

Science and Faith  
Are they mutually exclusive???

1. Briefly review where we have been...
  - a. Positive case
  - b. Answering objections
2. Introduction
  - a. There have been some very long wars in world history.
    - i. There was the 30 years' war.
    - ii. There was the 100 years' war.
    - iii. According to most historians, the longest war was the Iberian war. It lasted 781 years.
    - iv. Although... Others argue there has been a longer war.
      1. The war between science and faith...
    - v. It all started (supposedly) with Galileo's epic battle with the Catholic church.
    - vi. According to this popular narrative, Galileo was a fearless scientist, and the church was his oppressive enemy.
    - vii. According to many, this war is still raging...
  - b. How often have we seen or heard the following on you tube, tv, or the radio?
    - i. "Tonight, we will be talking about faith versus science. Our first guest is a former University of Oxford professor, evolutionary biologist, and bestselling author. He believes that science, not faith, holds the answers to all questions. On the other side of the aisle, we have Joe Smith, who will speak for the legitimacy of faith and Christianity. Joe homeschools his kids, thinks Oprah is the Antichrist, has no education, and lives near a swamp." (Mark Clark, 23)
  - c. David Barash of the University of Washington recently wrote an op-ed for the New York Times. He described "the talk" he gives every year to incoming freshmen informing them that science has rendered belief in God ridiculous. He writes,
    - i. "As evolutionary science has progressed, the available space for religious belief has narrowed: Science has . . . undermined belief in an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God." (The Return of the God Hypothesis, 13).
  - d. In the opening pages of *The Atheist's Guide to Reality*, philosopher Alex Rosenberg declares:
    - i. "There's so much more to atheism than its knockdown arguments that there is no God. There is the whole rest of the worldview that comes along with atheism. It's a demanding, rigorous, breathtaking grip on reality, one that has been vindicated beyond reasonable doubt. It's called science." (McLaughlin, 109)
  - e. Maybe you don't read David Barash or Alex Rosenberg, but I bet most of you have seen the film, *Nacho Libre*.

- i. In Nacho Libre the main character, Nacho, tries to baptize Esqueleto.
  - ii. But Esqueleto says, “Hey man... I don’t believe in God, I believe in Science.”
- f. The message from culture is clear.
  - i. If you love science, you must be an atheist.
  - ii. Science and Faith are opposites.
  - iii. You can’t be an intelligent person and believe in the God of the Bible.
- g. Many people state that they stopped believing in the God of the Bible because of the findings of modern science.
- h. According to many, the war between science and faith has been raging for hundreds of years and there has never been a truce.
  - i. But is this narrative true??? No!!!
  - ii. I often tell people that I’m a Christian because of science, not despite science.
- i. In Stephen Meyer’s superb new book “The Return of the God Hypothesis” he argues that the “science faith warfare” narrative is utterly false.
  - i. Dr. Meyer is not the only one to debunk this popular narrative. This narrative has been debunked by the world’s premier historians of science for decades.
  - ii. Dr. Colin Russell (the President of the British Society for the History of Science and a distinguished professor in the history science) argues that the notion of a deep and long-lasting conflict between Science and Faith is the product of late 19<sup>th</sup> century revisionist history. (Meyer, 18)
    - 1. Before this point, few argued that science and faith were incompatible.
    - 2. This all changed with the publication of two 19<sup>th</sup> century textbooks, filled with highly revisionist history.
    - 3. In both books, science stands for freedom and progress while religion stands for repression and superstition.
    - 4. The new atheists have simply regurgitated late 19<sup>th</sup> century revisionist history.
- j. In light of this background where are we going?
  - i. In this lecture I want to argue that nothing could be further from the truth.
  - ii. Science and faith are not only, not enemies, but real science is impossible apart from a Christian worldview.
  - iii. In fact, right now is the best time ever to be a Christian who loves science. Why? All the latest findings in science point towards Christian theism, rather than away from it.
  - iv. Many people are recognizing this fact. Stephen Meyer calls this intellectual movement, “**The Return of the God Hypothesis**.” By using the word “return” he is implying that at one point God played a huge part in the scientific endeavor.

k. I will cover five topics (over the next few weeks)

- i. The nature of science.
- ii. The origin of science.
- iii. The pioneers of science.
- iv. The discoveries of science.
- v. The stubbornness of scientism.

## 1. The nature of science.

a. We must begin our discussion with definitions.

i. What is science and what is faith?

1. According to many voices in our culture, science has to do with facts and faith has to do with fairy tales, wishes, and dreams.

2. Said another way,

a. “Science is based on truth and evidence, while faith is based on hopeful thinking and legend. Science is a search for objective evidence that leads humanity forward, while faith looks back to ancient teachings, outmoded holy books, and irrational conclusions in the face of overwhelming evidence otherwise.” (Mark Clark, 23-24)

3. For many “faith” is merely wishful thinking.

- a. Faith is what we resort to when we run out of evidence, but still want to believe in something.
- b. Faith is something we do when we lack evidence.
- c. There is no evidence to believe that the Seahawks will win the super bowl next year, but many still have “faith” that they will.

4. Richard Dawkins said,

a. “Faith is like a mental illness, a great cop out, the excuse to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence.” (Quoted in Clark, 24)

5. Sam Harris agrees,

a. “We have names for people who have many beliefs for which there is no rational justification. When their beliefs are extremely common, we call them religious. Otherwise, they are likely to be called mad, delusional, or psychotic.” (Quoted in Clark, 24-25)

ii. The dichotomy is very clear.

1. “Science is about thinking, evidence, and rational justification, while Christianity and faith in general are about evading evidence and clinging to nonrationality.” (Clark, 25)

b. There are two massive problems with this understanding of science and faith.

**i. First, science and faith (i.e., Christianity) are both rooted in evidence!**

1. Like so many others, I believe in the truthfulness of Christianity because of the evidence not because I lack evidence.
2. I often tell people that I believe that Christianity is true because of science, not despite science.
3. Because of the latest findings in astronomy, physics, biology, archaeology, and philosophy I'm persuaded to move towards Christianity not away from it.
  - a. We will cover some of these issues in more detail later...
4. Good scientists are always willing to go wherever the evidence leads and the scientific evidence leads towards Christianity.

