

The Interpretive War On Science

The National Geographic Magazine in their March 2015 number of their magazine wrote a lead article titled "The War On Science". Being a real science buff, and having strong interpretative beliefs toward some scientific data, got me thinking about the same subject. Since the beginning of man's written history, mankind has been on a quest to understand the world around him, the things of science around him. Over the past 6,000 years of man's written history, mankind has accumulated an increasingly accurate storehouse of scientific data, while adding his own interpretations to that data as time progressed. All throughout history, powerful religious or governmental groups within society have put their own personal spin on this increasingly accurate body of scientific data. In the 20th century this body of data, in all scientific fields, has increased at exponential rates, physics (Relativity and Quantum mechanics) astrophysics, astronomy, medical science, chemistry, biochemistry, biology, botany, geology, archeology, electrical engineering, electronics, the earth sciences, to just name a few of the major areas of this vast storehouse of scientific data. In all these areas, there is the raw data, and there are specific scientific organizations composed of the scientists themselves, who attempt to properly interpret the data. Also, both within and outside these scientific organizations, there are religious and governmental groups and other parts of society that have put their own personal spin on various parts of this body of raw scientific data. Let's take the raw data of where the universe came from, and man's origins, as a key interpretive area of disagreement, both within and outside the scientific community. Within the greater Christian church, what is referred to by Christians as the greater Body of Christ, they interpret the scientific data to show mankind and the earth was created by God (and this also includes a growing part of the scientific community as well). This group within the greater Body of Christ is composed of two, maybe three groups, one that believes the record of the rocks (another pile of raw scientific data) which shows the earth and universe are very old, 15.75 billion years old, also using physics as well (Old Earth Creationists). The other group interprets the data, coupled to their personal interpretation of Genesis 1:1-31, to say the earth and universe are only 6,000 years old (New Earth Creationists [this group really skews the scientific data]). A third much smaller group believes in theistic evolution. In the governmental-industrial verses environmental sides of society, two groups have arisen, one saying recently collected earth-science data show global warming is taking place (environmental group), while another group is interpreting the raw scientific data to say that it is not taking place (industrial and

some governmental sides of society). The huge storehouse of scientific data collected by mankind is neutral, basically, it teaches us about the physical universe and everything around us. But it does need accurate interpretation. For example, within the medical realm of science, misinterpretation can have dire consequences. But people are emotional creatures, with personal beliefs and agendas. So in various areas that affect man and his way of life, and within his various political and religious groups, certain parts of this huge pile of raw scientific data is put through their personal filters. Even within the qualified scientific community, the issue of how to interpret the data about the origins of the universe and mankind, whether it was created by a higher Intelligent Being, or just evolved, is a hotly debated issue. Global Warming, amongst the scientific community, is another hotly debated issue, where each group puts their own personal spin on the data. But honest objectivity is always the best course to take in seeking to properly interpret the raw scientific data mankind has collected in all the scientific fields. This article will focus on the Creation verses Evolution interpretation of the scientific data dealing with that subject, and the various emotional filters we put the neutral scientific data through, and more importantly, why.

Scientific Evidence verses Individual Beliefs, Why People Hang Onto Their Beliefs Over Scientific Evidence

If you could prove God's existence through the scientific method, coupled to fulfilled prophecy coupled to the scientific laws of probability, why does most of intelligent, scientifically minded humanity choose to maintain their individual beliefs over scientific evidence?

Now when I talk about an individual's personal beliefs, that runs a very wide gamut of belief systems in today's modern world. You have the three major religions, Christianity, Islam and Judaism, and countless religions in India, Hinduism being one of the largest. But we must also realize Atheism has taken over much of the scientific community as well as the average person in the Western world, along

with previous Communist Russia, and Communist China. Sadly, there are large portions of each group that hold onto personal beliefs, whether they be scientific and atheistic, or certain parts of Christianity, that hold unscientific, erroneous beliefs, beliefs not backed up by provable science at all. The March 2015 number of The National Geographic Magazine, from which I will quote, ran a feature article titled "The War On Science." The author painted his main points, at times, with a very wide brush, with some real truth coupled to some glaring inaccuracies. He singled out all of what I would term Evangelical Christianity as fitting into an unscientific belief system about creationism that opposes the scientific evidence clearly seen in the record of the rocks, wrongly implying that Evangelical Christianity believes dinosaurs walked with man in the Garden of Eden. Much of scientifically minded Evangelical Christianity as a whole believes just the opposite, they believe that the dinosaurs walked 65,000,000 years ago, just as the record of the rocks says, and that man has been around for far shorter a period, some believe 100,000 years, some the standard 6,000 years mankind's written records go back to. He went on to show, and I believe accurately, that a large segment of our scientifically minded population believe Global Warming is a hoax, regardless of reams of recently acquired scientific evidence proving to the contrary. The author is an evolutionist, which to me is a religious belief, just like atheism, Christianity, Judaism or Islam.

Why Do People Believe What They Do, In Opposition To Scientific Evidence?

