There are things in the world that cannot be understood by science

In the philosophy of science, a very prominent issue has been that of demarcation - how to distinguish science from non-science [3]. A well renowned attempt to solve this problem is that of Karl Popper. In his view, a hypothesis is scientific only in the case that it could possibly be falsified (proven wrong) by some observation [2].

Popper’s notion of falsifiability has been built upon Michal Ruse; he adds that science is a search for “unbroken, blind, natural regularities (laws),” [4] where these laws can be used to explain phenomena, and can be tested in the empirical world. He also adds that science must be open to change. Ruse [5] asserts that there is no clear line for demarcating science from non-science. However, he believes that despite the “grey” areas, his criteria are good enough to distinguish the “black and white.” Using these criteria, we can investigate what types of questions can and cannot be investigated using science.

The existence of god is constantly a topic of debate, and creation ‘scientists’ have spent much time attempting to use science to assert his existence. According to Ruse, to investigate something using science, you must appeal to natural laws, and you must use those laws to explain and predict phenomena in the world. Creation scientists, however, often appeal to miracles, the opposite of natural laws, and therefore cannot make predictions about the natural world. In addition, instead of testing the explanatory power of hypotheses that assert the existence of god, creation scientists “invent ad hoc hypotheses” [4] after empirical evidence is presented, in order to save their core assumptions. Ruse also asserts that science must be open to change, a feature that those attempting to prove the existence of god generally do not possess - creationists reject ideas of evolution, geology, and radiometric dating [1]. Finally, a scientific claim must be falsifiable. The claim that god exists is not one that could ever be empirically proven wrong, therefore it can never be properly investigated using science. For every observation about the world, we could just as easily say that it was or was not created by a higher being.

In conclusion, there are claims that are impossible to understand using science, and the example of creation science shows one such attempt. Topics of spirituality seem to be better left to disciplines akin to philosophy, where empirical evidence and the search for natural law are not the core concern.
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