

Coursera

Science & Religion 101

CLASS NOTES

Denis O. Lamoureux

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Only Warfare?	1
Categories & Principles I	6
Categories & Principles II	15
Science & Religion Models on the Relationships	25
Nature & Intelligent Design	37
Religious Beliefs of Galileo	43
Religious Beliefs of Darwin	52
Genesis 1-3: Biblical Creation Accounts	63
Modern Origins Debate	74
Conclusion: Possible Peace?	82

NB

Audio-Slide Episode
Number

=

Class Notes Page
Number

Abbreviations:

S: Audio-Slide Number

H: Class Handouts

INTRODUCTION: ONLY WARFARE?

Slide 2

I. THE PROBLEM: SCIENCE & RELIGION WARFARE

S3

INTENSIFIES:

S4

with Charles Darwin's theory of evolution presented in his book *On the Origin of Species* (1859)

Thomas Henry Huxley

review of this book:

1. “[H]istory records that whenever **science** and **orthodoxy** [religion] have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain.”

T .H. Huxley, “*Origin of Species*” *Westminster Review* 17 (1860), 556

COMMENTS:

S6

common understanding that Science destroys Religion

NO hope of a peaceful relationship between science & religion

PRODUCES:

S7 Handouts 1

Science vs. Religion Dichotomy

Dichotomy

DEF: division of an issue into only TWO simple positions
thinking about issues in ‘black-and-white’ & ‘either/or’ terms

Problem:

- ☛ forces people into choosing between one of two positions

Therefore:

You cannot be both a scientist & a religious believer

DEVELOPS:

S8 H1

into the *Evolution vs. Creation Dichotomy*

Problem:

- ☛ forces people into choosing between only TWO positions:

EITHER (1) “Evolution”

OR (2) “Creation”

Therefore:

You cannot be both an evolutionist & a believer in a Creator

1. Common Understanding of “Science” & “Evolution”

S9

Julian Huxley

S10

evolutionary biologist

Centennial celebration of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1959:

2. “In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer either need or room for the supernatural. **The earth was not created; it evolved.**

Evolutionary man can no longer take refuge from his loneliness in the arms of a divinized father figure **whom he has himself created.**

J. Huxley, “The Evolutionary Vision” in S. Tax & C. Callender, eds.
Evolution after Darwin: The University of Chicago Centennial
(Chicago, IL: University Press, 1960), 252, 260

COMMENTS:

S13 H1

- evolution vs. creation dichotomy
- COMMON understanding of “science” is “Godless”
“evolution” is “Godless” natural process
- humans created God → God is nothing but an invention of our imagination

Major Theme of This Course:

Challenge COMMON terms/definitions & replace with ACADEMIC terminology

More accurately, Julian Huxley’s position is:

S4 H1

Scientism

DEF: conflation of:

- (1) science
- and
- (2) secular [non-religious] philosophy

Conflation

DEF: careless mixing of distinct ideas into ONE simplistic concept

2. Common Understanding of “Religion” & “Creation”

S5

Henry Morris

S6

creation scientist & founder of the Institute for Creation Research (aka Young Earth Creation)

Creation Science

DEF: claims that creation of the world in 6 days 6000 yrs ago can be proven scientifically

3. “There are only **two** basic worldviews—the God-centred worldview and the man-centred worldview, **creation** or **evolution** ...

S7

The Bible is a book of science! ... The Bible does contain all the basic principles upon which **true** science [i.e., Creation Science] is built.

S8

H. Morris, “Foreword” in JD. Morris, *The Young Earth* (Colorado Springs, CO: Creation-Life Pub, 1994), 4-5; *Many Infallible Proofs* (San Diego, CA: C-LP,1980), 229

COMMENTS:

S9 H1

- evolution vs. creation dichotomy
- COMMON understanding of “religion” → Bible reveals science & origins
- “creation” → God created in 6 days 6000 yrs ago

More accurately, using ACADEMIC terms/definitions, Morris’ position is:

S10 H1

Fundamentalism

DEF: conflation of:

- (1) Christianity
- and
- (2) origins in 6 days

QUESTIONS:

S11 H1

- Is the relationship between science & religion this simple?
- Are we forced to choose between only TWO positions:

EITHER (1) “science”

OR (2) “religion”

EITHER (1) “evolution”

OR (2) “creation”

- Are there middle ground positions between these TWO positions?

II. LAMOUREUX’S POSITION	S2
First, I am a Christian theologian trained to the PhD level	S3
I believe in God	
I believe in the Bible	
I believe in miracles & I have experienced them	
Second, I am an evolutionary biologist trained to the PhD level	S4
I find that the evidence for biological evolution is OVERWHELMING	
I have yet to see evidence that falsifies evolution	
I recognize the explanatory power of the theory of evolution	
☛ Biology makes sense in the light of evolution	

III. TOWARD A SOLUTION: THE NEW SCIENCE-RELIGION DIALOGUE scholarship that arose during the 1990s	S5
1. Scientific Community	S6
• Religious Beliefs of Scientists	
4. “I believe in a God in intellectual and affective communication with humankind, i.e. a God to whom one may pray in expectation of receiving an answer. By “answer” I mean more than the subjective psychological effect of prayer.”	S7-8
Ed ward Larson & Larry Witham, “Scientists Are Still Keeping the Faith” 3 86 <i>Nature</i> (3 Apr 1997), 436	
<u>Results:</u> 40% believe in miracles → personal God	S9
<u>COMMENTS:</u>	S10
is this proof for God’s existence? NO	
☛ but this is serious data because these scientists are serious thinkers	
• Contribution to Science-Religion Dialogue	S11
5. “Both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science have launched projects to promote a dialogue between science and religion. New institutions aimed at bridging the gap have been formed, including the Chicago Center for Religion and Science, and the Center for Theology and Natural Sciences in Berkeley, California. Universities such as Cambridge and Princeton also have established professorships or lectureships on the reconciliation of the two camps.”	S12-13
G regg Easterbrook, “Science and God: A Warming Trend?” 2 77 <i>Science</i> (15 Aug 1997), 890	
<u>COMMENTS:</u>	S14-15 H1
NAS & AAAS → two of the most important scientific organizations in the world add to the list of professorships: Oxford, Harvard, Toronto ... St Joseph’s College, University of Alberta!	

2. Religious Community S2

- **Roman Catholic Christian: Pope John Paul II** S3

6. “New knowledge leads to the recognition of the theory of **evolution as more than a hypothesis** ... Sacred scripture wishes simply to declare that the world was created by God, and in order to teach this truth it expresses itself in the terms of the **cosmology [science] in use at the time of the writer** ... The Bible does **not** wish to teach how heaven was made [science], but how one goes to heaven [religion]. S4 S5

P ope John Paul II, “Message on Evolution,” *Origins: CNS Do cumentary Service* 26 (Nov 1996),415; “Scrip ture and Science” *Origins* 11 (Oct 1981), 279

COMMENTS: S6

- NO problem with evolution
- Bible is NOT a book of science
- Bible uses the science-of-the-day

☛ **ANCIENT SCIENCE** S7

Major Theme of this course

- **Evangelical Protestant Christian: Reverend Billy Graham** S8
very famous preacher

7. “I don’t think that there’s any conflict at all between science today and the Scriptures. I think **we have misinterpreted the Scriptures** many times and we’ve tried to make the Scriptures say things that they **weren’t meant to say**, and I think we have made a **mistake** by thinking the Bible is a scientific book. **The Bible is not a book of science.** S9 S10

And of course, I accept the Creation story. I believe that God did create the universe. S11
I believe He created man, and **whether** it came by an evolutionary process and at a certain point He took this person or being and made him a living soul **or not**, does not change the fact that **God did create man.**”

Dav id Frost, *Billy Graham: Personal Thoughts of a Public Man. 30 Years of Conversations with David Frost* (Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor, 1997), 73-74

COMMENTS: S12

- Bible is NOT a book of science
- Openness to evolution is starting to appear in evangelical protestant churches

3. Summary: Moving Beyond the Warfare S13

- Science & Religion Warfare is being challenged by prominent leaders within both the scientific community & the religious community S14 H1
- It is reasonable to accept **both** biological evolution & Christianity S15

IV. CRITICISM OF THE NEW SCIENCE-RELIGION DIALOGUE S2

Richard Dawkins S3

most important atheist in the world today

8. “Are science and religion converging? No ... Convergence? Only when it suits.

To an **honest** judge, the alleged marriage between religion and science is a shallow, empty, spin-doctored sham.”

R. Dawkins, “Snake Oil & Holy Water: Illogical Thinking Is the Only Thing Joining Science & Religion Together” *Forbes ASAP* (4 Oct 1999), 235, 237

COMMENTS: S4

Note the subtitle:

“**Illogical Thinking** is the Only Thing Joining Science & Religion Together”

☛ as you proceed through this course, ask yourself, “Is this true?”

V. CONCLUSION S5

The central question in this course: How do YOU relate Science & Religion? S6

SOME POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS:

1. Scientism S7

EG Julian Huxley

evolution explains away religion & God

2. Fundamentalism S8

EG Henry Morris

Bible reveals “**true science**” → the world was created in 6 days 6000 years ago

3. Compartmentalization S9

Science & Religion do not communicate at all

☛ many students entering this course

4. Two Divine Books Relationship: The Book of Scripture & the Book of Nature S10

EG Pope John Paul II & Billy Graham

Science & Religion complement & enrich each other

Sir Francis Bacon S11

contributed in developing modern science in the early 17th century

9. “To conclude, let no one . . . think or maintain, that anyone can search too far or be

too well studied in the **Book of God’s Words**, or in the **Book of God’s Works**;

theology or science; but rather let everyone endeavour an endless progress or

proficiency in **both**.”

Advancement of Learning (1605) 1.1.3

COMMENTS: S12

• traditional relationship between Science & Religion:

Book of God’s Words: Bible → Religion

Book of God’s Works: Nature → Science

• Bible & Nature are GIFTS from God S13

use both to construct YOUR personal beliefs & worldview

• Bible & Nature are used for loving God with our mind S14

10. Jesus: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all

your soul and **with all your mind**. This is the first and

greatest commandment.”

