

# Creation Science: Nonscience?

**Elmo M Recio**

*PHIL 361 - Philosophy of Science*

Department of Philosophy  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Drexel University

August 3, 2000

### **Abstract**

Using the articles by Michael Ruse and Larry Laudan contained in the “Science and Pseudoscience” section of the text, along with the NOVA documentary “God, Darwin and Dinosaurs.” examine the issues behind the so-called “Creation Science” controversy. Be sure to discuss the issue of the demarcation of science from non-science, and consider to what extent a scientific theory (in this case the theory of evolution) needs to be confirmed before it can be taught as “fact.” Decide in the end whether the Creationists are correct in claiming that their views should be taught along side Darwin’s in basic science education.

### **In the beginning...**

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” or so the story goes. The question, however, is whether this “story” can be considered a science, specifically *Creation Science*. There are several things which must be considered in order to categorise Creation Science as a actual science, and, herein, is the debate!

The question is whether Creation Science is really a scientific theory. For this we have to delve into the works of Larry Laudan and Michael Ruse in order to, first off, explain the demarcation of science.

### **What Science Is and What It Isn't**

Ruse states that the most salient feature of science (versus non-science, eg: mysticism) is it empirical catalogue about the real world. Moreover, Ruse states that “science looks for unbroken, blind, and natural regularities...” To scientists (and many people now-a-day) events don't just *occur* as it pleases. There are natural rules and regulations that guides the actions of the natural world. These rules and regulation are what scientists are in seek of.

Ruse's definition of science can be explained in the following way:

1. explanation
2. prediction
3. testability
4. confirmation

5. falsifiability

6. tentative

**A viable explanation is created** when natural laws are established. Religious beliefs often allow for events to happen that defy natural laws. For example, some may call these events miracles; or other events like Catholicism's transubstantiation. Without the obedience of natural law, religion cannot be considered a science per se.

**Predictions may then be established** based on the viable explanations presented. With natural laws nicely established, and an explanation as to what exactly happened, then one may go on a limb and predict what will happen with certainty. In addition to what will happen, you can then predict what *has* happened (in the past.)

**The previously made predictions could now be tested** which is the most important front in science. This is the ability for the scientific community to verify the predictions and explanations for themselves. This allows for scientists to "see for themselves" the results of an experiment or theory.

**The scientist then looks for confirmation** of his theory. In other words, he looks for positive evidence to support his theory. The evidence must be purely empirical and not circumstantial.

**A theory must be falsifiable** in order for it to be a science. In addition to being confirmable, a theory must lay itself out to be able to be proven wrong. When a hole is found in the theory, ad hoc explanations that aren't consistent with the general theory, exposes it as weak, or even a non-science. This is the major difference between theory of relativity and Freud's pseudo-scientific psychology. There isn't enough empirical evidence in the universe to prove Freud's theories wrong; each piece of empirical evidence brought against Freud could be countered by an ad hoc "patch". Yet there is much empirical data to be brought against the theory of relativity. In other words, it must be open to possible refutation.

**Science must also be tentative,** it must be open to change and “advances.” A scientist must also be open to alter his theory, or ultimately reject it if it proves invalid. This implies a certain professionalism that ought to be maintained. If an experiment cannot be reproduced, or is reproduced incorrectly a scientist must be professional enough to step up and say that his findings were wrong. On the flip-side it took the Catholic Church a long time to admit to the revolution of the heavens!

## **Creation Non-Science**

If the above points are to be used to demarcate science from non-science then Creation Science does not warrant the “Science” portion of its name. In fact it defies each of the above qualifications, made by Ruse, for being a science.

Creation-science implies that things have occurred which are outside of the handling of law, specifically, natural law. Even the creation scientists believe that “we cannot discover by scientific investigation [God’s creation of the universe.]” Law is also broken when asked for us to take the bible literally. It implies that the Earth is, indeed, much younger than *scientific* records show. Creation-scientists also would like us to believe that there was indeed once, a great flood. All of these things, in actuality, defy natural laws.

Since these things defy natural laws, it is very difficult for us to provide valid explanations and predictions. Evolutionists can explain and predict why certain bones are similar across species. Creationists give no explanations and will make no predictions regarding even just these “homologies”. They provide no reason for why something is one way, and not the other. In this case, they provide no reason *to explain* creation-science.

As with Freud, creation-science lacks in explaining things at more than just an ad-hoc level. It does not put forth any valid experiment so that it can help move itself along. They seem to hide their “empirical” proof away, due to fear of counter empirical evidence.

The nails in the coffin for Creation Science seems to be the fact that they are dogmatists, and lack integrity! They oft times misuse quotations, and are rather dogmatic (sometimes fanatically so) in what they believe. In science, a real science, we sometimes have to realise when we are wrong and proceed forward. Creation science lacks this ability to move forward with new information. Finally, Creation Science oft time removes, or is selective of the type of information relayed by the evolutionists. The most famous example of this is the “we are descended from monkeys” bit. Utterly it is

a slanted version of the argument. These attacks on the scientists personal character does nothing to keep the creation scientist's argument valid.