

Without Excuse

WITHOUT EXCUSE

Let's talk about observation. Observation is a key step of the scientific method and therefore a key step in creating the narrative that science purports to be scientific fact.

Observation is how data is collected. It can be human observation or mechanical observation.

According to definitions utilized by science, observation can be subjective or objective. The scientific method requires observations to be objective, not subjective.

Subjective observations are based on perceived reality, personal opinion, or beliefs and are therefore not acceptable. Objective observations are independent of the person's perceptions, opinions, and beliefs.

Let's look at Webster's Dictionary's definition of the word subjective and the word objective.

subjective

adjective

Essential Meaning of subjective

1 philosophy: relating to the way a person experiences things in his or her mind

2: based on feelings or opinions rather than facts

3a: characteristic of or belonging to reality as perceived rather

than as independent of mind

b: relating to or being experience or knowledge as conditioned by personal mental characteristics or states

4a(1): peculiar to a particular individual

(2): modified or affected by personal views, experience, or background a subjective account of the incident

b: arising from conditions within the brain or sense organs and not directly caused by external stimuli subjective sensations

c: arising out of or identified utilizing one's perception of one's states and processes a subjective symptom of a disease

5: lacking in reality or substance

Objective

adjective

Essential Meaning of objective

1: based on facts rather than feelings or opinions

: not influenced by feelings

2 philosophy: existing outside of the mind: existing in the real world objective reality

3a: expressing or dealing with facts or conditions as perceived without distortion by personal feelings, prejudices, or interpretations of a test: limited to choices of fixed alternatives and reducing subjective factors to a minimum

3b: of, relating to, or being an object, phenomenon, or condition in the realm of sensible experience independent of individual thought and perceptible by all observers: having reality independent of the mind

c: involving or deriving from sense perception or experience with actual objects, conditions, or phenomena

d of a symptom of the disease: perceptible to persons other than the affected individual

e: relating to or existing as an object of thought without consideration of independent existence —used chiefly in medieval philosophy

3: relating to, characteristic of, or constituting the case of words that follow prepositions or transitive verbs.

As you can see from the definitions the goal of objectivity is to keep humans from contaminating the data with their feelings, experiences, and beliefs.

In addition to observations being objective, they must also be as free from bias as possible. Bias is defined as systematic error introduced into sampling or testing by selecting or encouraging one outcome or answer over others. Bias and subjectivity, in this case, are similar with some distinctions.

So the goal here is to let raw data speak for itself independent of the observer's schema.

That being established, it is important to point out that science is exclusively a human endeavor. Of the millions of different life forms indigenous to planet Earth, only humans engage in scientific research. Humans alone, are trying to establish where everything came from, when, and how. Therefore, in the final analysis, humans along with their feelings, experiences, and beliefs will be involved in observing and interpreting the data. An interesting article on the role of objectivity in scientific research as a philosophical discussion can be found here: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-objectivity/>

The Association For Qualitative Research in the U.K. defines objectivity this way, "In its purest sense, the idea of objectivity assumes that **a truth or independent reality** exists outside of any investigation or observation." (emphasis mine). Therefore, the goal of objective research is to find or observe a truth/reality.

OBJECTIVE SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATION IS

The gathering of data by way of human senses and/or man-made mechanical devices in a manner that is not influenced by human feelings, personal views, experiences, or background. The data must be based on facts, perceptible by all observers, and must be a reality independent of the human mind.

Now here is the rub. Scientific objectivity does not allow for the possibility of God, classifying God as non-physical and thereby subjective since a non-physical entity cannot be observed.

I will deal with this objection and others in a moment but first I must say that **this idea is prejudicial to science itself. REMOVING GOD AS A POSSIBILITY IS BIAS.** It is the very reason that the scientific method fails to deliver the correct answer to many investigations. If you remove God as a possibility then you cannot come up with the correct answer to anything He had a hand in. **If you remove the correct answer to a question, the only answers left are erroneous.**

Alright, let's get to it. I'm going to get a little technical in order to lay the foundation for this argument, but don't worry it won't last long and it won't get too deep. Just bear with me and I'll get to the good stuff quickly.