Matt 22:37-38

☛ many students at the end of this course

CATEGORIES & PRINCIPLES

I. KEY THOUGHTS S2

WARNING: Your head is going to swim!!!

1. Science & Religion Warfare S4

Cartoons are commentaries on our culture S5

EG Non Sequitur

Common messages:

- Forced to choose between only TWO positions: **EITHER** (1) Science
OR (2) Religion
- Science explains away Religion

2. PROBLEM behind Science & Religion Warfare → COMMON CATEGORIES S6

Categories

DEF: the foundational concepts that direct the way we:

1. look at the world
2. think about the world

Note the two verbs. Categories are like:

1. Glasses → give a **view of the world**
2. Software → process information through a program or **worldview**

Common Categories S7

trap the mind & force people to think in:

Dichotomies

DEF: division of an issue into only two simple positions
thinking in 'black-and-white' & 'either/or'

EG: science vs. religion

☛ But this is a **False Dichotomy**

Conflations

DEF: careless mixing of distinct ideas into ONE simplistic concept

EG: science & godless secular philosophy
religion & origins in 6 days

NOTE:

we all begin our intellectual voyage in dichotomies & conflations

☛ good education moves us beyond both of these problems

3. SOLUTION toward a Peaceful Relationship between Science & Religion S9

Introduce Academic Categories

Major Theme of this course:

challenge common categories & replace with academic categories

4. RESULT S10

- Offer YOU a wide spectrum of possible relationships between Science & Religion
- Allow YOU to make informed decisions & develop:
YOUR worldview
YOUR personal beliefs

II. THEOLOGY: GENERAL CATEGORIES	S2
Etymology of the word “Theology”	S3
Greek <i>theos</i> : God	
<i>logos</i> : word	
DEF: theology is the study of God’s words in the Word of God (Bible)	
<u>COMMENTS</u> :	S4
• always be cautious with the term “God”	
has a very wide range of meanings & nuances:	
from a personal spiritual being (Jews, Christians, Muslims)	
to only beauty & harmony in physical world (Einstein)	
• ALL the definitions given below are the MOST BASIC	
Theism Greek <i>theos</i> : God	S5
DEF: <u>BELIEF</u> in a personal God	
Supreme Being who is all-loving, all-powerful, and all-knowing	
EG:	
God of Jews, Christians, Muslims	
40% of US scientists are theists	
Deism Latin <i>Deus</i> : God	S6
DEF: <u>BELIEF</u> in an impersonal God	
Supreme Being who creates the world and then has nothing to do with it	
this God winds the clock of the universe & leaves it to run down on its own	
EG:	
God of Charles Darwin for most of his adult life	
Paganism	S7
DEF: <u>BELIEF</u> in a Force or Forces that control/s the universe	
Note: not a negative term → an academic category	
EG:	
Nature Religions:	
a Force in the earth, sun, trees, etc	
Popular Culture:	
Fate, Destiny, the “Meant To Be”	
Pantheism Greek <i>pan</i> : all <i>theos</i> : God	S8
DEF: <u>BELIEF</u> that everything is God	
not a personal/impersonal spiritual being	
the universe is the only reality	
EG	
famed physicist Albert Einstein (1879-1955)	

Atheism Greek *a*: a prefix that negates S2
 DEF: BELIEF that God does not exist.
 EG:

Richard Dawkins S3

1. “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.”

Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*
 (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1995), 133.

KEY WORDS:

“nothing but” → often used by atheists

Agnosticism Greek *gnōsis*: knowledge Greek *a*: prefix that negates S4
 DEF: BELIEF that there is no knowledge regarding the existence or non-existence of God
 EG:

Charles Darwin late in life

III. CHRISTIANITY: GENERAL CATEGORIES S5

Christianity S6

- defined by HISTORY & 3 main branches (divisions): S7 H1

- (1) Roman Catholicism
- (2) Eastern Orthodoxy
- (3) Protestantism

- defined by CREEDS (major statements of belief): S8

2. Apostles’ Creed (150 AD/CE)

I BELIEVE in God, the Father almighty, Creator of heaven and earth.

I BELIEVE in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, S9

He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary.

He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried.

He descended to the dead.

On the third day he rose again. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father.

He will come again to judge the living and the dead.

I BELIEVE in the Holy Spirit, S10

the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

Catechism of the Catholic Church (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Bishops Publication, 1994), 50.

COMMENT: S11

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit = Holy Trinity. One God in Three Persons

Conservative Christianity

S2

CONSERVES the beliefs of the Apostles' Creed

- Jesus = fully God & fully human
- Resurrection of Jesus' physical body
- Bible **I**nspired (capital "I" inspired) by Holy Spirit

Liberal Christianity

S3

REJECTS the beliefs of the Apostles' Creed

- Jesus = merely an enlightened man
- Resurrection of Jesus' teaching only
- Bible inspiring (small "i") literature written by humans only

LAMOUREUX'S POSITION ON CHRISTIANITY:

S4

- ☛ Conservative Christian. I accept the Apostles' Creed

N8 Q2 S5

WARNING ABOUT PARADIGMS:

S6-7

paradigms are teaching tools to help organize information

Divine Revelation

S8

DEF: BELIEF that God communicates with humanity

(1) Special Revelation

S9

DEF: BELIEF that God communicates **SPECIFIC** information to humanity

- **Incarnation** Latin *in: in carnis*: flesh S10 H2
 God became a man and revealed himself through Jesus
 "The Word [Jesus] was God . . . and became flesh" Jn 1:1, 14
- **Biblical Revelation** S11 H2
 God inspired the writers of the Bible to reveal himself
 "All Scripture is God-breathed" 2 Tim 3:16
- **Personal Revelation** S12 H2
 answered prayer, dreams, visions, signs & wonders
 EG 40% of US scientists believe God answers prayer

(2) General Revelation

S13

DEF: BELIEF that God communicates **GENERAL** information to all of humanity

- **Natural Revelation** S14 H2
 nature reflects God & some of his general attributes
 "The heavens declare the glory of God and the skies proclaim the work of his hands"
 Ps 19:1
 "God's invisible qualities ... clearly seen and understood from what has been made"
 Rom 1:19-20
- ☛ **Intelligent Design** → HUGE topic in Science & Religion S15-16 H2
- **Moral Revelation** S17 H2
 human conscience & sense of morality
 "The law written on the human heart" Rom 2:14-15
 aka "moral compass" within us

The Two Divine Books

S2

DEF: BELIEF that God communicates (reveals) to humanity through two “books”

- traditional way for relating Science & Religion
EG Sir Francis Bacon

(1) **Book of God’s Words** Bible S3 H2
 VERBAL Latin *verbum*: word
 uses words → offers specific information

(2) **Book of God’s Works** Nature S4 H2
 NON-VERBAL
 does **NOT** use words → offers only general information
 EG it is like music. A symphony does not use words, but certainly communicates

Su mmary S5-6

The Bible

S7

- it’s like an ANTHOLOGY
 written by roughly 50 authors over roughly 1500 years
 has different types of literature (ie literary genres)
- gives the impression of being a record of actual events S8 H3
 some events align with scientific evidence in archeology
 EG Judah deported to Babylon in 6th century BC/E
- CENTRAL QUESTION in Science-Religion dialogue: S9 H3
 What is the literary genre of the accounts of creation in Genesis 1-3?
Science? Allegory? Fairy Tale?

Divine Action

S10

DEF: BELIEF that God acts in the world

Two Basic Concepts:

S11

(1) CONTEXT of Divine Action

- Personal
 DEF: divine acts with **people**
- Cosmological Greek *kosmos*: cosmos, entire universe
 DEF: divine acts in **nature** (i) origins
 (ii) operations

(2) MODE of Divine Action

S12

- Interventionism
 DEF: **dramatic** divine acts
 God breaks into the regular routines of people or nature
- Providentialism
 DEF: **subtle** divine acts
 God works through the regular routines of people or nature

Six Basic Categories of Divine Action:

For examples of each category see H3

1. Personal Interventionism S13 H3
2. Personal Providentialism S1 4 H3
3. Cosmological Interventionism in Origins S1 5 H3
4. Cosmological Interventionism in Operations S16 H3
5. Cosmological Providentialism in Origins S17 H3
6. Cosmological Providentialism in Operations S1 8 H3

How to Determine the Category of Divine Action: S2

1st determine CONTEXT

Does it deal with people **OR** is it with the origins/operations in the cosmos?

2nd determine MODE

Is it dramatic (interventionism) **OR** is it subtle (providentialism)?

TIP: Personal Trumps Cosmological S3
EG

3. Joshua & the miracle of the sun stopping S4

“Joshua said to the Lord in the presence of Israel: ‘O sun, stand still’...

The **sun stopped** in the middle of the sky.” Josh 10:12-13

QUESTION:

What category of divine action?

ANSWER:

Personal Interventionism

it involves people & it is dramatic

Sin S5

DEF: BELIEF that certain acts are wrong/evil because they break God’s intention for **joyous** and **peaceful** human living.

☛ God is NOT a cosmic kill-joy!!!

• Conservative Christian Position on Sin: S6

real & humans are accountable before God

determined by God → 10 Commandments S7 H4

2 Great Commandments of Jesus S8-9 H4

• Secular (at times Liberal Christian) Position on Sin: S10

ONLY a cultural artifact, social convention & ultimately relative

ONLY determined by humans

LAMOUREUX’S POSITON ON SIN: S11

• Biblical: from the opening pages to last pages

• Historical: major doctrine throughout Church history

• Experiential (life experience): have a look around the planet!

look inside YOURSELF

Was the Holocaust **nothing but** the clash of relative cultural artifacts & social conventions?

OR

Was the Holocaust truly wrong, truly evil, and truly sinful?