**ii. Second, science and Christianity are both based on faith!**

1. Scientists make faith commitments *all the time*, with very little evidence.
  - a. Let me give several examples...
  - b. Most scientists believe in some notion of truth, beauty, goodness, and right and wrong, but these things can't be proven with the scientific method or in a test tube.
  - c. For years, scientists believed in atoms and molecules, even though no one had ever seen one with the naked eye until very recently (a molecule in 2009 and an atom in 2018—Metaxas, 317). We took their existence on faith long before 2009.
  - d. Some scientists believe that nothing made the universe. This requires massive amounts of faith.
    - i. When it comes to the origin of the universe, there are only two options.
      1. Something created everything (Christian view)
      2. Nothing created everything (Atheistic view)
      3. Which one requires more faith?
  - e. Atheist physicist Quentin Smith from Western Michigan University says,
    - i. "The most reasonable belief is that we came from nothing, by nothing and for nothing."
  - f. Along these lines,
    - i. Few scientists dispute that all matter in the universe emerged from nothing nearly fourteen billion years ago, in what we call the Big Bang, even though there was no one there to observe it or record it. Science equally maintains that matter and energy cannot be created

or destroyed, which is the First Law of Thermodynamics. So science expects us to accept something (the Big Bang) that violates what is an immutable law of matter. But no real scientist has any difficulty in maintaining this awkward tension, because this is simply the strange pass—or impasse—to which logic and the evidence have taken us. (Metaxas, 316)

- g. Some scientists try to get around the fine-tuning argument for God's existence by believing in the multiverse theory of the universe even though there is zero evidence for the multi verse theory.
  - i. This too requires tons of faith.
- h. Some scientists believe that the information stored in the DNA of one single cell organism came about by chance.
  - i. Even though the information stored in the DNA of one cell is the equivalent of the information stored in over 1000 sets of the encyclopedia Britannica. Keep in mind that the letters in the DNA are arranged just as carefully as the letters in 1000 sets of Encyclopedias.
  - ii. Only two options...
    1. An intelligent designer arranged this information.
    2. Randomness arranged this information.
    3. Which perspective takes more faith?
- i. Many scientists now realize that it is chemically impossible and mathematical improbably that life emerged from nonlife in Darwin's warm little pond. To get around this fact, Richard Dawkins (and others) argues for panspermia (explain), even though there is zero evidence for this theory.
  - i. This requires tons of faith.
- j. Some scientists believe that all living things evolved from single celled organisms even though there is no evidence for this in paleontology.
  - i. One of the twentieth centuries greatest paleontologists was Harvard's Stephen Jay Gould. He writes,
    1. "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference."
  - ii. He admits that the fossil record does not show species gradually transforming from one kind to another, but each kind appears all at once and fully formed.

- iii. In other words, there is no evidence for evolution in the fossil record, which is the one place where there should be massive amounts of evidence. Yet many still believe it is true.
    - iv. This requires massive amounts of faith.
  - k. Many scientists believe that there is no life after death, even though they have no evidence for this claim. Have they died and seen the evidence???
  - i. Their belief requires massive amounts of faith.
  - l. Carl Sagan made the ultimate statement of faith when he famously said, “The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be.”
    - i. Really?
    - ii. How did he know that for sure?
    - iii. Had he been to every corner of the cosmos? Of course not!
    - iv. Had he been outside the cosmos? Of course not!
    - v. He was making a statement of faith.
  - m. Norm Geisler’s book...
    - i. “I don’t have enough faith to be an Atheist”
    - ii. The title says it all.
    - iii. He makes the point that the less evidence you have for your position, the more faith you need to believe it.
    - iv. Geisler argues that the evidence for theism is so strong and the evidence for atheism is so weak that it requires way more faith to be an atheist than a Christian.
- 2. Some scientists readily admit that they believe things despite the evidence.
  - a. Harvard University biologist Richard Lewontin wrote that his scientific community,
    - i. “has a prior commitment . . . to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes. . . . We cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.” (Clark, 31)
  - b. What an admission? Lewontin is saying that his science is driven by his personal philosophy and precommitments not the facts. In other words, his faith position predetermines his science, not the other way around.
- 3. Bottom line...
  - a. The secular worldview of scientific materialism (that is held by many scientists) and Christianity are both belief systems based on faith.

- b. Neither groups can avoid living by faith.
  - c. Phillip Johnson said,
    - i. “One who claims to be a skeptic of one set of beliefs is actually a true believer in another set of beliefs.” (quoted on page 27 of Geisler).
  - d. We all *believe* certain things based on evidence...
  - e. The important question is simply this, how much evidence is there for one’s beliefs?
  - f. In other words, are my beliefs based on the best evidence when all the factors are considered?
- c. Application
- i. Let me summarize and apply.
  - ii. Summary...
    - 1. The worlds of science and Christianity are both based on faith.
      - a. Neither worldview can avoid faith.
      - b. Christians *believe* certain things based on evidence.
      - c. Scientists *believe* certain things also based on evidence.
      - d. Both groups operate with, and rely on, faith.
      - e. Therefore, there is no contradiction between science and faith.
  - iii. Application...
    - 1. With that said, I don’t like the phrase “Science and faith.”
      - a. By describing the debate with these words, the person of faith has already lost the debate.
      - b. The scientist wants us to believe that there is science and there is faith.
      - c. But as I have already said, Science and faith (i.e., Christianity) both require faith.
      - d. The two sides are both arguing that we should believe their view of the world, based on the evidence for their truth claims.
    - 2. Both sides agree that we should only believe something if we have evidence for its truthfulness.
    - 3. What we are really talking about are two religions—scientism and Christianity.
      - a. JP Moreland explains,
        - i. There is science and scientism.
        - ii. What is science? Systems of knowledge of the physical or material world based on facts obtained through observation and experimentation. This is good and right!

