

# The Heresies of Science

Philip Hale

August 2002

The philosophic implications of modern science alter peoples' reasoning, and are impediments to a God-centered view of life. Presuming to know what cannot be discovered by science, erring scientists overstep their role and become philosophers. Errors in science have caused the acceptance of non-scientific theories which bring with them harmful philosophy. The philosophy of science distorts reality and the truth given by God to man in Holy Scripture. Within science, evolution is the paramount theory used to dismiss God. Evolution is not the main error of science but a direct product of it. As typical of the sizeable errors within science, Richard Dawkins' scientific ideas will be examined.

Richard Dawkins, one of the most prominent Darwinian evolutionists, is without doubt an intelligent person. He seems like a credible scientist because of his professorship at Oxford and the adoration he receives. Despite the intellectual capacity and winsomeness of Dawkins, he advocates pseudo-science. Dawkins follows and defends the misapplication of science in knowledge, which causes it to be an all-encompassing philosophy. This is a result of not answering the basic question of what science is. The definition of science, not what is labeled as science, must solely determine what is scientific. Because boundaries in the field of science do not exist for scientists such as Dawkins, they hold a different view of science than traditionally held. Instead of being a rational system to gain glimpses of what we as humans can understand, errors have caused science to become the universal secular religion.

## Definition of Science

True science can only offer observations on physical phenomena. The scientific method is taught to novice students as a five-step recipe to obtain scientific knowledge. Originating in philosophy, not science, the scientific method gives a precise formula that embodies valid scientific reasoning. Despite its origins in philosophy, the scientific method accurately describes the correct methodology used to obtain knowledge through science, which is unbiased observation. The principles behind the scientific method, not the actual formulation itself, are fundamental to all science. In practice, many scientists ignore the scientific method and its consequences in obtaining knowledge. The principles contained in the scientific method should be the guiding precepts in scientific reasoning.

The scientific method is useful because it allows an unprejudiced vantage point for observation. This instrument for objective inquiry is what separates science from other less stable ways of attaining knowledge. The scientific approach to knowledge is distinctive and useful because man is extremely biased in opinion and naturally without truth.

Two consequences of scientific reasoning are that the topic, if it is to be studied scientifically, must be empirically verifiable and experimentally falsifiable. In matters that cannot repeatedly be verified, science is inconclusive. Another important aspect of the scientific method is that all theories in science must be able to be proven false empirically, by experimental observation. Therefore nothing of certainty can be proposed by science, only that what seems most probable or is useful within science. A claim that cannot be independently verified is unscientific and merely speculation or guesswork. By this supposition anything man cannot reproduce for examination, such as a single event in history, is outside the authority of science—therefore nothing scientific can be said on the subject. The origins of man, or the beginning of the world are two examples of that which cannot be resolved by science. Some scientists, including Dawkins, would falsely deny that science is limited to a specific jurisdiction in knowledge.

Purpose, origin, or meaning, if it is not visibly evident, cannot be determined by science. Science can view and comment on the physical, but not the abstract. In contrast, philosophical ideas are not in any way experimentally verifiable, but purely human speculation—from a vantage

point not high enough to see clearly what actually is.<sup>1</sup> The man-made goal of science is to obtain a description of our world by impartial observation. Due to man's extremely limited viewpoint, science only offers a shallow view of the physical world. Certain and absolute statements of truth cannot come from science, only empirical generalizations based on repeated inspection. Anything that cannot be perceived or does not repeatedly occur is outside the scope of science. Science can only offer superficial external observations on the physical universe that was created and is sustained by God.

Scientific theory offers a logical and necessarily incomplete idea of a subject, to further man's understanding of it. Every truly scientific theory is merely a description of a God-created reality simplified so that the human mind can grasp it. Properly, science is the group of non-contradicting theories that offers the best description of all things physical. An honest scientist will readily admit that the currently accepted theory on any particular subject is far from complete, and is only a stepping-stone to a fuller description. Even a clearly flawed (oversimplified) theory is useful as the basis for a better understanding of a subject. Science has always used a simple theory of something at first, until a more suitable and complex theory is developed. Even a complete physical understanding of things is out of the reach of science because man is not omniscient as is God. The subject matter of science is God's physical creation, not the cause or hidden meaning behind His actions. The true scientist uses the logical reasoning contained in the scientific method as the foundation for obtaining scientific knowledge, ignoring what cannot be discerned.