☛ YOU decide

IV. PHILOSOPHY: GENERAL CATEGORIES

S2

Term “Philosophy” is made up of:

Greek *philos*: beloved, friend

sophia: wisdom, understanding

Worldview (Personal Philosophy)

S3

DEF: BELIEFS concerning: ULTIMATE character of the world
our place in the world
how to live in the world

☛ *everyone has a worldview or personal philosophy*

A goal of this course:

to become aware of YOUR worldview and to develop it further

Metaphysics

S4

Greek *meta*: behind, beyond, after

physis: nature → root of English words “physics” & “physical”

DEF: Ultimate Beliefs

- beliefs about the Ultimate Reality behind and beyond nature
- religious & philosophical beliefs

☛ *everyone has a metaphysics*

Intelligent Design

S5

DEF: BELIEF that the beauty, complexity, and functionality in nature reflect rationality and the creative work of an Intelligent Designer

Teleology

S6

Greek *telos*: plan, purpose, goal, final end

DEF: BELIEF that the universe & life have an ultimate plan and ultimate purpose and that the world is moving toward an ultimate goal or final end

- teleology is based on some Ultimate Being or Power
- Intelligent Design → REAL

Dysteleology

S7

German: *dysteleologie* *dys*: to lack *teleologie*: teleology

DEF: BELIEF that the universe & life have **NO** ultimate plan, **NO** ultimate purpose, **NO** ultimate goal, and **NO** ultimate final end

- universe & life arose through **nothing but** blind chance
- Intelligent Design → ILLUSION

EG

Richard Dawkins

S8

4. “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.”

R Dawkins, *River Out of Eden* (NY: Basic Books, 1995), 133

5. “The complexity of living organisms is matched by the elegant efficiency of the **apparent design**.”

S9

R Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (London: Penguin, 1986), xiii

METAPHYSICS-PHYSICS PRINCIPLE

S2

1st of the Two Foundational Principles in Science & Religion

- ☛ initial step toward a peaceful relationship

(1) STRUCTURE

S3 H5

- Upper Compartment of **METAPHYSICS** (Religion & Philosophy)
deals with Ultimate Beliefs
Scientific instruments do not work in the realm of metaphysical beliefs
EG cannot put God, sin, or teleology/dysteleology in a test tube

- Lower Compartment of **PHYSICS** (Science)

S4 H5

- deals with Physical Facts
Scientific instruments work extremely well in the natural world
EG parts of nature can be placed in a test tube

(2) COMPLEMENTARY RELATIONSHIP

S5 H5

- Latin *complēre*: to fill, complete
In a complementary relationship, two parties add something that is lacking in the other so that they complete each other → enhance & enrich

- Two-way exchange between: Metaphysics (Religion & Philosophy)
Physics (Science)

- Rooted in reciprocal STEPS OF FAITH (or intellectual leaps)

S6 H5

- informed by Intuition & Reason
no mathematical formula to move between upper & lower compartments
☛ *everyone takes these Steps of Faith whether they are aware of it or not*

UPWARD STEP OF FAITH

S7 H5

Science offers PHYSICAL FACTS to Religion & Philosophy

EG: Facts of an average cell:

1/1000th inch

2 yards of DNA

Storage Capacity = 1.5GB (2 CDs) = 6500 Books (300 pages each)

S8 H5

QUESTION:

Does this scientific evidence reflect the intelligent design of a Creator who is like a Supreme Engineer?

DOWNWARD STEP OF FAITH

S9 H5

Religion & Philosophy offer metaphysical BELIEFS to Science

NB: this is often overlooked & rarely acknowledged

These beliefs function like a “**Metaphysical Set of Glasses**” through which we:

- (1) observe nature
- (2) interpret nature

QUESTIONS:

S2 H5

- Do atheists view nature through a “Dysteleological Set of Glasses?”
Does their metaphysical “lens” force them to believe design is an ILLUSION?
- Do Christians view nature through a “Teleological Set of Glasses?”
Does their metaphysical “lens” force them to believe design is REAL?

TIP: SEPARATE DON'T CONFLATE

S4 H5

Common error of atheists & agnostics is that they often conflate their Metaphysics & science, and they assume their worldview is purely scientific

- ☛ But atheists & agnostics have ULTIMATE BELIEFS!

PROVOCATIVE QUESTIONS:

S5 H5

- Is there a **Personal Factor** influencing the reciprocal Steps of Faith?
Does our relationship with God (or lack of a relationship) impact the intellectual leap?
- If so, could there be a Commandment #1 issue with those who reject intelligent design?
☛ **Does sin have an impact on our thinking?**

Leads to next section:

Epistemological Categories

the ‘mental machinery’ or ‘intellectual tools’ that direct our thinking and allow us to build our worldview

V. PHILOSOPHY: EPISTEMOLOGICAL CATEGORIES

Epistemology Greek *epistēmē*: knowledge S2

DEF: rules of knowing
theory of knowledge

STUDENTS CONFUSE THIS!!!

NOT knowledge itself

NOT information

BUT how we know we know → “Mental Tools”

“Mental Software” & “Mental Hardware” that allows us to know & understand

☛ *everyone has an epistemology*

FOUNDATIONAL EPISTEMOLOGICAL CATEGORIES S4 H6

1. Correspondence

knowledge matches external reality

2. Coherence

knowledge is internally consistent & without contradictions

3. Consilience

knowledge interconnects & fits tightly into one encompassing theory

YOU have ALL these categories otherwise you would never have made it to university

RELIGIOUS EPISTEMOLOGICAL CATEGORIES S7 H6

1. Divine Foundation of Knowledge

DEF: knowledge is ultimately rooted in God

6. “The **fear** of the Lord is the beginning of **knowledge**.” Prov 1:7 S8

COMMENTS:

- problem with term ‘fear’ → 17th century English expression

Verse updated for today:

“**RESPECT** for the Lord is the beginning of **knowledge**.”

Biblical Notion of Knowledge:

- NOT just facts (our view)
- rooted in God & relational to God
- personal
- wide & holistic → includes wisdom, morals, personal experience

QUESTION: S10

What is the foundation of **YOUR** knowledge?

Is knowledge ultimately rooted in God (or some teleological factor)?

OR

A brain built by only a dysteleological evolutionary process? S11

Termed a “**4Fs Brain**” and it is produced by **nothing but**: S12

(1) Fighting (2) Fleeing (3) Feeding (4) “Fertilizing”

IMPLICATIONS: S13

IF we have a dysteleological **4Fs Brain**:

why should we trust our brain?

why should we trust our knowledge?

☛ our brain was never intended for finding Ultimate Truth

2. Mystery

S2 H6

DEF: knowledge that is beyond the human ability to know ideas that the human mind will **NEVER** grasp

EG

Religious Mystery:

Where did God come from?

Secular Mystery:

Where did energy & matter come from?

Albert Einstein:

S3

7. “The eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility.”

A . Einstein, “Physics & Reality,” *Journ. Franklin Institute*, tran s. J Piccard, 221:3 (Mar 1936), 351

COMMENTS:

S4

- not small ‘m’ mystery

EG medical mysteries

- but capital ‘M’ Mystery → concepts humans will never understand
- reflects the (creaturely) limits of the human mind
- word ‘mystery’ appears 30+ times in the Bible

S5

8. “Can you fathom the **mysteries** of God?

Can you probe the **limits** of the Almighty?”

Jo b 11:7

3. Impact of Sin

S6 H6

DEF: knowledge is influenced by the spiritual state of a person

Does our relationship with God (**or lack of**) affect our ability to know?

EG:

does hating God affect a person’s ability to think clearly & rationally?

The Bible on Sin & Epistemology:

S7

9. For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but **their thinking became futile** and their **foolish** hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became **fools** and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

Rom 1:21-23

COMMENTS:

S8

- in the Bible:

words ‘fool’ & ‘foolish’ do not mean intellectually stupid
a fool is someone missing out on the best part of life → GOD

- Reject Commandment #1 (God is #1), then break Command. #2 (Idolatry)

QUESTION:

S9

IF there is a Commandment #1 Problem,

THEN is there also a Knowledge Problem?

Does Sin Impact OUR Epistemology?

☛ YOU DECIDE

EXAMPLE: S2

Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (Oxford University Press, 2000)

Chapter 7: Sin and Its Cognitive Consequences

IV. The Noetic Effects of Sin Greek *nous*: mind

B. Sin and Knowledge

SIN & METAPHYSICS-PHYSICS PRINCIPLE S3 H5

QUESTIONS:

(1) IF sin is real,

IF the greatest sin is breaking Commandment #1 (i.e., not putting God as #1),
THEN will sin impact the Upward & Downward Steps of Faith?

(2) IF someone believes in God, S4 H5

THEN will this belief impact the Upward & Downward Steps of Faith?

BE AWARE: S5

Our Metaphysical Beliefs IMPACT Our Epistemological Tools

VI. HERMENEUTICAL CATEGORIES S6

Hermeneutics S7

DEF: rules of interpretation for reading a book

☛ *everyone has hermeneutics*

DRAWING EXERCISE: S8-9

10. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.” Gen 1:1-2

3-Tier Universe in the Bible S10 H6

• best example → Kenotic Hymn (Phil 2:6-11) S11

Greek *kenoō*: “to empty, pour out”

• one of the most important passages in the Bible

God emptied himself & became man in the person of Jesus → Incarnation

• Apostle Paul is the author

11. “At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, S12

[1] in heaven and,

[2] on earth and,

[3] UNDER THE EARTH,

and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,

to the glory of God the Father.” Phil 2:10-11

COMMENTS: S13

• English translation “UNDER THE EARTH” is not the actual Greek word!

katachthoniōn: *kata* = down

chthonios = underworld

• More accurate translation reveals that Paul believed in a **3-Tier Universe**

[1] in heaven and, S14 H6

[2] on earth and,

[3] in the **UNDERWORLD**

Eisegesis Greek *eis*: in, into *ēgeomai*: to guide S2

DEF: reading our views or agenda **INTO** a book

common error in reading of ancient texts like the Bible

EG: reading OUR modern science into the Bible (eg, spherical earth)

Exegesis Greek *ek*: out, out of *ēgeomai*: to guide S3

DEF: reading a book’s views or agenda **OUT** of it

goal of reading any book, including the Bible

EG: reading the Bible’s ancient science out of it (eg, 3-tier universe)

Hermeneutical Horizons S4-5 H7

DEF: the conceptual worlds of the: (1) Bible

(2) Modern Reader

CHALLENGE: S6

21st century people steeped in 21st century science will find statements about nature in the Bible quite unusual and even bizarre

GOAL:

when reading an ancient text like the Bible → **THINK LIKE AN ANCIENT PERSON**

Biblical Inerrancy S7

DEF: **BELIEF** the Bible is absolutely true & without error

because the Bible was inspired by God (Holy Spirit)

• Inerrancy based on the Bible S8

Old Testament:

12. “Every word of God proves true.” Prov 30:5

13. “All your [God’s] words are true.” Ps 119:160

New Testament:

14. “The Jews have been entrusted with the very words of God.” Rom 3:2

15. “All Scripture is God-breathed.” 2 Tim 3:16-17

• Inerrancy rooted in God’s character → God of Truth → **God does NOT lie!** S9

16. “God, who does not lie.” Titus 1:2

17. “It is impossible for God to lie.” Heb 6:18

BUT S10 H6

“At the name of Jesus every knee should bow,

[1] in heaven and,

[2] on earth and,

[3] in the UNDERWORLD,

and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,

to the glory of God the Father.” Phil 2:10-11

COMMENTS: S11 H6

• IF the Christian God is the Creator of the world and the Author of the Bible,

THEN it is reasonable to expect an alignment between the Two Divine Books

• Did God make an error or mistake when he inspired the Apostle Paul?