- iii. What is scientism? The view that the hard sciences alone have the intellectual authority to give us knowledge of reality. (back cover of the book *Scientism and Secularism*)
- iv. Scientism is a philosophy or worldview based on faith, just like Christianity.
- v. *It is scientism, not science, that is at war with Christianity.*

- 4. The Christian worldview has much more evidence for its truth claims than the worldview of scientism.
- 5. Christians have never seen a contradiction between science and faith. In fact, Christians were the creators of modern science.
- 6. Which brings us to our second subject...

d. *First, the nature of science....*

i. *Overall review of arguments...*

ii. *Review from last time...*

- 1. *Culture wants us to think that Science and Christianity are incompatible...*
- 2. *This is false for several reasons...*
  - a. *Science and Christianity are both belief systems based on evidence...*
  - b. *If one adopts the culture's definition of faith, Atheistic scientists have way more faith than theists.*
  - c. *The real conflict is between Christianity and scientism...*
  - d. *Good science goes wherever the evidence leads...*

## 2. The origin of science.

- a. I would like to ask several questions (five) to help us understand the origin of science!!!

i. **When and where did modern science begin?**

- 1. The scientific revolution happened from roughly 1500-1750.
- 2. The question we must ask is simply this—why then? And why did it happen in Western Europe?
- 3. This is famously called the “Why there? Why then?” question. This was first posed by Cambridge professor Joseph Needham.
- 4. “Why did human beings begin to unlock nature’s secrets in such a revolutionary and systematic way in western Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries?” (Meyer, 21)



5. The undisputed answer is that modern science developed in Western Europe during this time period because of the Christian worldview.
6. “Modern science [is] a legacy, I might even [say] a child, of Christianity.” — C. F. von Weizsäcker (Metaxas, 347)
7. Innumerable scholars from the widest variety of philosophical viewpoints have acknowledged the same and have admitted “that Christianity provided both intellectual presuppositions and moral sanction for the development of modern science.” But in perpetuating the ahistorical myth that science and religion are enemies, the Four Horsemen of the New Atheism pretend to know none of this and gallop along silently. (Metaxas, 348)

## ii. Why didn't it develop elsewhere?

1. Pearcey and Thaxton argue that several cultures in antiquity—ranging from the Chinese to the Arabs to the Greeks—produced a level of learning and technology that was *higher* than that of medieval Europe.
2. Many other cultures/nations had the materials necessary for conducting scientific experiments and for thinking scientifically.
  - a. The Egyptians erected great pyramids
  - b. The Chinese invented block printing, the compass, and gunpowder.
  - c. The Romans built great roads and aqueducts.
  - d. The Greeks produced great philosophers.
3. Yet, none of these cultures developed a systematic way or method for studying and investigating nature. Even though they had all the tools they needed to do so
  - a. They had free time.
  - b. Methods of collecting information.
  - c. A system of writing things down.
  - d. Etc...
  - e. So why didn't they invent modern science?
4. The foundational philosophical thinking in many cultures inhibited progress toward a scientific outlook:
  - a. Animism deifies nature and claims there is a god in trees, water, and rocks. Such a worldview inhibited scientific investigation because one cannot subject deified objects to objective analysis.
  - b. Buddhism says that the universe itself is an illusion; therefore, there's no point in doing any kind of scientific inquiry because all your conclusions are going to be an illusion as well.
  - c. Polytheistic religions explain events by citing the actions of the gods; thus there is no point in investigation. It is not necessary to ask why water

bubbles up in the ocean because the answer is metaphysical: Poseidon is stirring it up. (Clark, 28-29)

5. “The Bible teaches that nature is real, while Hinduism ‘teaches that the everyday world of material objects is maya, illusion.’ Therefore, it is ‘doubtful whether a philosophy that so denigrates the material world would be capable of inspiring the careful attention to it that is necessary for science.’ (Metaxas, 351)
6. What about Judaism and Islam?
  - a. They (Judaism and Islam), for the most part, are worldviews that emphasize not reason so much as jurisprudence, the study and interpretation of law: in their case, the study of the Torah, the Mishnah, and the Qur’an. That is their rich history. But Christianity’s history is in theology and philosophy. The heroes of Western Christianity are people who wrote and taught doctrine and creeds: the apostle Paul, Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, John Calvin, and Jonathan Edwards. (Clark, 29)
7. What about Atheism? Based on contemporary rhetoric, it sure seems like Atheism founded modern science.
  - a. It is a fact that Atheists did not develop modern science.
  - b. Princeton professor and world-class philosopher of science Hans Halvorson . . . notes that the scientific method did not arise from atheism. On the contrary, the first scientists believed our universe was designed and created by God “according to a blueprint that can be discerned by rational creatures like ourselves.” Since God was free to create however he chose, “the only way to discover the blueprint of creation is by means of empirical investigation.” Indeed, Halvorson argues that theism still provides a better philosophical foundation for science than does atheism. Atheism per se does not offer a foundation for science at all. (McLaughlin, 111-112)
8. Why didn’t science develop elsewhere? Other cultures thought systems did not have a worldview conducive to science.

### iii. Why did Modern Science develop specifically within the framework of Christianity?

1. Asked another way, why does Christianity and Christianity alone provide the necessary framework for modern science?
2. Christian theology was the garden out of which modern science grew because it presented a world with distinct form, complexity, and design. Christianity challenges us to experiment with what we see, believing there is order and uniformity to the universe. No other worldview, philosophy, or religion of the ancient world offered the unique perspective Christianity did. This is why modern science didn’t emerge prior to the seventeenth century. (Clark, 28)
3. Kenneth Richard Samples cites ten things necessary for science to flourish and they are only found in the Christian worldview.

- a. The physical universe is a distinct, objective reality,
  - b. The laws of nature exhibit order, patterns, and regularity,
  - c. The laws of nature are uniform throughout the physical universe,
  - d. The physical universe is intelligible,
  - e. The world is good, valuable, and worthy of careful study,
  - f. Because the world is not divine and therefore not a proper object of worship, it can be an object of rational study,
  - g. Human beings possess the ability to discover the universe's intelligibility,
  - h. The free agency of the Creator makes the empirical method necessary,
  - i. God encourages, even propels, science through his imperative to humans to take dominion over nature, and
  - j. The intellectual virtues essential to carrying out the scientific enterprise are part of God's moral law.
  - k. From these, science drew on the biblical mandate to use reason to explore and to investigate. (Clark, 29)
4. Furthermore, Christianity prized the life of the mind.
- a. Medieval monasteries were centers of academic study. The first universities emerged from a need to train priests. Oxford and Cambridge—and later, universities like Harvard and Yale—were founded as explicitly Christian institutions. (McLaughlin, 111)
5. In addition, the Christians doctrine of original sin led to the scientific method.
- a. Fuller says that in the late Middle Ages and through the Protestant Reformation the works of **Augustine** became popular, and the fourth- and fifth-century genius had brilliantly summed up the Bible's idea of man's twin nature.
    - i. **We were created in God's matchless image, and therefore bore the Imago Dei, but because we had also fallen from our perfect state in paradise, we now also bore the peccatum originis, or Original Sin.**
    - ii. As Meyer explains it, we had the extraordinary rational abilities to investigate and understand the material world around us, but we also "were vulnerable to self-deception, flights of fancy, and prematurely jumping to conclusions." So just as much as we were

obliged to be excited about what we might find, we had to be realistic in how we processed what we found.