---

<sup>1</sup>Some think it is beneficial to simply contemplate lofty philosophic ideas—a necessary reaction because philosophic inquiry does not reward the pursuer with any tangible results. A simplistic definition of philosophy could be: the attempt to answer the deep underlying intellectual questions of human existence—trying to unravel what is universally accepted as unknown. Intellectual pleasure is often had by those pondering these deep unsolvable mysteries—despite the proliferation of conflicting, ridiculous, and speculative answers. The appeal of being god and knowing all is undeniably naturally appealing to fallen man. The deep and lofty philosophical ideas that are so attractive are not truly proper to consider because man is not a high and lofty being [a god]. Man is but a created being, lower than his Creator. What reason does a creation have to judge his existence, from what little he knows, as though he were the Creator?

## Errors in Scientific Approach

The fundamental error of many present day scientists is to combine science and philosophy, putting the result under the heading of science. In the secular realm questions of truth and purpose formerly belonged in philosophy, not in scientific study. Philosophy tries to gain knowledge primarily by speculation, which stands in stark contrast to the observational methods of science. Science cannot try to answer any of the questions that are fundamental to human existence, while philosophy tries and fails. Through widespread application to man's life, science has assumed a precarious position, similar to philosophy. Philosophy as a whole has produced more uncertainties and questions than reliable answers, and now science is following suit.

Evidence of the changing subject nature of science is quite widespread and found in the most respected scientists. Even some of the most brilliant scientists, who are otherwise scientifically sound, subtly mix in philosophic assertions among their valid scientific statements, failing to rightly divide between the two distinct disciplines of approaching knowledge. The error is not that scientists do not know how to practice science correctly, but the admixture of philosophy that results in a unproductive confusion of two different ways of reasoning. Scientists today seem more prolific than philosophers in producing asinine ideas, such as time travel or the existence of infinite parallel universes, because of a lack of critical analysis of science.<sup>2</sup> Being critical and determining whether every statement is scientific (a provable observation) or merely one's opinion, is the way to practice science correctly without making false philosophical statements. By mixing two radically different ways of approaching knowledge, philosophy and science, the outcome is fruitless.

As science branches into philosophy it loses the characteristic of human dependability. It has been demonstrated over the course of time that philosophy cannot adequately answer any question, but only invent more, of an increasingly absurd nature. One only needs to ask the educated

---

<sup>2</sup>The so-called scientific theories of today are difficult to distinguish from children's fairy tales. Often any silly idea that cannot be disproved that originates from someone with scientific ability is taken as a credible theory. Stephen Hawking is a good example of a gifted scientist who considers his own conjecture, based on insufficient evidence, to be science that explains how the universe operates. The unscientific nature of Hawking's work is clearly evident in his best-selling book: *A Brief History of Time*. His own opinions on all that was created are so child-like, and without any basis on reality, because man is not above creation—but just comprises a portion of it.

philosophers man's purpose or what is right, good, and true, to demonstrate the impotence of philosophy to answer the highly sought-after questions. The response would be lengthy, because there are a multitude of answers which are only opinions or speculations of the many intelligent people who have pondered the questions. After wading through the wordy mire of the many schools of philosophical thought, the conclusion can only be that the answer to these important questions are unknown, or in post-modern fashion to say there are no answers.<sup>3</sup> Science, because it is much narrower in scope (limited to the observable), has summarized and categorized many unquestionable natural truths. Few can debate that science has made numerous useful descriptions of common natural knowledge. When strictly practiced science cannot contradict any statement concerning God, because its focus is so limited—only the physical realm created by God—that it does not include such lofty matters as spiritual concerns. Historically, science has achieved a lofty status because it did not make unprovable statements as does philosophy. When scientists are not dogmatic in the use of the principles of the scientific method they do not produce pure science. Modern science often goes outside the bounds that define it, therefore it ceases to be true science and becomes human philosophy—the individual opinion of man among a throng of erring personal sentiments.

## **Is Religion Under the Authority of Science?**

Richard Dawkins readily admits he has a different aim than traditional science. According to Dawkins, “science needs to be released from the lab into the culture.”<sup>4</sup> This wish of Dawkins is becoming a present reality. People far-removed from science often appeal to it as the only indisputable truth. The influence of erring science on mankind's thinking, has led to wrong conclusions in the most important matters. In *The Selfish Gene* Dawkins asserts “we no longer have to resort to superstition [religion] when faced with the deep problems: Is there a meaning to life? What are we for? What is man?” The answer given by science to these questions is essentially that life has no intrinsic meaning. If this ideology is taken seriously then despair

---

<sup>3</sup>Post-modernism, currently the reigning philosophy among the educated, revels in the meaninglessness of everything—resulting in a most depressing view of life, insinuating there is no purpose to even living.