• **DID GOD LIE IN THE BIBLE?**

Phenomenological Perspective of Nature Greek *phainōmenon*: appearance S2-3

DEF: nature as it appears to the naked eye & natural senses

18. “The sun **rises** and the sun **sets**, and **hurries back** to where it **rises**.” Eccl 1:5 S4

QUESTION:

Does the sun literally & actually move across the sky?

MODERN PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE S5 H7

what we see, we know to be only an APPEARANCE

so-called “movement” of the sun across the sky is a visual effect due to rotation of the earth

ANCIENT PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE S6 H7

what the ancients saw, they believed was LITERAL & ACTUAL:

sun literally & actually moves across the sky

NB: everyone believed this up to the 1700s (the debate with Galileo)

3-Tier Universe S7 H6

From an ancient phenomenological perspective, it looks like:

- heaven is an inverted bowl that holds up a blue sea of water
- the sun, moon, and stars are embedded in the surface of the inverted bowl
- the surface of the earth is flat

Therefore:

when reading an ancient text → **THINK LIKE AN ANCIENT PERSON**

DID GOD LIE IN THE BIBLE? S8 H6

NO!!!

God inspired the Bible & allowed an ancient phenomenological perspective of nature

• **Ancient Science**

Categories of Biblical Statements S9-13 H8

(1) Spiritual Statements

DEF: statements about God & spiritual reality

(2) Scientific Statements

DEF: statements about nature & physical reality → **Ancient Science** → **Ancient Origins?**

Categories of Biblical Correspondence & Concordism S1 4

DEF: alignment between the Bible and reality

(1) Spiritual Correspondence

S15 H9

DEF: spiritual statements in the Bible align with spiritual reality

(2) Scientific Concordism

DEF: scientific statements in the Bible align with physical reality

THE OVERLAP PROBLEM S16 H9

the topic of origins deals with both Spiritual Correspondence & Scientific Concordism

Genesis 1 & Creation in Six Days

Does this biblical chapter reveal:

- Spiritual Statements?

the actual method that God used to create the world

- Scientific Statements?

the actual origin of the world → **Is evolution false?**

Scientific Concordism

S2

DEF: common assumption that the Bible aligns (or is supposed to align) with modern science

NB often referred to as simply “**Concordism**”

- Reasonable Expectation:

S3

God inspired the Bible ✓

God created the world ✓

Therefore → God’s Two Books should align

- Church History:

scientific concordism was part of academic hermeneutics up to the 20th century

common view held by many Christians today

QUESTION: **Is scientific concordism TRUE?**

LAMOUREUX’S POSITION ON CONCORDISM

S4 H9

- 1st and foremost I accept spiritual correspondence throughout the Bible

- BUT I reject scientific concordism

Bible is NOT a book of science

☛ Bible uses the **science-of-the-day** → ANCIENT SCIENCE

MESSAGE-INCIDENT PRINCIPLE

S5

2nd of the Two Foundational Principles in Science & Religion

☛ steps away from using the Bible like a book of science

(1) STRUCTURE

S6 H5

- Upper Compartment: **The MESSAGE**

Spiritual Truths

INERRANT → absolutely true & without error

- Lower Compartment: **The INCIDENT**

S7 H5

Ancient Science

Science-of-the-Day

Ancient Phenomenological Perspective of the natural world

(2) INCIDENTAL RELATIONSHIP

S8 H5

- DEF of Incidental: to occur in connection with something important that which helps

- Incidental ancient science is a **vessel** that helps deliver the more important Spiritual Truths

☛ though ancient science is incidental, it is essential in transporting the Message

S9

- During the process of inspiring the Bible, God **ACCOMMODATED** & allowed the ancient authors to use the science-of-the-day

S10 H5

APPLICATION: Phil 2:10-11

S11 H5

Message: Jesus is Lord of the entire universe

Incident: 3-tiered universe

TIP: SEPARATE DON’T CONFLATE

S12 H5

common error made by Christians is that they often conflate the Message & the ancient science

VII. ORIGINS DEBATE: GENERAL CATEGORIES S2

In this debate, the distinction clearly emerges between:

- (1) Common (Church & Public) Categories
- (2) Academic Categories

“Evolution” vs. “Creation” Debate S3

DEF: common view of the origins debate BOTH inside & outside the church
leads to Science & Religion warfare

☛ But a **False Dichotomy**

Creation

DEF (Common): origin of universe & life in six 24-hour days 6000 yrs ago
based on a strict literal reading of Gen 1 S4

CONFLATION:

Christianity & literal interpretation of Gen 1

DEF (Academic): RELIGIOUS BELIEF the world (creation) was made by a Creator S5

☛ **Physical How?** questions are not part of theology

Evolution S6

DEF (Common): a natural process of molecules-to-humans through blind chance only

CONFLATION:

atheism & evolution

DEF (Academic): SCIENTIFIC THEORY that describes the natural processes that produced
the heavens, the earth, and all living organisms, including humans S7

ANIMALS:

molecules → single cells → soft-bodied marine animals → marine animals
with skeletons → jawless fishes → jawed fishes → amphibians → reptiles →
mammals → primates → pre-humans → humans

PLANTS:

molecules → single cells → marine plants → land plants → seed bearing plants →
flowering plants

☛ **Metaphysical Why?** questions are not part of science

Darwinism S8

DEF (Common): atheistic evolution

CONFLATION:

atheism & Darwin

NOTE: S9

- Darwin never was an atheist!!!

19. “I have **never been an atheist** in the sense of denying
the existence of a God.”

Darwin to Fordyce (7 May 1879)
Life & Letters of Darwin, I:304

- Term “Darwinism” is not often used in biology S10
computer search of biological abstracts (BIOSIS) between 2011-2015:
Evolution (93,696) Darwinism (151) → 620 to 1

SUGGESTION:

don’t use the term ‘Darwinism’
it misrepresents Charles Darwin & it only causes confusion

Re-Categorizing the Origins Debate

QUESTIONS:

Is evolution teleological or dysteleological?

Is it possible to be both a creationist & an evolutionist?

TIP for religious people struggling with evolution:

Embryology-Evolution Analogy

S4

God uses natural **embryological** processes to create us in the womb

☛ God used natural **evolutionary** processes to create all of life on earth

VIII. ORIGINS DEBATE: SPECIFIC CATEGORIES

S5

Evolutionary Sciences

S6

Cosmological Evolution

14 billion yrs ago there was a massive explosion (The Big Bang) from which emerged space, time, and matter, and eventually led to the evolution of stars, planets, moons, galaxies, etc.

Geological Evolution:

S7

4.5 billion yrs ago planet earth formed. Natural processes such as erosion, volcanic activity, and the movement of continents have caused the earth to evolve and change over time.

Biological Evolution

S8

4 billion yrs ago molecules self-assembled into living cells from which evolved plants and animals, including humans

Young Earth Creation

S9

DEF: God created the universe & life in six 24-hour days about 6000 yrs ago

Genesis 1: strict literal interpretation

common view of a “creationist” & THE Christian position on origins

Progressive Creation

S10

DEF: God created life intermittently (progressively) at different points over billions of yrs

Genesis 1: Creation Days = Geological Periods millions of yrs long

Evolutionary Creation

S11

DEF: Personal God created universe & life through evolution

Genesis 1: reveals Spiritual Truths, not modern scientific facts

has an ancient science → ancient understanding of origins

uses the academic definition of the term ‘creation’

☛ *evolutionary creationists believe in a Creator & the world is his creation*

Deistic Evolution

S12

DEF: Impersonal God created universe & life through evolution

Genesis 1: rejects Biblical Revelation

EG: Darwin’s view of evolution through most of his adult life

Dysteleological Evolution

S13

DEF: universe & life evolved without any ultimate plan, purpose or final goal

natural processes are run by nothing but blind chance

Genesis 1: rejects God & Biblical Revelation

common view of an “evolutionist” & THE scientific position on origins

EG: Richard Dawkins

Summary: Hermeneutics & the Origins Debate

S2 H10

Note the relationship between scientific concordism & the origins positions

S3 H10

- ☛ anti-evolutionism is connected to scientific concordism

QUESTION:

S4

IF the Bible has an ancient science of origins,

THEN

is anti-evolutionism based on poor hermeneutics (scientific concordism)?