- iii. **We had to have a system—which came to be called “the Scientific Method”—that allowed us to submit our findings and our theories to an objective and rigorous investigation.** We had to humble ourselves as we searched for knowledge by putting our findings and our ideas to the test. (Metaxas, 353-354)

6. Finally explicit texts from Scripture encourage us to study the world.

- a. **Romans 1:20 (ESV) — 20** For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse.
- b. **Genesis 1:28 (ESV) — 28** And God blessed them. And God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”
- c. **Psalms 19:1–4 (ESV) — 1** The heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky above proclaims his handiwork. **2** Day to day pours out speech, and night to night reveals knowledge. **3** There is no speech, nor are there words, whose voice is not heard. **4** Their voice goes out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world...
- d. **Psalms 50:10 (ESV) — 10** For every beast of the forest is mine, the cattle on a thousand hills.
- e. **Psalms 24:1 (ESV) — 1** The earth is the LORD’s and the fullness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein,

7. Application of these texts-

- a. The Bible teaches that science is not the enemy of faith but simply one of the means by which we look into nature and learn about God. God constantly woos us through what he made—stars, trees, and microorganisms. He constantly preaches at us, saying, “I want to know you. Here I am.” (Clark, 39)

iv. **What is a good summary statement?**

1. Why did modern science first arise only in the West? To summarize, it’s because the Judeo-Christian worldview that permeated Western culture proposed that a rational, orderly, and moral-lawgiving God created a rational and orderly universe that was governed by predictable physical laws. Simultaneously, the Judeo-Christian worldview taught that nature was not sacred, and thus could be studied and enjoyed as it teaches us about the loving God who created it. Even more, this worldview encouraged the humility necessary to admit mistakes and abandon

wrong ideas so our theories about nature could be improved. In other words, when properly practiced, history shows that Christian virtues helped inspire the scientific method. (Holden, 290)

b. Christians need to go on the offensive....

i. It is the atheistic worldview, not the Christian worldview, that provides no basis for the scientific endeavor.

ii. The Atheistic worldview affirms that there is...

1. No purpose
2. No truth
3. No meaning to life...
4. We are here because of a cosmic then a chemical accident.
5. Why study the surroundings when life is meaningless?

iii. Quote by Dawkins...

1. "In a universe of blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason to it, nor any justice. The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil, and no good. Nothing but blind pitiless indifference, DNA neither knows nor cares. DNA just is. And we dance to its music." (Reflections, 64)

iv. John Lennox quote...

1. I also reject it (atheism) because I am a mathematician interested in science and rational thought. How could I espouse a worldview that arguably abolishes the very rationality I need to do mathematics? By contrast, the biblical worldview that traces the origin of human rationality to the fact that we are created in the image of a rational God makes real sense as an explanation of why we can do science. Science and God mix very well. It is science and atheism that do not mix. (John Lennox, quoted in Metaxas, 355)

v. In light of these realities, it takes a lot of guts for Atheists to say that science and faith are incompatible, when Christianity, and Christianity alone, is responsible for the creation of modern science and provides the only philosophical foundation for modern science.

1. Star Trek episode...

2. This would be like a creature from another planet saying that they wrote the works of William Shakespeare (no, they didn't).

c. *Who were some of the great Christian thinkers who created modern science? This brings us to the next point...*

d. *The nature of science.*

e. *The origin of science.*

### 3. The pioneers of science.

- a. The pioneers/inventors of modern science were all theists (most were devout Christians).
  - i. I will talk about two groups of scientists, the pioneers of modern science and the contemporary stars of modern science.

**b. The pioneers**

- i. Two Franciscan friars, **Roger Bacon** (ca. 1214–ca. 1294) and **William of Ockham** (ca. 1285–ca. 1350) laid the empirical and methodological foundations for the scientific method. Francis Bacon (1561–1626) established and popularized it. (McLaughlin, 111).
- ii. **Copernicus** (1473-1543) and **Galileo** (1564-1642) were devout Roman Catholics.
  - 1. In other words, they had a biblical worldview...
- iii. **Sir Francis Bacon** (1561-1626), was the inventor of the modern scientific method.
  - 1. The English philosopher Francis Bacon, who strongly advocated for the scientific method of gaining knowledge by careful observation, experimentation, and inductive reasoning, believed that,
    - a. “The laws of nature, which now remain and govern inviolably till the end of the world, began to be in force when God first rested from his works, and ceased to create; but received a revocation, in part, by the curse, since which time they change not.” (source???)
- iv. **Johannes Kepler** (1571-1630) said that “God wanted us to recognize natural laws and that God made this possible by creating us after his own image so that we could share in his own thoughts.” (Kepler, 25 of Meyer)
  - 1. He was a game changer in the world of astronomy.
  - 2. He invented the three laws of planetary motion.
  - 3. According to Johannes Kepler, the astronomers of his day (including himself and Tycho Brahe, the Danish astronomer whose extremely accurate observations Kepler used) sought “to carry out investigations in the heavens for the praise of their Creator.” (Holden, 282-283)
- v. **Blaise Pascal** (1623-1662)
  - 1. Mathematician and a founder of hydrostatics and hydrodynamics.
- vi. **Robert Boyle** (1627-1691), the father of modern chemistry.
  - 1. Robert Boyle, whose name is memorialized in Boyle’s law, was another key player in the development of science. Boyle was a devout Christian, heavily invested in evangelism and Bible translation. He considered becoming a minister but decided he could serve Jesus better as a scientist. (McLaughlin, 111)