<sup>4</sup>The Richard Dimbleby Lecture: *Science, Delusion and the Appetite for Wonder*.

is the only possible outcome. There is an innate quality within man that compels him to have meaning and purpose for his existence. Being naturally ignorant of reconciliation to God through Christ, man is without real meaning. Separated from God, man on his own cannot find the true meaning of existence<sup>5</sup>, and is doomed to endlessly search for the elusive truth or invent fairy tales. To replace and ignore God, man has used many human inventions and currently scientific philosophy is a popular substitute.

Dawkins' view on religion is unambiguous. He is not ignorant of the truth, but is in opposition to it. In attacking the core of Christianity, Dawkins actively rejects the truth. His intense hatred toward religion is displayed in the comparison of it to the AIDS virus.<sup>6</sup> One of the recurring themes of Dawkins is the attempt to destroy any religious belief. Using science as the final rebuttal against religion he displays a polemical style that is unusual for a scientist. For Dawkins the undeniable complexity in nature "has obviously not the smallest connection with a being capable of forgiving sins, a being who might listen to prayers ... and no connection whatever with a being capable of imposing a death penalty on His son to expiate the sins of the world before and after he was born."<sup>7</sup> Dawkins honestly reveals his abhorrence for the central truths in Christianity, the incarnation and the redemption of man. Obviously, true religion and evolutionary theory are completely philosophically incompatible. Attacking divine truth should not be construed as scientific construction, as it frequently is by those in the scientific community. Science gives a superficial physical interpretation, in contrast to the profound spiritual answer of divine truth, to the deep philosophical questions.

## Disparities in Science

Two divides exist in science. Many scientists who study the world on a macroscopic scale, such as geologists, paleontologists, and astrophysicists, (improperly) see everything they study

---

<sup>5</sup>Which is simply that we are created, taken care of, redeemed, and blessed by God, and that we should act accordingly and merely receive God's gifts with thanksgiving. But not just any god we choose—God can only be found in and as far as humans are concerned does not exist apart from the man Jesus. As fallen creatures we can't reach to the all-holy God, so He reached down to us and took human flesh upon Himself—so that we can achieve communion with Him.

<sup>6</sup>TV interview with Sheena McDonald, August 15th, 1994.

<sup>7</sup>Lecture by Richard Dawkins from *The Nullifidian*, December 1994.

as support for Darwinian evolution. Many scientists who study the world on a microscopic scale, mainly physicists, see the unbelievable complexity of this creation and seem to know that accidents of that magnitude do not occur without cause. The reason for this trend is that on a large scale view of creation scientists tend to ask questions of a philosophical nature, outside the narrow scope of science. Scientists who are only concerned with the details and particulars of the creation stay away from the larger philosophical questions. The foremost Darwinian himself (Dawkins) concedes that scientists, who study God's creation detached from evolutionary theory, realize that the intricately connected properties of nature fit together as a harmonious whole, as if by consequence.

This marvelous creation is so transcendent in its divine qualities that man has yet to decipher many of its great mysteries. If one of a multitude of natural properties (such as physical constants) were slightly varied the world would be radically different. The universe we live in is a complex system that depends on the interaction of many physical things that are far beyond our understanding, even after hundreds of years of serious study. Dawkins refutes non-scientists when they use this scientific observation. "The trouble is that God in this sophisticated, physicist's sense bears no resemblance to the God of the Bible or any other religion. If a physicist says God is another name for Planck's constant, or God is a superstring, we should take it as a picturesque metaphorical way of saying that the nature of superstrings or the value of Planck's constant is a profound mystery."<sup>8</sup> It is interesting that according to Dawkins the universe contains profound mysteries but that it was only the result of "luck." If evolution is true, then man is so completely obtuse and without intelligence because he does not fully understand a simple "accident." The opposite conclusion is generally found in a culture that accepts evolution as fact. Rare is the man who will not fail to praise human nature, despite the evilness of man. Spiritual beliefs erroneously held, even for scientists, are too much for weak humanity to overcome and achieve unbiased reasoning. Contradictions within science on the nature of creation are due more to false preconceived notions, rather than unbiased scientific observation.