- ☛ by the end of this course, I guarantee you will have a firm answer

God-of-the-Gaps

S5

DEF: BELIEF that God miraculously intervenes at different places in the natural world

these places are termed “**Gaps in Nature**”

FEATURES

S6

- Term carries a negative nuance

BUT logically possible

God can intervene in nature at any time he wants to

EG **during biological evolution**

by adding new genes, new chromosomes, new species, etc

or by manipulating genes into new genes, etc

- ☛ **Progressive Creation**

- Prediction

S7

IF gaps in nature are real,

THEN gaps should WIDEN with scientific research

No natural explanations or mechanisms will be found by science

Therefore, a point in nature (eg evolution) where God intervenes

- History of Science

S8

ALL the gaps in nature proposed by religious people have CLOSED

natural explanations or mechanisms have been found by scientists

- ☛ gaps are **Gaps in Knowledge**, NOT **Gaps in Nature**

EG Isaac Newton’s Rewinding of the Universe Theory

S9

saw wobbles in the orbit of Saturn

believed God intervened to fix wobbles & stop the collapse of the universe

BUT a **Gap in Knowledge**

the wobbles are self-correcting & explained by gravitational pull of Uranus on Saturn

telescopes in Newton’s day were too weak to see Uranus

- Concern

S10

IF religious people claim there are Gaps in Nature where God intervenes,

EG adding new genes during evolution

IF new scientific knowledge closes these Gaps in Knowledge,

EG discovery of genetic mechanisms that form new genes thru natural processes

THEN

will this lead to a loss of belief in God?

God-of-the-Self-Assembling Creation

S2

DEF: BELIEF God used cosmological, geological & biological evolution & the world **Self-Assembled**

God used only ONE divine act → Big Bang to start the process

GOD SHOOTING POOL ANALOGY

S3

who is the more magnificent God?

- God who sinks all the balls shot after shot after shot & clears the table (God-of-the-gaps)

OR

S4

- God who sinks all the balls in ORDER with ONLY ONE shot, representing Big Bang

1st balls representing the heavens

2nd a ball representing the earth

3rd balls representing living organisms (in order):

fish → amphibians → reptiles → mammals

Finally, the 8-ball (the most important ball) representing humans

S5

God then takes the 8-ball out of the pocket to have a personal

relationship with men & women

☛ **Evolutionary Creation**

IX. CONCLUSIONS

S6

1. Categories Are Absolutely Vital

S7

BE AWARE of conflations & false dichotomies

S8

COMMON CATEGORIES

S9

trap us & chain us

conflations → false dichotomies → false choices → missed choices

ACADEMIC CATEGORIES

S10

free us & open our mind

spectrum of choices → allows informed choices → **OWNERSHIP of Your Worldview**

2. Consider the Two Foundational Principles for Science & Religion:

S11

METAPHYSICS-PHYSICS PRINCIPLE

S12 H5

a philosophical concept

Common Problem:

Atheists & Agnostics tend to conflate science & their metaphysics

TIP: SEPARATE & DON'T CONFLATE

Atheism & Agnosticism are Ultimate Beliefs and not science!

MESSAGE-INCIDENT PRINCIPLE

S13 H5

a hermeneutical concept

Common Problem:

Christians tend to conflate the ancient science in the Bible & the Message of Faith

TIP: SEPARATE & DON'T CONFLATE

Ancient Science is not a Spiritual Truth!

3. CONGRATS!

S14

You have made it through the part of the course with the most information!

SCIENCE & RELIGION MODELS & RELATIONSHIPS

I. KEY THOUGHTS	S2
1. Warfare is the Common Perception of the Relationship between Science & Religion	S3
59% of Americans believe science & religion are often in CONFLICT (Pew 2015)	
BUT	
science-religion scholarship has moved well beyond warfare	
2. Foundation of Science & Religion Scholarship Reflects the Metaphysics-Physics Principle	S4
Two Steps:	
1 st distinguish the fundamental differences between science & religion	S5 H5
2 nd look for points of contact and have a reciprocal exchange of information	S6 H5
EG Intelligent Design deals with both science & religion	
☛ explore & develop different relationships	
3. Science & Religion Scholarship is a Young Academic Discipline	S7
emerged during the 1990s	
still in the process of developing	
two founding scholars: Ian Barbour & John Haught	
II. SCIENCE & RELIGION MODEL OF JOHN F. HAUGHT	S8
<i>Science and Religion: From Conflict to Conversation</i> (NY: Paulist Press, 1995)	S9
Roman Catholic theologian	
Haught's <u>MODEL</u> of Science & Religion	S10
NB:	
a model includes as many relationships as possible, including those we do not accept	
Four Relationships between Science & Religion:	
1. Conflict	
2. Contrast	
3. Contact	
4. Confirmation	
Haught's <u>POSITION</u> on Science & Religion	S11
NB:	
a position is a personal & specific view on Science & Religion	
Haught:	
• rejects Conflict	
• starts with Contrast	
• integrates Contact & Confirmation	
TIP:	
<u>Select</u> & <u>Combine</u> the relationships to develop <u>YOUR</u> position	S12

1. CONFLICT RELATIONSHIP

S2

- common perception of the relationship between Science & Religion asserts it is impossible to be both religious & scientific
 - especially if you are honest or not crazy!!!
- conflict fuelled by two groups: 1. Scientific Skeptics
2. Biblical Literalists

SCIENTIFIC SKEPTICS

S3

Religion → enemy of truth & enlightenment

Science → liberator & saviour

Conflict Relationship of Scientific Skepticscommon perception of science & religion by those who reject religion

S4-5

RELIGION

- based on mindless faith
- uses Deduction
general rule to particular case
- emotional & irrational

SUBJECTIVE**SCIENCE**

- based on hard facts & logic
- uses Induction
particular case to general rule
- dispassionate & rational

OBJECTIVE**COMMENTS:**

trapped in simple dichotomies & conflations
entrenched in black & white and either/or thinking

S6

BIBLICAL LITERALISTS

S7

Science → enemy of truth & God

Religion → defender of REAL science (ie. Creation Science or Young Earth Creation)

Conflict Relationship of Biblical Literalistscommon perception of science & religion by many who accept religion

S8-9

RELIGION

- offers **True** science
- based on hard facts
- Godly & competent

OBJECTIVE**SCIENCE**

- offers **False** science
- misinterprets the facts
- Satanic & incompetent

SUBJECTIVE**COMMENTS:**

trapped in simple dichotomies & conflations
entrenched in black & white and either/or thinking

S10

CONCLUSION: Conflict Relationship

S11

1. Ironically, Scientific Skeptics & Biblical Literalists are quite similar

BOTH: claim to be purely “objective” & based on “hard facts”
steeped in simple dichotomies & conflations

2. Scientific Skeptics alienate religious people from science

S12

Biblical Literalists alienate scientific people from religion

2. CONTRAST RELATIONSHIP

S2

- NO conflict between Science & Religion
- Each deals with RADICALLY different issues & questions

Contrast Relationship of Science & Religion

separate science & religion from each other & recognize their fundamental differences S3-4

SCIENCE

HOW questions of nature

- patterns & processes
- natural causes
- works of nature

RELIGION

WHY questions of belief

- meaning & mystery
- ultimate causes
- Foundation of Nature

COMMENTS:

NO conflict is possible: Science → Physical
Religion → Metaphysical

S5

CONCLUSION: Contrast Relationship

S6

1. Contrast is THE 1st STEP toward a peaceful relationship between science & religion

1. “Perhaps it is even almost essential for us to pass through the discipline of contrast as we make our way out of the **confusions of conflation** and move toward a more nuanced discussion of science and religion.” Haught, 15-16

S7

COMMENTS:

also called: “an important step toward clarity”

“helpful first approximation” Haught, 17

reflects the 1st Principle in this course → Metaphysics-Physics Principle

2. Leaving science & religion in separate compartments is UNSATISFYING

S8

2. “The urge to discover the coherence of all our ways of knowing is too powerful for us to suppress indefinitely.” Hau ght, 17

S9

COMMENTS:

many students enter this course with science & religion compartmentalized
BUT we all want an INTEGRATED worldview

3. CONTACT RELATIONSHIP

S10

- cautious (but not too intimate) move toward a fruitful relationship between science & religion
beginning of a more integrated picture of reality

• Two-Way Relationship:

S11

- (1) Science **broadens** religion’s understanding of the natural world
offers physical facts
- (2) Religion **deepens** science’s understanding of the ultimate meaning of nature
offers metaphysical beliefs

SCIENCE CONTACTS RELIGION

S2

- Enriches & Magnifies the Doctrine of Creation

EG Who has a greater & more magnificent picture of God's grandeur in nature? S3

Biblical writers & their 3-tier universe?

OR

Our generation & the Hubble Telescope? S4

- Improves Hermeneutics S5

modern science: reveals there is an ancient science in the Bible

assists religious people to focus on the Message of Faith

• formulation of the Message-Incident Principle

RELIGION CONTACTS SCIENCE

S6

not as substantive as science contacting religion

religion does not impact/change/add to science

religion brings "religious meaning" (metaphysics)

EG: God is the Creator

cosmos is heading in an ordained direction

CONCLUSION: Contact Relationship

S7

1. Science impacts Religion more than Religion impacts Science

science changes religion → hermeneutics & Doctrine of Creation

religion has no real effect on scientific research → just adds a metaphysical interpretation

4. CONFIRMATION RELATIONSHIP

S8

- Intimate relationship between Science & Religion

- religion: nourishes science at a "very deep level"

impacts science substantively

NB: Haught claims there are religious elements in science!!!

S9 H5

EG: FAITH & BELIEFS

Metaphysics-Physics Principle

- downward movement of ULTIMATE BELIEFS into science
- STEPS OF FAITH are needed to move these BELIEFS into science

3. "Science, to be more specific, cannot even get off the ground without **rooting** itself in S10

a kind of *a priori* 'faith' that the universe is a **rationally ordered** totality of things.

Scientists always rely on a **tacit faith** (which they seldom reflect on in an explicitly S11

conscious way) that there is a **real world** 'out there,' that this **real world** hangs

together **intelligibly**, that the human mind has the capacity to comprehend at least

some of the world's **intelligibility**, and that no matter how far we probe there will

still be further **intelligibility** to uncover.

FAITH IN SCIENCE

S2

Scientists have:

- “*a priori* ‘faith’” → assumed & not empirically proven

Latin *a priori*:

from something earlier (not based on observation/experience)

S3

- “*tacit* faith” → “seldom reflect on [this faith] in an explicitly conscious way”

Latin *tacitus*:

silent, unmentioned

ULTIMATE BELIEFS (METAPHYSICAL) IN SCIENCE

S4

Metaphysics-Physics Principle

downward movement of metaphysical/religious beliefs into science

• **Realism**

S5 H5

BELIEF “there is a real world ‘out there’”

refers to a “real world” 2X

how do you know you are not trapped in a computer program?

