

## The Scientific Method

Do you like Christmas and New Years? I do. Christmas is a set aside to celebrate the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. New Year's is a great time for reflection. What can we do to serve Him better? It's also a great time to visit and be a living testimony of Jesus Christ to some of our relatives.

I would like to talk to you today about "that one party" though. Can you prove that you were there? Well, perhaps the FBI could find enough hair follicles and fingerprints to legally put you behind bars if you committed a crime during "that party." This is "legal evidence" (often referred to as "proof") but it is not "scientific proof". You could have 27 family members all testify that you were present. This is "historical proof," not "scientific proof." My point is very simple. We use words like "proof," "evidence," "fact," and "truth" as if we all understand each other, but this is often NOT the case.

When it comes to the birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, we have substantial "historical proof" of this occurrence. Not only do we have numerous written accounts by those who walked and talked with Him, we have abundant accounts of numerous people who went to their death in defense of Christ and their faith in Him! Not one of the 11 martyred apostles defected! The historical proof of Christ is more overwhelming than any other historical event ever. Just because something cannot be "scientifically proven," does not mean that it cannot be "historically proven." Historical proof requires documentation by numerous sources that do not have a common agenda to lie. In the case of the documentation of Christ, the 11 martyred apostles had a common interest in lying against Christ! (Their own lives were at stake!) Yet not one did!

On the other hand, "scientific proof" is quite different from "historical proof." It makes no difference how many people believe in a particular scientific idea. The number of people that say something is scientifically true has nothing to do with whether or not it is actually true! Personal agendas get in the way. Let me give you an example.

In my previous employment, we manufactured a tool for collecting data pertaining to ground water contamination. Collecting meaningful data was extremely difficult due to an enormous number of variables. There were basically two manufacturers of one particular type of water sampling tool. The two tools worked under entirely different principles and thus had entirely different error factors. The industry wanted to develop a correlation between the two types of tools. Due to the number of variables involved with the two techniques, it was clear to most people that this would never be possible. That is - until one day! An otherwise bright, young, scientifically minded individual decided to end the discussion. She published a paper "proving" that the data of both tools was virtually the same. How did she "prove" this? She took six data points of each tool taken from one geographic location, with contamination levels so low that they were difficult to measure at all, never mind accurately, and showed that the data was similar. The fact that this was six data points out of millions, that this was one small 500 square foot area of the entire world, that it was one contaminant out of thousands, were completely glossed over and ignored!!! "No one will ever believe it!" I chuckled as I read it. But, I was wrong! Within 6 months, this scientific article was referenced all over the world, yet there was not one shred of truth to it's conclusions! All of the information in the article was certainly true for that one specific contaminant in that one location, but the conclusion

could not possibly be universally true! This conclusion defied the fundamental physics of the way the two tools worked. Why was this conclusion accepted so quickly and without question? The industry wanted to believe it! If people believed that both tools provided “similar” results, they could bid on any contract with the specified tool “or equal.” Prior to this fallacious publication, a testing company would need to own both tools, or only be able to bid on half the contracts! This “scientific proof” wasn’t proof at all. It merely satisfied an ulterior motive. Such is the case with evolution. Let’s look at how the “scientific method” really works. (Or at least how it used to work!)

The “scientific method” according to most scientists today is, “If it’s generally accepted by the scientific community, then it is, by definition, fact.” This is unfortunate. It leads to the errors of ulterior motives. The “scientific method” when I went to school (and for hundreds of years prior) was much more clearly defined. I am sorry I don’t have my 8<sup>th</sup> grade science book. I will have to go by memory; but scientific terms like “fact” were defined in a grander scheme of scientific dogma. For example, the “scientific method” as I recall it, defined the following terms as follows:

- Hypothesis: An idea that may scientifically explain a technical phenomena. This idea has never been tested, but on the surface, makes sense and does not appear to violate fundamental scientific laws.
- Theory: An idea with scientific evidence to support it. It has been closely scrutinized for consistency with fundamental scientific laws. If it violates a law, then the theory must be amended to be consistent or it is simply not a valid theory. Also, evidence that does not support it, must be explained or the theory is not valid.
- Fact: An idea that absolutely does not violate fundamental scientific laws and can be observed and duplicated by anyone following a designated procedure. No evidence could ever discredit it.

Based on these definitions, neither creation theory nor evolution theory, as an explanation of our origins, will ever be “scientific fact.” Neither are observable, nor will they ever be! At best, the two ideas are both poor “scientific theories.” Clearly, as you have read from this column, I find substantially more evidence to support the creation theory than the evolution theory. But, tallying the evidence of either theory and deciding by popular vote will never make a theory true or false. (In some cases it barely selects a president, much less a scientific fact!)

This leads us back to other methods of “proof.” Creation has been “historically proven!” Our Father in heaven witnessed the creation of the universe and our origins. He also documented it as such! *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.* Gen 1:1 *So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.* Gen 1:27 His Son, Jesus Christ confirmed it. *But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.* Mark 10:6 No witness has ever disputed this fact! If someone could ever produce just one witness to document evolution, then creation could be in doubt. But - nobody ever has. And nobody ever will! Our God Reigns!!

Not only did God inspire these words, He also inscribed the documentation of His creation; *Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy*

*son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it. Ex 22:8-11 And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God. Ex 31:18*

*Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created. Rev 4:11*

Praise God!!!

Jay A Auxt