---

<sup>8</sup>Lecture by Richard Dawkins from *The Nullifidian*, December 1994.

## Errors in Science Today

Dawkins applies the voodoo that is evolution to man's life, which results in strange philosophical implications. The holes in evolutionary theory are evident to Dawkins. He thinks that DNA carries the basic information of life, and the blind watchmaker, that is natural selection, guided primordial bacteria to evolve into a human. Dawkins does not offer concrete answers to the logical questions of where DNA or the first bacteria originated. In ardently defending an incomplete unscientific theory with logical holes, Dawkins crosses the boundary of truth-seeking science into fanaticism.

It is almost comedic to watch so-called scientists try to explain the origin of the universe. These scientists do not use scientific investigation, but rely on vivid imaginations to concoct "big-bang" theories. In speculations they can reduce the universe to almost nothing in its first moments, but cannot make the jump that before the universe there was nothing. Evolutionary scientists do not realize that before a transitory object physically existed, it could not have materially existed in any form. If everything material is transitory and temporal then at some point there existed nothing physical. It seems that scientists actually gravitate toward the real truth of Christ, who created everything out of nothing. Those who do mind experiments and employ guesswork to obtain knowledge do not follow the scientific principles, but mock and oppose them.

Science precludes such ideas as there really existing an all-powerful being more intelligent than humans. In the philosophy of modern science, God is outside of creation by assumption, rather than by conclusion. In reaction to evolution, creationist scientists offer their creationist proofs to oppose evolutionist proofs. Although the creationists are correct in their refutation of evolution, they leave the matter unsettled and inconclusive by letting science answer questions of origin. When creationists use scientific evidences they partake in the same error as evolutionists, putting religious matters under the authority of science. Any truly scientific observation must agree with and support creationism. The evidence has to follow the reality.<sup>9</sup> It is not the duty of

---

<sup>9</sup>The evidence must follow the reality, regardless of deceiving appearances. Being fallen human creatures, man's faculty of reason is not dependable.



science to judge truthfulness or apply scientific observations to uphold philosophy. The reality that God is the creator of everything should not be promoted by science. Science should be limited to what can be studied by the scientific method and abstain from philosophizing on anything else. Science in any form should not be used as proof for any philosophy, whether it is correct or not. Certain knowledge cannot be attained by science, therefore it is foolhardy to have science try to answer questions of truth that have eternal consequences.

Another incongruent element of Dawkins' religious philosophy is that he will not follow morality through to its logical conclusions in evolution. Dawkins expresses the idea that man is born selfish (necessary for the fittest to survive) and that selfishness is of itself a bad virtue. The idea that simple robots like humans, who are accidents, can have virtues is irreconcilable. In *The Selfish Gene*, Dawkins writes "I am not advocating morality based on evolution. I am simply saying how things evolved." It is inconsistent for Dawkins to not have a morality based on the "scientific fact" of evolution. For someone who derives the meaning of life and even spiritual fulfillment from evolutionary thought, yet fails to have a morality based on evolution, there exists serious reasoning flaws. This logical inconsistency is held because if morality (right or wrong) is dissolved by evolution, the fallen nature of man would be beyond containment. It is a horrendous thought to imagine man without any restraint of the law.<sup>10</sup> Evolutionists want to have it both ways, but morality without God is fraudulent.<sup>11</sup>

Dawkins ideas on evolution are logically incomplete. If he were a genuine scientist he would be continually testing what science has said to see if better descriptions can be formulated. In Dawkins core argument<sup>12</sup> he claims there is not a god but that if one does exist he is not involved in anyway with our world. In his controversial interview<sup>13</sup> Dawkins related, "maybe somewhere in some other galaxy there is a super-intelligence so colossal that from our point of view it would be a god. But it cannot have been the sort of God that we need to explain the origin of the universe, because it cannot have been there that early." In making an emphatic statement of

---

<sup>10</sup>Law as in any requirement or demand upon man, including morality.

<sup>11</sup>Without a higher authority above man (God), morality is one's opinion of what is right against another's personal preference—no real morality because nothing external says what is right or wrong.

<sup>12</sup>Evolution as the explanation for human life. Nothing but strictly physical causes as the reason for everything—which excludes the supernatural and spiritual.

<sup>13</sup>TV interview with Sheena McDonald, August 15th, 1994.

certainty concerning God, Dawkins reveals his true reasoning, which is entirely outside the realm of what can be seen (science).