- vii. Danish naturalist, **Niels Steno** (1638-1686), the founder of modern geology.
- viii. **Sir Isaac Newton**,
  - 1. Newton (ca. 1642–1727) is one of the most influential scientists of all time, famous for formulating the laws of gravity and motion. While not an orthodox Christian, owing to his denial of the full divinity of Christ, Newton was an earnest believer in God and wrote more about theology than physics.
  - 2. He was elected president of the Royal society for 24 consecutive terms. He discovered the law of gravity and invented calculus.
  - 3. Sir Isaac Newton believed that Atheism was senseless. He wrote,
    - a. “When I look at the solar system, I see the Earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance... This most beautiful system of the sun, planets and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent Being.” (Holden, 282-283)
- ix. Swedish biologist **Carolus Linnaeus** (1707-1778), the father of biological taxonomy
- x. **William Herschel** (1738-1822), outstanding nineteenth-century astronomer...
  - 1. William Herschel was one **of the first 'professional' astronomers, and discovered infrared radiation**. His sister Caroline helped him to develop the modern mathematical approach to astronomy.
- xi. **William Kirby** (1759-1850), father of entomology...
- xii. **Michael Faraday** (pioneer in the sciences of electricity and magnetism),
  - 1. Faraday (1791–1867) is best known for his work on electromagnetism, and his scientific contributions were so significant that he is considered one of the greatest experimental scientists ever.
  - 2. The Faraday constant is named after him, as is the Faraday effect, the Faraday cage, and Faraday waves. Faraday was a passionate Christian, deeply interested in the relationship between science and faith.
- xiii. **Matthew Maury** (1806-1873), pioneer in oceanography.
- xiv. **Louis Pasteur** (1822-1895) (leading bacteriologist and developer of germ theory of disease and the process of pasteurization).
- xv. **Gregor Mendel** (1822-1884), father of genetics...
  - 1. Gregor Mendel (1822–1884) was a Roman Catholic friar who studied the heredity of pea plants in the gardens of St Thomas’s Abbey.

2. Dawkins recognizes Mendel as the “founding genius of genetics itself,” but is careful to downplay his faith:
    - a. “Mendel, of course, was a religious man, an Augustinian monk; but that was in the nineteenth century when becoming a monk was the easiest way for the young Mendel to pursue his science. For him, it was the equivalent of a research grant.”
  3. Such biased reporting is vital if one is to maintain the story of science as antithetical to faith, and in most instances, it is simply impossible to justify. (McLaughlin, 116-117)
- xvi. **William Thomson** (1824-1907), also known as Baron Kelvin, was a brilliant nineteenth-century physicist from Scotland.
1. “One of the most eminent scientists of the nineteenth century.” (Wikipedia)
  2. Lord Kelvin (1824–1907), whose name is memorialized in the Kelvin unit of temperature, is another example of scientific excellence and serious faith. (McLaughlin, 115)
  3. He is best known today as inventing the international system of absolute temperature that bears his name.
- xvii. **Joseph Lister** (1827-1912), was the father of modern surgery, founder of antiseptic medicine, pioneer in preventive medicine.
- xviii. **James Clerk Maxwell**, the father of modern physics
1. Maxwell (1831–1879) has been credited with the second great unification of physics, bringing together electricity, magnetism, and light. He was an evangelical Presbyterian, who became an elder of the Church of Scotland.
- xix. **Georges Lemaitre** (1894-1966), brilliant physicist who formulated the modern big-bang theory, which holds that the universe had a cataclysmic beginning.
1. Like any scientific paradigm shift, the theory met with resistance. In this instance, some of the pushback was motivated by atheism.
  2. As Stephen Hawking observed,
    - a. “Many people do not like the idea that time has a beginning, probably because it smacks of divine intervention. . . . There were therefore a number of attempts to avoid the conclusion that there had been a big bang.” (McLaughlin, 115)
  3. One of the scientists who opposed the theory was atheist physicist Fred Hoyle, who coined the term big bang in a radio interview, where he compared the theory



to a party girl jumping out of a cake. Along with many scientists of his day, Hoyle preferred the “steady state” theory, according to which the universe had always existed. With this model, it was easier to avoid the idea that anything outside the universe brought it into being.

4. “Far from being yet another pointer toward atheism, the big bang is intriguingly congruent with the core Christian belief that God created the universe out of nothing.” (McLaughlin, 115-116)

c. Summary...

- i. These men were all Christians (Except Isaac Newton).
- ii. Objection- everyone was a “Christian” back then...
  1. No, they were not...
- iii. Furthermore, most of these scientists were very explicit about their Christian worldview driving their science.
- iv. Their Christian beliefs did not prevent them from doing science, but rather, were the foundation and motivation of their scientific research.
- v. For these men, science and faith went hand in hand, and studying God’s creation was an act of worship. But is this just a tiny minority report in the history of otherwise atheistic science? Not at all. (McLaughlin, 114-115)

d. What about recent history???

- i. Objection...
  1. All those guys lived before the advent of modern science.
  2. What we know now, surely makes God superfluous.
  3. The opposite is true. What we know now makes belief in the God of the Bible even more likely.
- ii. Allan Sandage
  1. Allan Rex Sandage was considered the greatest observational cosmologist in the world.
  2. One scholar notes,
    - a. “Few scientists are as widely respected as this one-time protégé to legendary astronomer Edwin Hubble.”
  3. Sandage has been showered with one prestigious award after another including, receiving astronomy’s equivalent of the Noble prize.
  4. In 1985, he attended a conference on science and religion.
    - a. One of the sessions was on the origin of the universe.

- b. It was meant to be a debate of sorts.
  - c. On the right side of the stage sat all the scientists who believed in God and on the left side of the stage sat all the scientists who did not believe in God.
5. When Sandage walked up onto the stage steps everyone assumed he would join the atheists on stage left.
- a. After all, he grew up a secular Jew.
  - b. As a result, he had been a vocal atheist for years.
  - c. Furthermore, many assumed that a scientist of his caliber would surely be an Atheist.
6. Then the unthinkable happened...
- a. The room gasped out loud when Sandage got to the top of the stage steps and turned right to sit with the theists.
  - b. Even more shocking, a few minutes later, he disclosed to the room that he had recently embraced Christianity.
7. How did this happen?
- a. He explained that an in-depth study of Big Bang cosmology forced him to draw the conclusion that the God of the Bible must have done it...
8. He went on to explain that,
- a. "the Big Bang was a supernatural event that cannot be explained within the realm of physics as we know it." (Case for the Creator, 69-70).
9. At the same conference Harvard Astronomer Owen Gingerich said that,
- a. "the Big Bang seems to fit best within the theistic framework." (Case for the Creator, 70)

