purely naturalistic explanations and allowing scientific investigations a more logical interpretation of the facts.

On seeing this trend, the national evolutionary science organizations produced such a strident propaganda piece for evolution aired on PBS that a cadre of scientists felt it necessary to document their opposition and doubt of the theory of evolution in a public ad and website. So far over 600 active scientists have indicated their doubt of the theory of evolution by signing their name to this website, [www.discovery.org](http://www.discovery.org).

A brief overview of the lack of naturalistic evidence for evolution glaringly illuminates the gigantic leap of faith needed to keep believing in evolution against known scientific processes. The acrostic “FLAWED” (Chris Sherrod, *The Flaws of Evolution*, 2004) succinctly sums up the lack of empirical scientific facts to support the dominate theory of origins. The “Fossil Fallacy” is that the facts of paleontology show no transitional fossils just a huge explosion of fully formed species, genera, and families suddenly appearing in the strata. The “Laws of Science” are violated by the theory of macroevolution which is diametrically opposed to the law of biogenesis that says life does not generate spontaneously and the law of entropy that states all organisms and systems decay to a state of greatest entropy. Proponents of evolution say the process is so slow we cannot see it happen within our lifetime, so that we have an “Absence of Observations”. Yet the smaller steps of change that we do see occurring do not operate with a mechanism that can lead to an increase in genetic information (“Without a Mechanism”). No natural chemical processes are known whereby proteins form spontaneously or nucleic acids are multiplied with an increase in information. No natural chemical process can order nucleic acids to form even the most rudimentary of “messages” for a ribosome to “read”. Life can only come from life, and non-living chemicals cannot form the complex systems needed for life, in fact chemicals acting in natural ways, obey the laws of thermodynamics and trend towards states of less order and energy in a manner that is hostile to life molecules.

Finally, the theory of evolution has employed “Erroneous Examples” that have given a veneer of legitimacy to this “science” but under closer scrutiny have failed to overcome any of the other four arguments against evolution. “Design and DNA” points out that the DNA of every molecule contains information, not just rote chemical connections. When even the most unlearned among us can recognize that design and outside manipulation is necessary to arrange rocks into a firering, the intricate and delicately balanced processes of life in a cell are a more compelling testimony of design. To ignore this stupendous monument to intelligent design and the absolute necessity of a Designer is to screen the natural rational and logical conclusion of the evidence.

It is time to expand scientific inquiry to include other theories of origins, to admit that all that exists cannot be measured under a microscope. It is time to allow students to freely engage all the competing theories and to process all the facts into these frameworks and see which theory best accounts for the workings of the natural world. As former Supreme Court Justice, Sandra Day O’Conner wrote in the *Edwards vs. Aguillard* decision in 1987; “A decision respecting the subject matter to be taught in public schools does not violate the Establishment

Clause simply because the material to be taught “happens to coincide or harmonize with the tenets of some or all religions.”

Certainly in a college setting, students should be demanding a thorough and thoughtful treatment of all the current theories of origins. That is the free exchange of ideas that sharpens all who participate. As a start attend the presentations by the Answers in Genesis scientists who will speak on April 6-9, 2017 at the UM University Center Ballroom, Missoula, MT. Come ready to hear a different point of view that is well supported by empirical science. Go to [LakeMissoulaFlood.org](http://LakeMissoulaFlood.org) for complete information on the Lake Missoula Creation Conference.

Esther Fishbaugh  
MS in Exercise Physiology from MSU  
CEO Canyon Enterprises, Inc for 29 years  
1380 Wolverine Lane  
Bozeman, Montana 59718  
406-587-2116