The principle of the scientific method that refutes scientists who, in similar fashion to Dawkins, assert that something cannot be, is that science cannot disprove anything. Positive scientific statements can be disproved by evidence, but science cannot establish what cannot be possible. The nonexistent cannot be studied or empirically authenticated. Mortal humans will never be able to conclusively prove anything about the Creator.<sup>14</sup> No one can ever have all the information necessary to make such claims about God due to the very nature of being human. Certain scientists consider themselves as gods and are dogmatic in naturally unknowable matters. Only in Christ is the truth of God freely given to man, and apart from being told by a higher authority than man [God], there is no certainty to be had in matters of truth. When science tries to answer questions that cannot be explained by what humans inherently know, scientists wrongly try to assume the place of God.

## **The Spread of Errors within Science to the General Populace**

The errors of science have pervaded the thinking of a great many people. Unfortunately the majority of people have accepted scientific philosophy without consciously realizing it. There is almost unanimous agreement that technology is greatest product of humanity. It is thought that science, because it has produced the tangible results of technology used by all, is the only undeniable truth.<sup>15</sup> The worship of technology occurs in some people who totally immerse themselves in the various innovations of man. The current faith in the progress of humanity parallels the childish fascination with what man can accomplish in technology through science.

---

<sup>14</sup>Man cannot intimately know God through His creation because He chooses to not make himself known, but remains hidden—only to be found in Christ. This is one of the great paradoxes of Christianity. It then follows that science can know nothing about God since He does not reveal himself in nature. Although it is true that God created everything, it does not follow that man can achieve personal knowledge or oneness with Him through what He has made. Only a superficial knowledge of a divine power can be seen in the creation, the relationship between God and man remains a mystery.

<sup>15</sup>The very prevalent Post-modernist idea is that there is no truth, although it is thought that science is one of the few reliable sources of knowledge. Perhaps due to the failure of philosophy, science has been given the title of being objective. The result is that without any real meaning or truth to life, the strictly physical and biological view of science is used to interpret all facets of life.

The idea is assumed by many that man is currently at the pinnacle of human progress, due to the limitless power of science. Without doubt the technology of the last hundred years or so has advanced rapidly, and afforded modern man many luxuries. Despite the ease of life created by man, it is not obvious that humanity has improved overall by this technological progression. The convenience of life currently has led to a lazy, apathetic generation, while godliness and morality become forgotten ideas. Living in an inundation of technology has produced a self-serving and overly-stressed people who can now survive without real human interaction. Claims of a superior existence due to technology should be examined closer on the basis of why man is put on this earth for such a short time, a question for the Church—not science. Hope in the achievements of man is but shallow human pride that neglects a right God-centered view of life. The philosophic scientific mind-set, along with its errors, has been wholly accepted to the detriment of modern man.

Modern society, under the pretense that science is the only truth, is fond of describing natural phenomena as a result of the scientific theory that describes it. As an example, someone might say an apple falls to the ground because of the law of gravity. This is an incorrect statement. By discerning which occurred first, it is easy to see that before Newton objects did not suspend in air. It is obvious that the natural truth of gravity was a known and understood reality before it was designated as such. The force we attribute to gravity was created by God and has remained unchanged despite a progressively improving description by science. Science can offer nothing but a simplified model of a physical truth conceived by God. A scientific theory is simply a means of describing physical phenomena, it is not a concrete rule that determines or regulates behavior. A new scientific theory can in no way change physical reality, only the way in which it is viewed by man. In attributing the wondrous divine qualities of nature to science, people rob God of His credit due in the creation and preservation of everything physical.

Science is one of the few areas of study that seems above criticism. If the same ideas in science came from a less respected field those people would be denounced as lunatics. Because people do not really understand what science is they think that if something is called scientific it is above questioning. In today's society everything is relative save the seemingly absolute truth

of science. Science seems to attract people who detest the relativity of post-modernism, but unfortunately they tend to assert more than can be said by science. “There’s this thing called being so open-minded your brains drop out,”<sup>16</sup> which is Dawkins response to the absence of truth in post-modernist thinking. Despite craving to make bold statements of truth, science does not offer the truth needed to make such radical claims. Science that is really scientific is so limited in scope that universal statements of fact are futile because nothing can be known by science absolutely. Refusing to be critical of anything labeled science has led to the unchecked spread and acceptance of scientific errors in society.

