

## **Science Falsely So Called**

**By Elder David Pyles**

*O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. – 1Tim 6:20*

We are commonly misled to believe that nearly all scientists are Atheists and that science is therefore at odds with religion. Our society abounds with such propaganda and misinformation. There have in fact been several surveys indicating that Theists are as common as Atheists in the scientific community and that a disproportionate number of them are Christians. When such surveys are limited to *accomplished* scientists (e.g. Nobel Prize winners) these tendencies become even stronger.

One must also bear in mind that Atheism is itself a faith-based belief system that cannot qualify as science. It must invest in outrageously miniscule probabilities and must ultimately commit to an assertion that is impossible to prove. In order to prove there is no god, one would have to be able to survey the entire Universe at once; be able to traverse all dimensions it might have, and be able to overcome all abilities that any god might have of concealing himself. Now if the analyst could do this, he could himself rightfully be called “god,” thereby contradicting his own proposition. In short, it would take God to prove there is no god. Therefore, the fact that a scientist is an Atheist does not imply he is a *scientific* Atheist. When we see large numbers of scientists falling under both Theism and Atheism, this is sufficient evidence that something other than science is dictating their conclusions. The issue is one of personal philosophy and religion, not of science. This is further evidenced by the fact that a remarkable number of these “Atheists” seem to be somewhat angry with the God whose existence they purport to deny.

We now effectively have a state-sponsored atheistic religion in America called “evolution” or “Darwinism.” This violation of the Constitution derives from the illogic of legally distinguishing a religion by its belief in a God. The error of this can be seen in the fact that if God were scientifically verifiable, the Constitution would have said nothing of the right to believe on Him. This is

because the right to believe what is verifiable is axiomatic to law. Therefore, the distinguishing feature of a religion is not its belief in a god, but its belief in that which is not verifiable by scientific method, or equivalently, by its dependence on faith. Since the majority of Americans and a formidable number of scientists agree that it takes more faith to believe in evolution than to believe in God, evolution should be a religion for legal purposes.

True Christianity will not complain of analysis that begins with the assumption of a naturalistic explanation. This is to be expected of science. However, when one insists upon a naturalistic explanation, and insists that all testimony and evidence to the contrary is delusional and deceptive, this is not science. It is a philosophy called “naturalism” and is “*science falsely so called.*”

Albert Einstein is as respected as any scientist who ever lived. He once famously said, “There are only two ways to live your life. One is as though nothing is a miracle. The other is as though everything is a miracle.” Einstein likely saw both views as applicable. Insofar as the functioning of the Universe was concerned, he thought nothing is a miracle. I say this is very nearly true but not absolutely. Insofar as the origin of the Universe was concerned, Einstein thought everything was a miracle. This can only mean that Einstein was a Theist, and such was the case also with multitudes of other great intellects of past and present.