EG the movie The Matrix

• **Intelligibility of Nature**

S6 H5

BELIEF “universe is a rationally ordered totality of things”

refers to world’s intelligibility 3X and orderliness 1X

all scientists practice science assuming that nature “makes sense”

☛ reflects the belief in Intelligent Design

• **Human Intelligence**

S7 H5

BELIEF “the human mind has the capacity to comprehend” & we truly can

know nature

NO 4Fs **dysteological brain** problem here! (See notes p. 15)**CONCLUSION: Confirmation Relationship**

S8

1. Confirmation can be very challenging to grasp
you might have to think about it for a while

2. Confirmation appreciates faith (metaphysical) components in science

S9

it reflects the human epistemological condition

DO NOT be embarrassed to say that we are creatures of FAITH**CONCLUSION: Science & Religion Model of John Haught**

S10

Haught’s Personal Position:

4. “The ‘**contrast**’ approach, while perhaps a necessary first step away from both **conflation** and **conflict**, is also unsatisfying ... I think that the ‘**contact**’ approach, supplemented by that of ‘**confirmation**,’ provides the most fruitful and reasonable response to the unfortunate tension that has held so many scientists away from an appreciation of religion, and an even larger number of religious people from enjoying the discoveries of science.” Haught, 4

COMMENT:

move beyond conflation & conflict to a peaceful view of science & religion

V. SCIENCE & RELIGION MODEL OF IAN G. BARBOUR

S2

Religion in an Age of Science (San Francisco: Harper, 1990)

S3

“The Grandfather” of the science-religion dialogue

PhD in physics & Master of Divinity

Protestant Christian

Barbour’s MODEL of Science & Religion

S4

NB:

a model includes as many relationships as possible, including those we do not accept

Four Relationships between Science & Religion:

1. Conflict
2. Independence
3. Dialogue
4. Integration

Barbour’s POSITION on Science & Religion

S5

NB:

a position is a personal & specific view on Science & Religion

Barbour:

- rejects Conflict
- starts with Independence
- uses Dialogue & aspects of Integration

TIP:

Select & Combine the relationships to develop YOUR position

S6

The Challenge to Religion

S7

the success of science

5. “The first major challenge to religion in an age of science is the **success** of the methods of science.”

Barbour, 3

COMMENTS:

Why bother with religion when science can deal with most of our problems?

The Problem

S8

Epistemological → science appears to be the only way to find Truth (capital “T”)

6. “**Science** seems to provide the **only reliable path to knowledge**. Many people view

[1] **science** as objective, universal, rational and based on solid evidence.

[2] **Religion**, by contrast, seems to be subjective, parochial, emotional, and based on traditions or authorities that disagree with each other.”

Barbour, 3

COMMENTS:

S9 -10

- common perception of the relationship between science & religion:

SCIENCE	RELIGION
objective	subjective
universal	parochial
rational	emotional
<u>Based on:</u>	<u>Based on:</u>
solid evidence	disagreeing traditions

- trapped in simple dichotomies & conflation
- entrenched in black & white and either/or thinking

1. CONFLICT RELATIONSHIP

S2

- never-ending conflict between science & religion
- fuelled by two groups: (1) Scientific Materialists
(2) Biblical Literalists

SCIENTIFIC MATERIALISTS

S3

Foundational Principle

reality is **nothing but** energy & matter → there is no spiritual reality

Foundational MethodReductionism

everything is explainable by reduction into physical laws

EG love & religion are “nothing but” energy & matter

Carl Sagan

S4

astronomer & hosted the most popular science TV series in 1980s

HUGE impact promoting the conflict relationship & the idea that Science = Atheism

7. “THE COSMOS IS ALL THAT IS OR EVER WAS OR EVER WILL BE.”

C Sagan, *Cosmos* (NY: Random House, 1980), 4
Capitals original

QUESTIONS:

- is this a scientific or religious statement?

is Sagan’s claim the same as:

S5

8. Jesus: “I am the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last,
the Beginning and the End.”

Rev 22:13

- did Sagan alienate religious people in Canada & US?

S6

did he do a disservice to science by discouraging them to be scientists?

COMMENTS

S7

Historical Trend:

science explains more & more aspects of the natural world

science discovers more & more natural processes in origins & operations

☛ science eliminates divine interventions in nature

QUESTIONS:

S8

- will science eventually explain away God & religion?
- can we extrapolate this historical trend and PROVE there is no God?

NO. Categorically not possible

Metaphysics-Physics Principle stops the extrapolation of physics to metaphysics

BUT you can take a Step of Faith & come to the BELIEF there is no God

BIBLICAL LITERALISTS

S9

Foundational Principle

Bible reveals True science

Therefore, biological evolution is false

Foundational MethodScientific Concordism

align the scientific evidence with the literal statements about nature in the Bible

Ken Ham

S2

President of Answers in Genesis (Young Earth Creation)

9. “Many Christians fail to realize that the events of Genesis are **literal**, are **historical** (particularly Genesis 1-11), and are foundational to all Christian doctrine.

All biblical doctrines of theology, directly or indirectly, ultimately have their basis in the Book of Genesis. Therefore, a **believing understanding** of the **Book of Genesis** is a prerequisite to an understanding of God and His meaning to man. If Genesis is only a **myth** or **allegory**, then Christian doctrines have **no foundation**.”

The Lie: Evolution (Master Book., 1987), 10.

COMMENTS:

S4

steeped in a literalist concordism → The Bible is a Book of Science

QUESTION:

S5

IF God inspired the writer of Genesis 1-3 to use allegory,
THEN does it mean that “Christian doctrines have **no foundation**”?

EG Parables of Jesus

S6

parables are made up stories → NOT literal or historical
1/3 of Jesus’s teaching is parables
he used stories to reveal inerrant spiritual truths

CONCLUSION: Conflict Relationship

S7

fuels the common perception that there are only two choices—either Science or Religion

10. “Both sides [scientific materialists & biblical literalists] **err** in assuming that evolutionary theory is **inherently atheistic**, and they thereby perpetuate the **false dilemma** of having to choose between science and religion.” Barbour, 10

COMMENTS:

S8

common assumptions: evolution “inherently atheistic” = dysteleological
“false dilemma” = false dichotomy

2. INDEPENDENCE RELATIONSHIP

S9

- Science & Religion are totally independent & autonomous
 - each asks different **questions**
 - each uses different **methods**
 - each is **limited**
- THEREFORE: it’s impossible for Science & Religion to conflict

Langdon Gilkey

S10-11

	SCIENCE	RELIGION
Questions	Physical HOW?	Metaphysical WHY?
Domain	Public	Personal
	Objective Repeatable Data	Good, Evil, Meaning
Authority	Nature	God
	Logic & Experiment	Revelation & Spiritual Experience
Language	Quantitative	Symbolic & Analogical

CONCLUSION: Independence Relationship

S2

1. A first step in moving beyond the conflict relationship

11. “The **independence** of science and religion represents a good **starting point** or **first approximation.**”

Barbour, 5

similar to: Haught’s Contrast Relationship

1st move in this course (Metaphysics-Physics Principle)

2. BUT incomplete & unsatisfying

S3

12. “We do not experience life as neatly divided into **separate compartments**; we experience it in **wholeness** and **interconnectedness.**”

Barbour, 16

similar to: Haught’s criticism of his Contrast Relationship

many students entering this course

3. DIALOGUE RELATIONSHIP

S4

- the beginning of a discussion between Science & Religion
- deals with questions at the boundary or border between Science & Religion

Cosmology

S5

QUESTIONS:

what happens before the Big Bang?

physics can go back to 10^{-43} of a second after the Big Bang

S6 H10

why are the laws & initial conditions of the Big Bang so finely-tuned?

S7 H10

EG explosive & gravitational forces balanced to 1 part in 10^{60}

☛ is there a Fine Tuner?

Ethics

S8

QUESTIONS:

when does life begin?

implications for the abortion debate

when does life end?

implications for the physician-assisted death debate

Stephen Jay Gould

S9

leading evolutionary biologist at Harvard University

contributor to Science-Religion dialogue

13. “No such **conflict** should exist [between science & religion] because each

S10

subject has a legitimate magisterium, or domain of teaching authority—

and these magisteria **do not overlap** (the principle that I would like to

designate as **NOMA**, or ‘non-overlapping magisteria’). The **net of science**

S11

covers the empirical universe: what is it made of (fact) and why does it work

this way (theory). The **net of religion** extends over questions of moral meaning

and value ... the two magisteria **bump right up against each other, inter-**

S12

digitating in wondrously complex ways along their **joint border**. Many of our

deepest questions call upon aspects of both for different **parts** of a **full answer.**”

SJ, “No n-overlapping Magisteria” *Natural History* 106 (1997), 19-20

COMMENTS: S2

NOT an independence relationship
 because Science & Religion: “bump right up against each other”
 share a “joint border”

NOT all sci-rel contributors are RELIGIOUS

☛ Gould was an agnostic

NOMA allows Gould to state: S3

14. “Evolution [is] both **true** and **entirely compatible** with
 Christian belief—a position I hold **sincerely.**” Gould, 16

CONCLUSION: Dialogue Relationship S4

1. Boundary questions between Science & Religion are quite valuable
 especially in cosmology & ethics
2. Dialogue between Science & Religion only informs the other party
 exchanges of information do not support or change either of them S5

4. INTEGRATION RELATIONSHIP S6

- an integration between the content of Science & the content of Religion in areas that overlap
- Science supports and in some cases even changes Religion

Types of Integration: S7

1. Natural Theology
 part of traditional Conservative Christianity throughout history
2. Theology of Nature
 20th century approach originating from modern Liberal Christianity

NATURAL THEOLOGY S8-9 H2

DEF: the use of science to argue for Intelligent Design in nature & point to an Intelligent Designer

