

4. Logic, rather than science, should be used to define the parameters of what can possibly and reasonably account for the evidence. There are only two basic possibilities: that personal forces are ultimately responsible or that impersonal forces are.

In any investigation into the origins of the universe, scientists are eventually going to hit bedrock: the existence of some set of components that cannot be reduced any further and that cannot account for their own existence. The scope of science is, therefore, superseded by any explanation for the bedrock itself.

“BUT WHY ANYTHING COMES TO BE THERE AT ALL, AND WHETHER THERE IS ANYTHING BEHIND THE THINGS SCIENCE OBSERVES--SOMETHING OF A DIFFERENT KIND--THIS IS NOT A SCIENTIFIC QUESTION. IF THERE IS 'SOMETHING BEHIND,' THEN EITHER IT WILL HAVE TO REMAIN ALTOGETHER UNKNOWN TO MEN OR ELSE MAKE ITSELF KNOWN IN SOME DIFFERENT WAY.”

C.S. Lewis

There are only two conceivable foundations for reality: personal forces or impersonal forces. These categories are mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive. Each person comes down on one side or the other, with no room for middle ground and no room for indecision.

Life itself necessitates a worldview. It is because of our worldview that we can relate with our world on more than a sensory and instinctive plane. Before we can interact socially and form moral or political values, we must first decide *why* we are here and, in light of that answer, *how* we should live. We may not have consciously arrived at all aspects of our worldview, but it is there—grounding and influencing our cognitive behaviors. (Even a person’s choice of breakfast is influenced by his worldview. Choosing oatmeal over chocolate-frosted sugar bombs, for example, reflects a person’s values and which authority/authorities he defers to.)

In other words, everyone has a worldview and no worldview is neutral. A so-called "lack of belief" in personal forces is in fact a positive claim that impersonal forces are the foundation of reality.

Whether personal or impersonal are responsible, neither explanation can be borne out scientifically. Those who seek to rule out personal causes out-of-hand do so illogically. If an individual *insists* that impersonal forces are responsible because methodological naturalism restricts him from exploring personal causes, then he is engaging in circular reasoning.

CONSIDER: Those who insist that science can fully inform a person's worldview can be compared to forensic experts in a criminal trial who attempt to convince the jury that forensic evidence renders any and all eyewitness testimony fully obsolete.