Dawkins writes popular science. To have a separate way of doing science that is popular implies that traditional science is unpopular and even unimportant for the general population. As a general rule, science that is easily disseminated or becomes a news story is suspect. People uneducated (and some educated) in science often accept unscientific ideas because they are mesmerized by the scientific terminology, and fail to reason through the actual theory. Science is a self-contained systematic way of modeling something to the best of human ability according to the scientific principles. A scientific theory isolated from the scientific principles can cause nothing but harm.

There is only a grain of absolute truth in science. Science is only truthful in a limited sense, because descriptions of the world (science) are irrelevant when man is confronting the harsh reality of living in a world that is not perfect like he expects or demands. That is not to deny science does not have its place or is useful, but that during the difficult times in life it not important or relevant.

Dawkins reacts against the correct perception of science, and rejects the idea that scientists are completely absorbed in the minutiae of science, and oblivious to any spiritual significance of life. “... the stereo-type of scientists being scruffy nerds with rows of pens in their top pocket is just about as wicked as racist stereotypes.” The most heinous sin for Dawkins is to say that science is irrelevant for everyone but scientists. The ultimate goal of Dawkins is not to gain insights into our fascinating world by the scientific method, but to have people live by the

---

<sup>16</sup>From Dawkins’ *The Real Romance in the Stars*, a paper against astrology.

philosophic by-products of evolution. He detests the idea that science is really as mundane as it appears in practice.

It is extremely telling that the word scientific is a synonym for describing precision and exactness in the details. If the true nature of science, as an orderly and methodical investigation of every visible tedious detail were known, people might be less inclined to ascribe praise to it. True science is so unique because it is thoroughly grounded in concrete details. Broad generalizations, such as those made in philosophy, are difficult to justify by man because they are so abstract in nature, and man does not have a broad point-of-view. Man's shortcomings in reasoning are most visible when he tries to analyze the universality of a statement.

Science is not and should not be accessible to common man, it requires a technical mind-set and advanced tools like mathematics. Also, a special gratification in understanding the intricate interaction of physical minutiae is essential to enjoy the study of science. The proper response to science is thankfulness for God's marvelous creation, not a glamorous worship of what man thinks he understands. Dawkins and others have successfully transplanted the errors of science into society at large.<sup>17</sup> Science should not be common knowledge, because only within the scientific framework is science useful knowledge to man. The popular science of Dawkins achieves the goal of secular popularity but fails altogether to be scientific.

Dawkins' popularity is due to his impassioned application of scientific ideas to everyday human life. The many books written by Dawkins are simply apologetics for the evolutionist viewpoint. The fact that evolution must be defended in an apologetic tone speaks of its doubtfulness as scientific fact. When scientists, like Dawkins, are emotionally tied to theories and passionately advocate them they become irrational in their scientific reasoning. Scientific reasoning has always been non-sensational because emotionalism would cloud the use of unbiased reason. Good scientific writing is austere and detached in tone, to allow focus only on the idea being described. In reading Dawkins lively prose, he comes across as a charismatic religious scientist. Such an oxymoron is appropriate for Dawkins' brand of science. Emotionalism combined with the sterling reputation of science deceives many simple-minded (yet often well educated)

---

<sup>17</sup>Because this error in viewing science touches God and man's salvation, it is without doubt the work of the devil ultimately.

people. Despite seeing holes in evolutionary theory, Dawkins doesn't search for a more tenable scientific theory, but spreads his "gospel" with religious fervor. When compared to legitimate scientists it is apparent that Dawkins is entirely unscientific.

## **Conclusions**

Dawkins is not a real scientist. He does not do scientific research or publish scientific material for the academic community. Dawkins only writes pop-science and is a media figure for the masses of people who are not qualified (or fail) to judge him by scientific standards. He has been accurately criticized within the scientific community of trying to make imaginary science popular among the public. Dawkins is much closer to a religious fanatic rather than to a calm, investigative, rational scientist. The errors in reasoning of Dawkins are the qualities most highly regarded by science and society in general. He is held up as a scientific role-model, which condemns a great many within the field of science.

Because those in science have failed to correct the error of not rightly dividing between scientific and philosophic knowledge, much confusion has resulted. Natural philosophy under the guise of science has deceived many, and devilishly opposes God's liberating truth. The philosophies that science has recently bore, are due to scientists going beyond what can be properly studied by the science. By definition what is found outside the reasoning of the scientific method is unscientific. The heresies of science, human knowledge masquerading as divine, are a poor substitute for the complete truth of God, found in Christ. Science will continue to produce foolish philosophic ideas until it is confined to the boundaries that properly define it.