### iii. Francis Collins

1. Dr. Francis Collins is a physician-geneticist.
  - a. He is one of the world's premiere genetics researchers.
  - b. He is known for his leadership of the international human genome project.
  - c. He was also the director of the NIH.
2. His story-
  - a. Collins grew up in a secular home. Religion wasn't so much attacked as it was irrelevant. As a graduate student at Yale, he shifted from agnosticism to atheism, assuming that belief in God was rationally untenable. But his atheism was challenged during his time as a junior doctor, when the faith of his patients seemed to give them enviable help in the face of suffering. Collins was particularly shaken by one conversation with an older woman suffering from severe and untreatable pain, who shared her faith in Jesus and asked, "Doctor, what do you believe?" "I felt my face flush," he recalls, "as I stammered out the words, 'I'm not really sure.'" In his discomfort, Collins realized that he had never really considered the

evidence for God. This patient's simple question set him on a journey of exploration and research that ended in him accepting Jesus as his Savior. He now believes that "the God of the Bible is also the God of the genome." (McLaughlin, 118-119)

iv. Gunter Bechly

1. Dr. Bechly is one of the world's leading paleo entomologist (insect paleontologist).
2. He specializes in the fossil history of insects.
3. He was one of the curators of Germany's natural history museum (largest natural history museum in Germany).
4. When the Museum celebrated the 200th anniversary of Darwin's birth in 2009 he built and exhibit...
  - a. He created a scale, all the ID books on one side, Darwin's book on the other side... it was the scale of justice. One side was "The Origin of Species" the other side were a bunch of ID books. **Darwin's book was the "book that outweighed them all."** At least, this was his catchphrase.
  - b. He was challenged by a colleague to read the ID books, because he would probably be asked about their claims.
  - c. So, he did... that was a mistake!
  - d. In 2016, he came out publicly for ID, but the museum could not fire him, but they told him they did not want him there anymore, so they reached a negotiated settlement.
  - e. Many of his colleagues have privately reached out to him explaining that they too have doubts about evolution.
  - f. He was a staunch atheist but now he is a Christian...

v. James Tour

1. **Dr. James Tour** is one of the ten most cited chemists in the world, has over 600 research publications and over 120 patents, was named among "The 50 Most Influential Scientists in the World Today," and was ranked as one of the Top 10 chemists in the world over the past decade.
2. He is a professor at Rice University.
3. Tour is the world's premier nonscientists and knows more about the art of creating molecules than anyone else in the world. (Metaxas, 90)
4. He is a passionate proponent of ID and Christianity.

vi. Dr. Dean Kenyon

1. Biophysicist Dean Kenyon is one of the world's leading origin of life researchers.

2. He wrote *the* book on the origin of life titled *Biochemical Predestination*.
  3. This was *the* go-to book about chemical evolution for decades.
  4. He argued that living cells had the power to self-organize in the prebiotic soup.
  5. Dr. Kenyon was not a Christian when he wrote his best seller.
  6. But then after being challenged by the ID movement, he shocked the scientific world by repudiating the main thesis of his best seller.
  7. He now argues that an intelligent designer is responsible for creating the first life forms on planet earth.
- vii. Anthony Flew was one of the twentieth centuries greatest Atheistic philosophers.
1. He changed his mind after learning about the arguments for God's existence based on the fine tuning of the universe. Arguments from cosmology and physics.
- viii. Dissent from Darwin
1. This statement was drafted in 2001.
  2. Who can sign it?
    - a. One must have a PhD in biology, chemistry, mathematics, engineering or one of the other natural sciences or they must hold an MD and serve as a professor of medicine.
    - b. Since 2001 over 1000 Ph. D's have signed it...
  3. "Signatories of the Scientific Dissent From Darwinism hold doctorates in biological sciences, physics, chemistry, mathematics, medicine, computer science, and related disciplines from such institutions as Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Dartmouth, Rutgers, University of Chicago, Stanford and University of California at Berkeley. Many are also professors or researchers at major universities and research institutions such as Cambridge, Princeton, MIT, UCLA, University of Pennsylvania, University of Georgia, Tulane, Moscow State University, Chitose Institute of Science & Technology in Japan, and Ben-Gurion University in Israel." (dissentfromdarwin.org)
- ix. Summary and application
1. According to a survey of the members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science conducted by the Pew Research Center in May and June of 2009, 51% of scientists said they believed in God or a higher power, while 41% said they did not. Think about the significance of this. If scientific evidence was conclusive and could prove that God does not exist, then all scientists would be atheists. Therefore, it is clear that science can neither prove nor disprove the existence of God. (Simmons, 151)
  2. Application
    - a. It is simply false to say that Christianity and science can't coexist.

- b. Science was invented by Christians and some of today's leading scientists are devout evangelicals.
- c. I hope and pray that some in this room, give themselves wholeheartedly to studying science for the glory of God.
- d. Mention the two books
  - i. Book of Creation
  - ii. Book of Scripture
- e. You have talked about scientists, but what in science causes them to believe in God? this brings us to the next point...

- x. *The nature of science*
- xi. *The origin of science*
- xii. *The pioneers of science*

#### 4. The discoveries of science.

- a. Rather than disproving Christianity, the last discoveries in science point directly towards the Christian worldview.
  - i. I'm going to list five examples...
  - ii. These come from Dr. Stephen Meyer. (Stroebel, Case for the Creator, 77ff).
  - iii. Scientists in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were not aware of these discoveries.
  - iv. We live in the best period of world history to be Christians... All the evidence is increasingly on our side.
- b. **First, the new cosmology**
  - i. Most scientists now agree that time, space, energy, and matter all had a beginning.
  - ii. Einstein proved this with his theory of general relativity.
  - iii. These conclusions are decidedly theistic.
    - 1. Expand...
  - iv. This is creation ex nihilo, an old Christian doctrine.
  - v. Great quote about the theologians at the top of the mountain...
  - vi. Dr. Meyer writes,
    - 1. "In short, naturalism is on hard times in cosmology; the deeper you get into it, the harder it is to get rid of the God hypothesis." (Strobel, 77)
  - vii. Jared Jastrow (agnostic, leading scientist for NASA, and chairman of the Hubble telescope) says
    - 1. "Astronomers now find they have painted themselves into a corner because they have proven, by their own methods, that the world began abruptly in an act of creation to which you can trace the seeds of every star, every planet, every living

thing in this cosmos and on the earth... that there are supernatural forces at work is now, I think a scientifically proven fact.” (Geisler, 84-85)

viii. Nobel prize winner Arnold Penzias said of the Big Bang

1. “The best data we have are exactly what I would have predicted had I nothing to go on but the first five books of Moses, the Psalms and the Bible as a whole.” (Strobel, 77)

**c. Second, the fine tuning of the universe.**

i. This is an incredibly compelling argument.