But the question I beg to ask is, why do people hold to their individual beliefs, even in the face of provable scientific evidence? In the National Geographic article I'm referencing to, the author interviewed Dr. Dan Kahan of Yale University. The author of the article stated "Even when we intellectually accept these precepts of science, we subconsciously cling to our intuitions---what researchers call our naive beliefs." [p. 40, March 2015 *National Geographic Magazine*] He goes on to say "The "science communication problem," as it's blandly called by the scientists who study it, has yielded abundant new research into how people decide what to believe---and why they so often don't accept the scientific consensus." [(quoting Dr. Dan Kahan, of Yale University), *ibid.* p. 44] Another revealing quote says this, "**Science appeals to our rational brain, but our beliefs are motivated largely by emotion, and the biggest motivation is remaining tight with our peers.**" *"We're all in high school. We've never left high school,": says Marcia McNutt. "People still have a need to fit in, and that need to fit in is so strong that local values and local*

opinions are always trumping science. And they will continue to trump science, especially when there is no clear downside to ignoring science."... "The internet has democratized information, which is a good thing. But along with cable TV, it has made it possible to live in a "filter bubble" that lets in only the information with which you already agree." The author goes on to quote Dr. Kahan, "In Kahan's description of how we decide what to believe, what we decide [to believe] sometimes sounds almost incidental. Those of us in the science-communication business are as tribal as anyone else, he told me. We believe in scientific ideas not because we have truly evaluated all the evidence but because we feel an affinity for the scientific community. When I mentioned to Kahan that I fully accepted evolution, he said, "Believing in evolution is just a description about you. It's not an account of how you reason." [ibed. quotes from pp. 45-47, *emphasis mine throughout*] Here you see that even Dr. Kahan was showing the author's personal belief in evolution, one particular belief system found within the scientific community, but not all the scientific community, was more of belief than proof of scientific knowledge or scientific reasoning. You can see clearly, within both the religious communities of the world (even the religious beliefs of atheism, and yes, evolutionary theory), as well as within the scientific community, there are myriad groups and sub-groups of individual beliefs and interpretations which individuals within each group hold onto tenaciously with a religious fervor.

Why Does Emotion Overrule Scientific Logic?

But going back to a key quote, which I emphasized in ***bold italics***, "***Science appeals to our rational brain, but our beliefs are motivated largely by emotion,***" Why does emotion overrule the logical, rational side of what we believe, the scientific evidence, if you will? I am now going to quote from a book that was written for those who suffer from anxiety, which goes into the workings of the human brain. The authors go right to the heart of the matter, and I quote, "The human brain is composed of many different structures...neuroscientists have grouped them into three different "families," or parts, based on their location and the tasks they perform...we refer to them as the *hindbrain*, the *midbrain*, and the *forebrain*...The hindbrain lies deep within the brain, near where the brain connects with the spinal column. The structures within the hindbrain are largely responsible for controlling bodily functions basic to survival...The midbrain...is located approximately in the middle of the brain and is largely responsible for our experience of emotions. The forebrain is located above the hindbrain and midbrain...The highly developed forebrain is largely responsible for

our ability to think logically and rationally. It is because of our large forebrains that we can engage in complex thought and communication with written and spoken language." [*Anxious in Love* by Carolyn Daitch, PhD & Lissah Lorberbaum, MA, pp. 91-92] As I recall, the authors made this analogy '**that the midbrain talks through a megaphone, whereas the forebrain, responsible for thinking in the language of reason and logic, talks through a dime-store walkie-talkie.**' Thus the part of our brains responsible for our logical reasoning thoughts can always be out-shouted by the part of our brains responsible for our emotional thoughts. They are also speaking two different languages, that of emotional thoughts, the other, the language of reason (i.e. what true science is based upon). Have you ever wondered why some of the worst wars have been fought over religions and religious ideologies? Islam, the Crusades, even Communist atheism, these are all supercharged emotion-based beliefs. Another quote from *Anxious in Love*, "Recall...our brains are hardwired in such a way that it's far easier to become flooded by emotion than to manage those emotions with reason." [ibed p. 99] "Your emotions [coming from your midbrain] blast with the intensity of a megaphone while your more-rational appraisals...[from] your situation barely have the attention getting power of a whisper." [ibed. p. 109]

The Bottom Line

So if sound scientific evidence can be presented for God's existence, both from science, such as from the science of physics and quantum mechanics (the macro and micro of the physics world), and from fulfilled Bible prophecies, historically proven in secular history books, this coupled to the laws of probability, another science, so why is it that the scientific community and our modern Western society reject this scientific evidence for God's existence, choosing instead to maintain personal beliefs, much of which is atheistic right now? People's personal beliefs, it has been shown, are emotion-based, and are merely out-shouting the voice of reason, the voice of provable scientific logic. It is an emotion-based decision to remain with your peers, the crowd you "hang out with," rather than accept the voice of scientific reason. You will skew the true scientific data to suit your emotion-based comfort zone. To see some real scientific evidence proving God's existence, and fulfilled prophecies proven accurate in secular history books, see the related links below. Who are you going to listen to, the voice of reason and logic, or the voice of emotion?

related links:

For *The Genesis Code*, covering creation from Genesis 1:1-31, see,
<http://www.unityinchrist.com/Does/Does%20God%20Exist.html>

All physical matter is a holographic projection coming from somewhere outside Space-Time. See,
<http://www.unityinchrist.com/Does/Hebrews%2011%201-4.html>

To see the vastly different life-forms that appeared after the dinosaurs died off, see,
<http://www.unityinchrist.com/dinosaurs/dinosaurs.htm>

The Bible is full of fulfilled prophecies, verified in secular history books. They all defy the laws of probability. No other book does this, except the Bible. To view a few, see,
<http://www.unityinchrist.com/ProofOfTheBible-FulfilledProphecy.htm> and

<http://www.unityinchrist.com/prophecies/1stcoming.htm>