The science that wishes to deny the existence of God has two fundamental problems that must be addressed, causality and order out of chaos.

Causality is the principle that everything has a cause. Currently accepted science says that the universe began with a Big Bang. The great unanswered question is who or what caused the Big Bang? How did everything that exists come from a singularity? Where did the singularity come from? The principle of conservation of energy demands that all the energy in the universe was contained in the singularity. Where did the energy in the singularity come from?

The obvious answer that **everyone** knows is God created the heavens and the earth and all the hosts thereof. However, science and some scientists deny the very possibility of the existence of God. Therefore, as I said earlier when you remove the correct answer all that is left is an error.

The scientific community currently is working with two answers to the dilemma. The first comes from Steven Hawking.

The late Steven Hawking who unfortunately went to his death stubbornly denying

the existence of God left us with this answer to the most fundamental question in the science he devoted his life to. Hawking's answer is "there was no time *before* the Big Bang." "We have finally found something that doesn't have a cause because there was no time for a cause to exist in," Hawking wrote. "For me, (Hawking speaking here) this means that [there is no possibility of a creator](#), because there is no time for a creator to have existed in." - a quote from his last book first published in *Live Science*.

Earlier in his life, he took the position that whatever took place before the Big Bang "remains undefined". In that statement, he did not deny causality he just refused to credit God with creation. In his final opinion, he goes so far as to deny causality in order to deny God. That opinion fits the definition of subjective perfectly and therefore is not objective. It is sad, but this is a good example of the [irrational prejudice against God in the scientific community](#) and the error it causes.

Now for the second answer science is working with.

The second answer and by far the most popular is... wait for it...the second answer is "just because". Seriously, I am not kidding here. It "just is", it "just does" is the best science can come up with. Oh, they give it a good name like Emergence Theory or Chaos Theory.

It goes like this, order emerges spontaneously but inevitably from chaos. Again, no cause, it just happens. Believe it or not, this idea has spread throughout many areas of science over the last 150 years. Darwinism is based on this idea, random mutations occur over time eventually changing a single-celled amoeba into a fully functioning human being. This is what they teach your children in school and they are dead serious about it.

The highest levels of physics explain that order arises spontaneously from chaos somewhere above the Planck length scale of 1.616×10^{-33} centimeters. Below this level, the fundamental particles that make up the universe exist in a quantum foam where only chaos exists. Below the Planck scale of distance and time (1.616×10^{-33} centimeters and 5.36×10^{-44} seconds) the fundamental laws of space and time have no meaning. There are vacuum fluctuations, particles are real or virtual, they go in and out of existence randomly, and their position cannot be determined. Yet, science purports that without cause, this random chaos

somehow rises to higher levels of space and time and begins to organize itself according to the physical laws of this universe. No cause, it “just happens”.

Forgive me, but that is the argument of a five-year-old. It just happens. Just because. That is truly the argument of a five-year-old. Great scientific minds should never surrender to such an argument.

It amazes me the lengths that people with a good head on their shoulders will go to in an effort to deny God. These people can in no possible way be called dumb. They are bright people. Some of the most agile minds of our generation. Yet they waste their education and energy trying to deny God. Why?

Everyone and I mean every single person that is alive today and everyone who has ever lived believes in God. God is **observed** in the orderly arrangement of the universe He created. Everyone can and does **observe** it every moment they exist on this earth. His power and divinity are revealed and clearly understood by **observing** what He has created.

But don't take my word for it. Here is what God has to say for Himself. Paul the apostle, writing by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in Romans 1 verses 18-20.

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;

19 Because **that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them.** 20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; **so that they are without excuse:**

Please, whoever may be reading this, make no mistake, God has revealed Himself to you and YOU KNOW IT. He has gone so far as to say that denying Him **cannot be justified** by anyone who has ever lived. ‘

He who has ears to hear, let him hear.
