

## ARE FAITH & SCIENCE ADVERSARIES?

Pastor Matt Garvin June 15, 2014

## Questions raised at the intersection between Science and Faith:

- Is there an ultimate explanation for the Universe?
- Is Evolution compatible with Creation?
- Do the Laws of Nature exclude Miracles?
- Do we have a soul?
- Is there life after death?
- How does Science explain morality?

find and understand the source of these things.

Has Science made belief in God obsolete?

#### TRUTH MATTERS

what is the purpose, value and meaning behind everything that exists and seeks to

#### 4 POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION

	: One asserts itself as the only source of worthwhile truth.
0	: is the view that we should only believe what can be proven scientifically. In other words, science is the sole source of knowledge and the sole arbiter of truth.
0	: A form of a religion, especially Islam or Protestant Christianity that upholds belief in the strict, literal interpretation of scripture.
otł	: Science and theology are so different from each ner that there is no possibility of interaction between them.
vis	: The ways in which they answer their separate estions must be congruent with each other. The resulting binocular tion into reality may be expected to yield a view that is deeper and more imprehensive than either discipline could offer on its own.
	: A fully unified synthesis of science and theology
ess	of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and of people, who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of people, who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse. Romans 1:18-20 NIV

We cannot ultimately specify the grounds (either metaphysical or logical or empirical) upon which we hold that our knowledge is true. Being committed to such grounds, dwelling in them, we are projecting ourselves to what we believe to be true from or through these grounds. We cannot therefore see what they are. We cannot look at them because we are looking with them.

~ Michael Polanyi, Meaning

#### Cosmic Fine Tuning

Ratio of Electrons: Protons -  $1:10^{37}$ 

Ratio of Electromagnetic Force: Gravity -  $1:10^{40}$ 

Expansion Rate of Universe - 1:10<sup>55</sup> Mass Density of Universe - 1:10<sup>59</sup>

There are 154 parameters that we know of that must fall within a narrowly defined range (for more info check out www.reasons.org).

We should note that the preceding arguments are not 'God of the gaps' arguments; it is advance in science, not ignorance of science, that has revealed this fine-tuning to us. In that sense there is no 'gap' in the science, the question is rather: how should we interpret the science? In what direction is it pointing?

~ John Lennox, Professor of Mathematics and Philosophy of Science at Green Templeton College, Oxford

It is an actual technique of discovery in fundamental physics to seek theories that are expressed in terms of equations possessing the unmistakable character of mathematical beauty, a property which the mathematically minded can readily recognize and agree about.

~ John Polkinghorne, Professor Mathematical Physics

The concept of moral obligation [is] unintelligible apart from the idea of God. The words remain but their meaning is gone.

~ Richard Taylor (ethicist and non-Theist)

There are aspects of human subjective consciousness that are deeply mysterious. Neither Steve Pinker nor I can explain human subjective consciousness - what philosophers call qualia. In How the Mind Works, Steve sets out the problem of subjective consciousness, and asks where it comes from and what's the explanation. Then he's honest enough to say, "Beats the heck out of me." That's an honest thing to say, and I echo it. We don't know. We don't understand it.

~ Richard Dawkins (Author of The God Delusion)

### We know more than we can tell.

~ Michael Polanyi

Then God said, "Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creatures that move along the ground." So God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them. Genesis 1:26-27 NIV

Then the Lord God formed a man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being. Genesis 2:7 NIV

But it is the spirit in a person, the breath of the Almighty that gives them understanding. Job 32:8 NIV

The Spirit himself testifies with our spirit that we are God's children. Romans 8:16 NIV

I pray that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened in order that you may know the hope to which he has called you, the riches of his glorious inheritance in his holy people, and his incomparably great power for us who believe... Ephesians 1:18-19 NIV

Many conservative Christians equate modern science with materialism — a view conditioned by early 20th-century debates over evolution and human origins. Science is often viewed as an alternative theology, with a competing creation story. Some religious communities define themselves by resisting this rival faith — and filter evidence to reinforce their identity.

This approach raises two protests. First, it will eventually fail. It is a deep weakness for any theology or ideology to be wrong about the scientific nature of the universe. The children of believers are presented with a cruel and false choice: In order to accept the scientific method, they must abandon the beliefs of their community. And many will naturally choose science. If theological conservatives define themselves by their skepticism about the (marvelous, breathtaking, compelling) findings of modern science, they will eventually lose — not only in public debates but in the minds of their own children.

Second, this strategy is completely unnecessary. The scientific method is the proper way — actually the only way — to understand the physical universe. There is no philosophical or theological method to study the structure of a star or a starfish. But this does not mean that the knowledge revealed by the physical sciences is the only valid type of human knowledge. There is ethical reasoning. There is also theological belief — involving the possibility that the Creator might suspend the laws of nature in certain circumstances, such as the parting of the Red Sea or the Resurrection.

The problem comes when materialism, claiming the authority of science, denies the possibility of all other types of knowledge — reducing human beings to a bag of chemicals and all their hopes and loves to the firing of neurons. Or when religion exceeds its bounds and declares the Earth to be 6,000 years old. In both cases, the besetting sin is the same: the arrogant exclusive claim to know reality.

 $\sim$  Michael Gerson - Washington Post, April 24, 2014

# **Exploring Further**

Science and Religion in Quest of Truth

John Polkinghorne

 ${\bf reasons.org}$ 

Reasons to Believe

www.premier.org.uk/unbelievable

**Unbelievable Podcast** 

www.reasonablefaith.org

Dr. William Lane Craig

www.randalrauser.com

Dr. Randal Rauser