1. This is what changed the mind of Anthony Flew.
2. Eric Metaxas article in the WSJ on this topic was the Journals most read article of all time.

ii. How many finely tuned conditions are there for life to exist on planet earth?

1. In 1966, Carl Sagan had two items on the list. Making the point that our planet is not that special.... Wow... was he wrong!!!
2. Eric Metaxas recently put this list at **200** (WSJ article “Science increasingly Makes the case for God”). He argues that the mere existence of the universe is the greatest miracle in the history of miracles.

iii. As the list of finely tuned conditions continues to grow, it makes the notion of an inhabitable planet coming into existence by chance increasingly non-sensical...

1. It is really important to grasp this next point...

2. Metaxas writes that, “Every single condition must be perfectly met or the whole thing falls apart.” (Metaxas)

3. The chance of these conditions coming into existence by chance is 1 out of 10 to the 138<sup>th</sup>.

4. The estimated amount of sub-atomic particles in the universe is 10 to the 80<sup>th</sup>. (1 followed by 80 zeroes)

5. Metaxas writes,

- a. “. . . the odds against the universe existing are so heart-stoppingly astronomical that the notion that it all “just happened” defies common sense. It would be like tossing a coin and having it come up heads 10 quintillion times in a row. Really?” (Metaxas, WSJ article)

6. In other words, for all intents and purposes it is mathematically impossible for all these conditions to exist by chance.

7. This points clearly to a creator.

d. **Third, the information stored in DNA.**

i. We know from observation that information only comes from intelligence.

1. DNA is often compared to a set of blueprints that contains the genetic instructions or the code for creating the building blocks of all living organisms.
2. “...Bill Gates once wrote: ‘DNA is like a computer program but far, far more advanced than any software ever created.’” (Wells, 97)
3. Computer code uses 1s and 0s.
4. The DNA code uses the four letters ATCG.
5. These four letters are arranged in different patterns in our genetic code.
6. The arrangement of these four letters spells out incredibly complex instructions for the detailed biology of every living thing.
7. There is a massive amount of coding or information stored in our DNA.
8. The foundation for all of life is information stored in DNA... digitally characters are arranged in a certain way for the performance of specific functions. If you change the arrangement of the code bad things happen.

ii. **One author writes,**

1. “Staunch Darwinist Richard Dawkins, professor of zoology at Oxford University, admits that the message found in just the cell nucleus of a tiny amoeba is more than all thirty volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica combined, and the entire amoeba has a much information in its DNA as 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica! In other words, if you were to spell out all the A, T, C, and G in the ‘unjustly called primitive amoeba’ (as Dawkins describes it), the letters would fill 1,000 complete sets of an encyclopedia.” (Geisler, I don’t have enough faith...., 116)

iii. It is important to note that the 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica referred to by Dawkins contain highly complex arrangements of letters. Not one letter is out of order. If constructing the sentence, “Can you do the dishes please?” requires intelligence than how much more intelligence is required to write 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica? This is the same amount of information required to construct one single celled amoeba.

iv. **Another author writes-**

1. “Human DNA contains more organized information than the encyclopedia Britannica. If the full text of the encyclopedia were to arrive in computer code from outer space, most people would regard this as proof of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence. But when seen in nature, it is explained as the workings of random forces.” (George Simon Johnson)

v. Don't read this one...

1. “In *The Cosmic Blueprint*, the physicist Paul Davies says it ‘is possible to perform rough calculations of the probability that the endless breakup and reforming of the soup’s complex molecules would lead to a small virus after a billion years.’ He then tells us what those calculations lead to. He says they work out at one chance in over ten to the two millionth power, a “mind-numbing” number, which put more simply would be harder to achieve than just happening to flip ‘heads on a coin six million times in a row.’ For anyone who has flipped heads on a coin ten times in a row (try it), you get the idea. Davies concludes by saying ‘the spontaneous generation of life by random molecular shuffling is a ludicrously improbable event.’” (Metaxas, IAD, 94-95)

**e. Fourth, the complexity of the cell.**

- i. Michael Behe’s book *Darwin’s Black Box* is the seminal book on this subject.
  1. He argues that the complexity of cells is staggering.
  2. Each cell has signal transduction circuits, sophisticated motors, and all kinds of biological circuitry.
- ii. When Darwin developed his theory, he believed that cells were very simply globs of “protoplasm” a jelly like substance.
  1. He had no clue that each cell contains a whole world of incredibly complex machinery. The more we learn about cells, the more we are blown away by their complexity.
  2. Behe developed the term “irreducible complexity.”

iii. “What we once thought was a simple membrane surrounding some gooey “protoplasm” was now seen to contain an astonishing universe within itself, a staggering agglomeration of intertwined parts performing stunningly complex functions. Even the membrane was outrageously sophisticated, being perfectly “water-tight” until it somehow “chose” to allow something in or out, and then did so. The more science learned, the more clear it became that a single cell was anything but simple, and the more it became obvious that something so impossibly sophisticated did not appear to have come into existence by chance. Already in 1978, the evolutionist and Cambridge zoologist W. H. Thorpe said that even the “most elementary type of cell constitutes a ‘mechanism’ unimaginably more complex than any machine yet thought up, let alone constructed, by man.” Exactly how complex is hard to comprehend. The information in the DNA of a single bacterium alone is equivalent to the millions of words in a shelf of twenty books.” (Metaxas, IAD, 93-94)

