

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

SCIENCE CAN'T EXPLAIN EVERYTHING.

SCIENCE/SCIENTISTS HAVE GOTTEN THINGS WRONG IN THE PAST.

THINGS DON'T CREATE THEMSELVES.

WHO CREATED THE UNIVERSE?
WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE THE BIG BANG? FROM WHERE DID THE UNIVERSE COME?



Freethinkers Around Redlands



Desert Atheist Community



Victor Valley



Atheists & Agnostics

SCIENCE

AN ATHEIST
DISCUSSES SCIENCE

Science can't explain everything.

The root word for "science" is 'knowledge', we use it today in the same way and when referring to the method used to obtain knowledge which can be tested/verified by repeatable experiments. Saying "science can't explain everything" is like saying "knowledge can't explain everything." Which is another way to phrase "we can't know everything." This idea is not disputed. Some things are not possible to know because they are composed of contradictions, like a married bachelor. However, everything we do claim to know can be learned via the scientific method. We've never had a scientific answer for something which was later corrected by religion. Don't confuse the temporarily unknown with the permanently unknowable, or the permanently unknowable with the supernatural. "Science doesn't know everything; religion doesn't know anything."
-Neil deGrasse Tyson

Science/Scientists have gotten things wrong in the past.

Yes, it has, and the scientific method was used to make every correction. Isaac Newton was a brilliant scientist as well as a devout religious believer in theism but he also believed in the veracity of alchemy. We have no Objective Evidence for the accuracy of alchemy or theism.

"The deepest sin against the human mind is to believe things without evidence. Science is simply common sense at its best - that is, rigidly accurate in observation, and merciless to fallacy in logic." (Thomas Huxley)

When a hypothesis proves unsatisfactory, it is either modified or discarded. If the hypothesis survived testing, it may become adopted into the framework of a scientific theory, a logically reasoned, self-consistent model or framework for describing the behavior of certain natural phenomena.

While performing experiments to test hypotheses, scientists may have a preference for one outcome over another, and so it is important to ensure that science as a whole can eliminate this bias. This can be achieved by careful experimental design, transparency, and a thorough peer review process of the experimental results as well as any conclusions.

After the results of an experiment are announced or published, it is normal practice for independent researchers to double-check how the research was performed, and to follow up by performing similar experiments to determine how dependable the results might be. Taken in its entirety, the scientific method allows for highly creative problem solving while minimizing any effects of subjective bias on the part of its users (especially the confirmation bias).

Things don't create themselves.

At best you can say "as far as we know, inside the universe things don't create themselves." Just because we don't yet understand many things doesn't mean they aren't understandable and therefore supernatural. Ignorance \neq supernatural.

Who created the universe? What happened before the Big Bang? From where did the universe come?

"Who" assumes there was a who, "created" assumes creation. If the big bang was the first moment there was existence (last moment we can measure extrapolating backwards) then there was no 'before' and all the "where the universe comes from(s)" are only relevant to locations inside the cosmos. Outside the universe and the cosmos may not even be a cogent concept to suggest like asking what is North of the North Pole. No one knows, and it may be beyond our ability to know. Ignorance \neq supernatural.