Anthropic Principle Greek *anthrōpos*: man, human S10

DEF: observation that the physical laws of the universe are finely-tuned and that minor changes to them would not have allowed the evolution of human life

Big Bang Physics S11 H10

- the math reveals:
 “mysterious numerical co-incidences” & “delicate fine-tuning”
- raises **Metaphysical** questions S12 H10
 are the co-incidences a reflection of intelligence?
 is Someone/s or Something/s behind the universe?
- no one questions the amazing fine-tuning
 ☛ debate is over whether it reflects intelligent design & points to Designer

Basic Types of Anthropic Principle S13

- 1. Strong Anthropic Principle**
 fine-tuning is intentional & points to a Fine Tuner
 held by those who BELIEVE in intelligent design & a Designer

- 2. Weak Anthropic Principle** S14
 fine-tuning is nothing but an accident
 held by those who do NOT BELIEVE in intelligent design or a Designer

- Multiple Worlds Hypothesis (2 variations) S2
1. Sequential: many Big Bangs in a **sequence** over time S3
 our universe is the successful Big Bang → produced humans
 2. Parallel: many universes exist **parallel** to our universe at the same time S4
 our universe is successful → produced humans
- COMMENTS: S5
- proposing a high number of universes reduces statistical improbability
 EG assume that the universe is fine-tuned to 1 part in 10^{100}
 IF there are 10^{100} universes,
 THEN one is bound to be like ours
 - NO scientific evidence for sequential or parallel universes S6
 Therefore,
 Multiple Worlds Hypothesis is NOT scientific
 ☛ it is an “out-of-this-world” argument
 just like RELIGION!!!

EXAMPLES

Paul Davies S7
 physicist & leading Science & Religion scholar
 Big Bang → balance between explosive force & force of gravity → 1 part in 10^{60}

Sir Roger Penrose S8
 Oxford University mathematical physicist
 amount of precise order in the Big Bang → 1 part in $10^{10^{123}}$
 estimated number of atoms in the entire universe → 10^{80}

Hugh Ross S9-10 H11-12
 astronomer
 offers fine-tuning evidence that is accessible to popular audiences

Simon Conway Morris S11
 Cambridge University paleontologist
 believes “the emergence of human intelligence is a near-inevitability”
 ☛ evolution is set up or loaded for humans to evolve

Scientific Evidence:
 pattern of convergence in the fossil record points to a teleological evolution

Convergent Evolution S12
 DEF: appearance of the same basic structures on unrelated evolutionary branches
 EG eye evolved 40 X
 camera-like eye 6 X (eg humans & octopus) S13 H43

CHALLENGES S14

Stephen Jay Gould’s “**Re-Play the Video Tape of Evolution**” Analogy
 Gould: rewind the tape of evolution & play it again
 DIFFERENT living organisms, or maybe NONE at all
 BUT Conway Morris:
 SIMILAR living organisms would evolve

THEOLOGY OF NATURE

DEF: science is used to **reformulate** traditional theological doctrines
 the work of 20th century Liberal Christianity
 • reformulates the character of God

S2

EG God’s Interventionistic (Dramatic) action in nature
 science reveals only natural processes
 Therefore,

S3

God **does not** intervene in the universe or in the lives of people

Panentheism Greek *pan*: all *en*: in

S4

DEF: BELIEF that the world & God are inseparable realities, yet distinct realities
 therefore, not pantheism
 aka **Process Theology**

15. “God is in the world, but the world is also in God, in the sense
 that God is more than the world ... the analogy of the world as
God’s body, and God as the **world’s mind or soul.**”

S5

Barbour, 27

COMMENTS:

S6

termed a “**Dipolar God**”
 challenges traditional distinction between Creator & creation
 changes the character of God
 this God is often seen as grovelling through time like us

CONCLUSION: Integration Relationship

S7

1. **Natural Theology** (Natural Revelation & Intelligent Design)

the traditional position is alive and well today → Strong Anthropic Principle

Barbour is supportive of Natural Theology

Why?

he once was a professional physicist & was impacted by the fine-tuning in
 the laws of nature

2. **Theology of Nature** is held by some science & religion scholars

S8

BUT it has little impact on the average person in most churches

a God who is grovelling through time like us does not attract many followers

this God rarely transforms the lives of people

CONCLUSION: Science & Religion Model of Ian Barbour

S9

16. “I will argue that none of the options considered above [**Conflict & Independence**]
 is adequate to the task ... I will suggest reasons for supporting **Dialogue**, and with
 some qualifications, certain versions of **Integration.**”

Barbour, 3 & 16

COMMENT:

S10

TIP:

Select & Combine the Science-Religion relationships to develop YOUR position

NATURE & INTELLIGENT DESIGN

I. KEY THOUGHTS	S2-3 H2
1. Definition of Intelligent Design	S4
DEF: <u>BELIEF</u> that the beauty, complexity, and functionality in nature reflect rationality and the creative work of an Intelligent Designer	
<u>BELIEF THAT</u> nature reflects design, <u>not HOW</u> design arose in nature	
2. ID is the Classic Complementary Relationship between Science & Religion	S5
mirrors the Metaphysics-Physics Principle & reciprocal Steps of Faith	S6 H14
<u>Requirement of Faith:</u>	S7
1. “ By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God’s command.”	
Heb 11:3	
<u>Heb 11:3 Recast in the Context of ID:</u>	S8
By faith we understand that the universe reflects God’s intelligent design.	
☛ EVERYONE takes a step of faith/intellectual leap	
both believers of ID & skeptics of ID	
ID is <u>not</u> a proof → at best an argument	
3. ID is a Powerful, but Limited Non-Verbal (Does <u>Not</u> Use Words) Revelation	S9
at best ID only points to a teleological reality:	
Someone,	
Someones,	
Something, or	
Somethings	
II. INTELLIGENT DESIGN ARGUMENTS	S10
Two basic arguments:	
<u>ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN TO NATURE</u> (Downward Arrows)	S11 H14
Presupposition Approach	
often overlooked & not acknowledged	
<u>BEGINS</u> with the belief in God & design (ie, the presupposition),	
THEN	
uses this belief like a “Metaphysical Set of Glasses” to view nature	
☛ looks at the creation through the “ Eyes of Faith ”	
Cardinal John Henry Newman	S12
famous 19 th century Roman Catholic theologian	
2. “I believe in design because I believe in God [the presupposition];	
not in God because I see design.”	

C Dessain & T Gornall, eds. *Letters & Diaries*
(Oxford: Clarendon, 2006), 25:97

Evidence Approach

ID is often limited to this argument → aka: argument from design in nature for the existence of God

BEGINS with the natural world,

THEN uses physical evidence to argue for belief in design & God

Antony Flew

S3

famous atheist who became a deist because of ID in biology

3. “Biologists’ investigation of DNA has shown, by the almost **unbelievable complexity** of the arrangements to produce life, that **intelligence** must have been involved ... **The only satisfying explanation** for the origin of such ‘end-directed, self-replicating’ life as we see it on earth is an **infinitely intelligent Mind.**”

A Flew, There Is a God: How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind (NY: HarperOne, 2007), 123, 132

EG

6.4 billion base pairs in each cell “self-replicate” with near perfection S4

• ONLY 1 bp mutation every 64 million bp per generation!!!

15,000 genes to make the enamel in 1 tooth → stunning co-ordination!!!

III. RICHARD DAWKINS & INTELLIGENT DESIGN

S5

most famous atheist in the world & rejects ID

4. “The **problem** is that of complex design ... every single one of more than a trillion cells in the body contains about a thousand times as much precisely-coded digital information as my entire computer. The **complexity** of living organisms is matched by the **elegant efficiency** of the **apparent design**. If anyone doesn’t agree that this amount of complex design **CRIES OUT for an explanation, I give up ...**” S6

Our world is dominated by [1] feats of **engineering** and [2] works of **art**. S7

We are entirely accustomed to the idea that **complex elegance** is an indicator of **premeditated, crafted design**. This is probably the **most powerful reason** for the **belief**, held by the **vast majority of people** that have ever lived, in some kind of **supernatural deity**.

R Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (London: Penguin, 1986), xiii, xvi, my capitals

COMMENTS:

S8

- despite being only “apparent” design (not real & nothing but an illusion): nature powerfully **IMPACTS** Dawkins “cries out for an explanation”
- impact of nature is the “most powerful reason for the BELIEF” in God an argument from nature to design “held by the vast majority of people” S9
- Characteristics of ID: S10
 - (1) engineered: “complexity” & “efficiency” (functionality)
 - (2) artistic: “elegance”

QUESTIONS

S11

Does the “elegant efficiency” & “complex elegance” in nature reflect ID? **OR** is this experience merely an illusion?

IV. SCRIPTURE & INTELLIGENT DESIGN

S2

NB: term “Intelligent Design” does not appear in the Bible

BUT the concept of ID is definitely there in that nature offers a revelation from God

Best Biblical Passages on ID:

S3

(1) Psalm 19:1-4. Old Testament

(2) Romans 1:19-23. New Testament

Features of ID according to Scripture:

S4

- Active
the creation powerfully impacts humans
- Intelligible
humans are fully equipped to understand the revelation in nature
- Incessant
natural revelation never stops
- Universal
natural revelation is heard by everyone (both religious & non-religious people)
- Non-Verbal
natural revelation is like music → it does not use words, but it definitely communicates
- Revelatory
natural revelation reveals general attributes of the Creator
- Rejectable (Rom 1)
humans have the freedom to reject natural revelation
- Accountable (Rom 1)
humans “are without excuse” if they reject natural revelation

S5

S6

PSALM 19:1-4

S7

¹The heavens declare the glory of God;
the firmament proclaims the work
of his hands.

²Day after day they pour forth speech;
night after night they display knowledge.

³They have no speech, they use no words;
no sound is heard from them.

S8

⁴Yet their voice goes out into all the earth,
their words to the ends of the world.

COMMENTS:

- note all the verbs in the Active Voice (subject does an action)

S9

Heavens:

“declare” “proclaim” “pour forth” “display”

Dawkins:

“complex design **CRIES OUT** for an explanation”

- note all the terms related to intelligent communication

S10

“speech” “knowledge” “language” “words” “voice”

Hebrew *qaw* (translated as “voice” in v. 4) means “line”

can be rendered “a chord of music”

☛ nature is like a heavenly hymn

- Non-Verbal Revelation

³They have no speech, they use no words;
no sound is heard from them.