**f. Fifth, the Cambrian explosion**



- i. Often called the geological big bang...
  - ii. The Cambrian period was roughly 530 million years ago. The only fossils found below the Cambrian stratum are single celled organisms. In the Cambrian strata complex species appear suddenly (geologically speaking) without evidence of transitional species.<sup>1</sup> This turns Darwin's tree of life upside down.
  - iii. Most science textbooks teach that all life can be traced back to one single celled organism. This is represented with Darwin's tree of life. The bottom of the tree represents a single celled organism. The top of the tree represents all the complex species that evolved from the simple celled organism at the bottom of the tree.
  - iv. The Cambrian explosion paints a very different picture. Fossils found in the Cambrian period represent nearly every major group of living organisms. Interestingly they all show up at once with zero transitional history.
  - v. Which is why evolutionists Richard Dawkins said- "It was though they (species) were just planted there (Cambrian period) without any evolutionary history"<sup>2</sup> Darwin's tree would be more accurate if it was turned upside down since there were more species in the Cambrian period than there are now since some species have gone extinct since then.
  - vi. The Cambrian explosion is a massive problem for Darwin's theory of descent with modification. If descent with modification was true, we would see thousands if not millions of transitional species before the Cambrian period. Instead, most of the species we see in the Cambrian period have zero transitional history.
- g. All five discoveries point us towards God...
- i. On the flip side
    - 1. Many mainstream, leading Neo-Darwinists, are expressing significant doubts about Darwin's theory.
      - a. Stephen Meyer tells the story of attending the Royal Society Meeting in 2016 and hearing the world's leading biologist express serious doubts about evolutionary theory.
      - b. This story is told on page 258-259 of *Theistic Evolution* edited by Grudem, Meyer, Moreland, Shaw, and Gauger.
    - 2. He argues that most high school and college science teachers are not even aware of all the doubts in the academy because they are so cutting edge.
  - ii. So why do so many scientists reject the harmonization of belief in God and Science??? this brings us to the last point.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephen Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive origin of Animal life and the case for Intelligent Design* (New York, New York: Harper One, 2013). In this book Stephen Meyer provides a devastating critique of Darwinism from paleontology.

<sup>2</sup> Blanchard, 10.

- h. *The nature of science*
- i. *The origin of science*
- j. *The pioneers of science*
- k. *The discoveries of science*

## 5. The stubbornness of science.

- a. Modern science is very stubborn.
  - i. It rejects most attempts to harmonize science and faith.
- b. Why??? I will mention the two main reasons...
- c. Galileo!!!
  - i. Introduction
    - 1. Eric Metaxas calls the Galileo incident the founding myth of Atheism.
      - a. This story is often portrayed as what typically happens when science and faith interact.
      - b. Science attacks and faith reacts....
    - 2. Galileo's persecution by the Church was the opening salvo in the war between faith and science, or between religion and "reason."(Metaxas, IAD, 333)
    - 3. "Galileo's condemnation by the Catholic church in 1633 is presented as a win for atheism, when a conception of the cosmos based on a literal reading of Scripture was challenged by brave scientists willing to stand up to the church." (McLaughlin, 112)
    - 4. The story we have all heard is that in the early seventeenth century authoritarian religious forces crushed the free-thinking scientist named Galileo, and champions of reason and science have been fighting the forces of faith and religion ever since. (Metaxas, 334)
- d. Setting the record straight.
  - i. To set the record straight, we must first say that Galileo was no enemy of the Church—and far from it. He was a deeply serious Christian who saw no disparity between what the Church taught—or what the Bible said—and what science revealed. Indeed, the very idea was unthinkable to him. And he would be deeply upset to think that his own experiences could have led people through the centuries to think it. (Metaxas, IAD, 334)
  - ii. "Sociologist Elaine Howard Ecklund interviewed scientists at elite universities and found that many cited "Galileo's torture at the hands of the Inquisition as a central piece of evidence that religion and science are in an entrenched conflict." As Ecklund points out, the idea that Galileo was tortured is a widely believed myth unsupported by historical evidence. But there are three other problems with the notion that the Galileo affair proves the triumph of science over Christianity." (McLaughlin, 112)

1. First, Galileo was a Christian. He argued vociferously that heliocentrism did not undermine the Bible. Bible. In fact, his attempt to make theological arguments was part of what got him in trouble with the pope, who had previously been Galileo's friend and supported his scientific work. (McLaughlin, 112)
  2. Second, the prevailing cosmology before this controversy was not biblical but Aristotelian. Aristotle's model, in which the earth was at the center of the universe with the sun rotating around it, had been the standard paradigm taught in universities for centuries before Copernicus and Galileo rocked the cosmological boat. To be sure, Aristotle's model was more easily superimposed on some biblical texts than the heliocentric model. But his view that the earth was spherical does not map onto the ancient Near Eastern cosmology of the Old Testament, which envisages the earth being founded on pillars. Thus, the cosmology endorsed by the church before the Copernican revolution was not compatible with strict biblical literalism. (McLaughlin, 113)
  3. The third problem with the notion that Galileo overturned biblical literalism was that Christians had been exploring nonliteral views of biblical texts in relation to science for centuries. For example, the fourth-century theologian Augustine of Hippo cautioned his contemporaries not to make statements about science that might bring the Christian faith into disrepute: "It is a disgraceful and dangerous thing," he wrote, for a non-Christian "to hear a Christian, presumably giving the meaning of Holy Scripture, talking nonsense on these topics." (McLaughlin, 113)
  4. Far from being a blow by atheist scientists against what had always been a literalist view of Scripture, therefore, the Copernican revolution could equally be heralded as a blow by Christian scientists against centuries of a misunderstanding based on pagan philosophy. To be sure, the Catholic church resisted at the time. But, as with practically every scientific controversy since, there were Christians on both sides. (McLaughlin, 114)
- iii. And so, Oxford professor Alister McGrath concludes rightly, "The idea that science and religion are in perpetual conflict is no longer taken seriously by any major historian of science. . . . One of the last remaining bastions of atheism which survives only at the popular level—namely, the myth that an atheistic, fact-based science is permanently at war with a faith-based religion." (Clark, 27-28)
- e. What about evolution?
- i. I will spend at least two weeks, maybe three addressing this issue.
  - ii. But for now, let me say three things.
    1. First, even if evolution is true, it does not disprove God, far from it.
      - a. All it proves is that life evolved...
      - b. But it leaves several questions unanswered.
      - c. Expand...
    2. Second, increasing numbers of scientists are doubting Darwinism.
      - a. DissentfromDarwin.org.
    3. Third, there are really good scientific reasons to doubt Darwinism... which we will talk about next week.

6. Conclusion...
  - a. We spent three weeks arguing that science and faith are very compatible.
  - b. We looked at five subjects.
    - i. *The nature of science*
    - ii. *The origin of science*
    - iii. *The pioneers of science*
    - iv. *The discoveries of science*
    - v. *The stubbornness of science.*