⁴Yet their voice goes out into all the earth,
their words to the ends of the world.

- ☛ Nature does not use words,
BUT nature definitely communicates that God exists

ROMANS 1:19-23

S3

Book of God's Works

¹⁹Since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. ²⁰For 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 men and women are without excuse.**

Epistemological Impact of Sin

S4

²¹For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their **thinking became futile** and their **foolish** hearts were darkened. ²²Although they claimed to be wise, they became **fools** ²³and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

COMMENTS:

- Nature reveals some of God's general attributes S5
“his eternal power and divine nature”
- ID is connected to Commandments #1 & #2 S6
reject:
“immortal God” S7 H4
replace God with:
idols of “mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles”
- Sin Impacts Thinking S8
“their thinking became futile” → “they became fools”
NB
in the Bible the words ‘fool’ & ‘foolish’ do not mean intellectually stupid
a fool is someone who is missing out on the best part of life:
☛ a personal relationship with God
- ID makes ALL humans accountable S9
The Without Excuse Clause:
“so that men and women are without excuse”
according to Romans 1:20, there is no excuse or reason for anyone to say, “There is no evidence for the existence of God”

V. CHRISTIAN TRADITION & INTELLIGENT DESIGN S2

Pope John Paul II S3

5. “Developing a **philosophical argument** in popular language, the apostle [Paul] declares a profound truth: Through all that is created, the ‘**eyes of the mind**’ can come to know God. Through the medium of creatures, God stirs in **reason**, an **intuition** of his ‘power’ and his ‘divinity’ (Rom 1:20) . . . By discoursing on the data provided by the senses, **reason** S4
can reach the cause [God] which lies at the origin of all perceptible reality. In philosophical terms, we could say that this important Pauline text affirms the human capacity for **metaphysical inquiry**.” JP II, “Faith & Reason” *Origins: CNS*
28 (15 Oct 1998), 324

COMMENTS:

- reflects the Metaphysics-Physics Principle S5 H5
 creatures (physics) → intuition & reason → God & his attributes (metaphysics)
 - Argument from Nature to Design S6 H14
6. “This is to recognize as a **first stage of divine revelation** the marvellous ‘**book of nature**,’ S7
 which, when read with the proper tools of human reason [ie, science], can lead to knowledge of the Creator. If human beings with their intelligence **fail** to recognize God as Creator of all, it is **not because they lack the means to do so**, but because their **free will** and their **sinfulness** place an impediment in the way.” Ibid., 324

COMMENTS:

- The Two Divine Books S8 H2
 1st Stage: Book of Nature → Works point toward God
 2nd Stage: Book of Scripture → Words reveal who God is
- humans have “free will” & can reject ID S9
- accepts epistemological Impact of Sin with regard to ID S10
 sinfulness “an impediment” that blocks us from finding God thru his creation

VI. CONCLUSION: NATURE & INTELLIGENT DESIGN S11

1. ID Is Powerful S12

nature impacts even the skeptics of ID (Dawkins) & former skeptics (Flew)
 affirmed by Biblical Texts & Christian Tradition

2. ID Requires Reciprocal Steps of Faith S13

ALL skeptics of ID & ALL believers of ID make a leap of faith

- ☛ whether they are aware of it or not → so be aware!

ID is a metaphysical BELIEF

ID is not a **proof** → at best an **argument**

3. ID Is Limited S14

only points to Someone, Someones, Something or Somethings

only reveals general attributes of the Intelligent Designer/s

ID is **Non-Verbal**

in a subtle way, ID calls for a **Verbal Special Revelation** (eg Bible)

- ☛ a fuller revelation of the Intelligent Designer

VII. MODEL OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN	Lamoureux	S2
NB: a model includes as many positions on ID as possible, including those that reject ID		
<u>PARAMETERS OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN</u>		S3
Ontological Parameter	Greek <i>ontos</i> : participle of verb “to be” → “being”	S4
DEF of Ontology: the ultimate nature of something, its ultimate being		
Asks the question: “What IS Intelligent Design?”		
• Character: ARTISTIC or ENGINEERED		
• Integrity: REAL or an ILLUSION		
EXAMPLES		S6-7 H15
Epistemological Parameter	Greek <i>epistēmē</i> : knowledge	S8
DEF of Epistemology: theory of knowledge → how we know we know		
Asks the question: “How CERTAIN is knowledge of Intelligent Design?”		
• Range: Proof—Argument—Suggestive—Consistent—Inert		
• Epistemological Impact of Sin (1 st Commandment): YES or NO		
EXAMPLES		S11-12 H15
<u>POSITIONS ON INTELLIGENT DESIGN</u>		S13
intersection of the two parameters results in a countless number of positions		
EXAMPLES		
Richard Dawkins		S14-15 H16
ID is an illusion		
Lamoureux		S16-17 H16
ID is real & we are accountable		
ID → Beyond a Reasonable Doubt		
<u>WHY IS INTELLIGENT DESIGN SUCH A CONTROVERSIAL TOPIC?</u>		S18
My Answer:		
the implications of ID are DEEPLY PERSONAL		
IF Intelligent Design is real:		S19
THEN nature is a constant reminder forcing us to deal with Commandment #1		S20 H4
raises the question, “Who or What is #1 in our life?”		
THEN it points to an Intelligent Designer/s		S21
raises the question, “What is our relationship to this Designer/s?”		
☛ is the Intelligent Designer/s ultimately in charge over our life?		
are we accountable to Someone/s or Something/s greater than ourselves?		
What do you think?		S22

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF GALILEO

- I. KEY THOUGHTS** S2
- 1. The scientific issue in the Galileo Affair was NOT about a flat earth!** S3
- anti-religious individuals in 19th century concocted that myth
- ALL educated people in the 17th century accepted the earth was spherical
- Debate was over: S4
- GEOCENTRICITY Greek *gē*: earth
- Earth** at the centre of the universe
- old science of the scientific community
- OR**
- HELIOCENTRICITY Greek *hēlios*: sun
- Sun** at the centre of the universe
- new science of Galileo
- 2. Galileo had a PEACEFUL relationship between Science & Religion** S5
- IMPLICITLY he accepted:
- Metaphysics-Physics Principle & Message-Incident Principle
- his hermeneutics were remarkable & better than the theologians of the church!
- Features: Principle of Accommodation
- Incidental Ancient Science in Scripture
- 3. The Re-cycle Thesis** S6
- QUESTION:
- Is the origins debate today a re-cycling of the Galileo Affair with a different science?
- ☛ **evolutionary biology** instead of **astronomy**
- II. THE TWO VIEWS OF ASTRONOMY IN GALILEO'S DAY** S7
- Geocentricity** S8
- 1st proposed by ancient Greeks (about 550 BC/E)
- further developed by Claudius Ptolemy (100-170 AD/CE)
- became the dominant astronomy for 1400 years
- ☛ Galileo will challenge Ptolemaic astronomy
- Basic features: S9 H17
- THE EARTH
- centre of the entire universe
 - spherical
 - immovable
- THE HEAVENS S10 H17
- spherical
 - multiple spheres with each having a planet
 - last sphere is called the “**Firmament**” & it has the “fixed” stars attached to it
 - daily rotation of spheres around the earth causes day & night

Heliocentricity

proposed by Nicholas Copernicus (1473-1543)

famous book:

On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres (1543)

- ☛ Galileo will develop & promote Copernican astronomy

faithful Christian

church canon (administrator) for 40 yrs

had a peaceful relationship between Science & Religion

Basic features:

S3 H17

THE SUN

- centre of the entire universe

THE HEAVENS

- planets & moon are in their own sphere
- motion of spheres caused the motion of the planets & moon
- fixed stars are attached to the firmament (last sphere of the universe)
- firmament is immovable

THE EARTH

S4 H17

- in the third sphere from the sun
- daily rotation of earth causes day & night

III. BRIEF HISTORY OF GALILEO GALILEI (1564-1642)

S5

1564

S6

born 15 Feb in Pisa, Italy

raised a Roman Catholic

1585

moved to Florence and studied physics & math

1589

S7

professor of mathematics at U of Pisa

1592

professor of mathematics at U of Padua

1597

admits he had long ago accepted Copernican astronomy

1608

S8

telescope was invented by Hans Lippershey

1609

Galileo made his own telescope & pointed it to the heavens

1610

S9

leaves U of Padua & became “Philosopher & Mathematician” of the Grand Duke of Tuscany
an opportunity to challenge the ideas in the universities

1615

writes the “Letter to Grand Duchess” → AMAZING document on his hermeneutics!!!

- 1616 Roman Catholic Church bans Copernicus' *On the Revolutions* (1543) S2
- Committee of only theologians & pastors judged two propositions:
 - (1) The sun is at the centre of the world & does not move
 - (2) The earth is not at the centre of the world & is in motion
 - Scientific Judgment: S3
 - “foolish and absurd in philosophy” natural philosophy = science
 - ☛ sun moves across the sky every day & no one feels earth moving
 - Theological Judgment: S4
 1. “All said that this proposition [1] ... **explicitly contradicts** in many places the sense of **Holy Scripture**, according to the **literal meaning** of the words ... All said that this proposition [2] ... in regard to theological truth it is at least **erroneous in faith.**” S5

M. Fin occhiaro, ed/trans, *The Galileo Affair* (Berkeley: U of California, 1989), 146
- COMMENTS: S6
- ☛ church was entrenched in SCIENTIFIC CONCORDISM
 - (1) sun moves daily across sky (Eccl 1:5, Ps 19:6)
 - (2) earth is immovable (Ps 93:1, Ps 104:5)
- 1632 *Dialogue on the Two Chief World Systems: Ptolemaic & Copernican* S7
Galileo's most famous book
- 1633 Roman Catholic Church bans Galileo's *Dialogue* & demands he reject his scientific views S8
- Galileo's Heresy Trial & “Recantation”** S9
2. “I, Galileo, son of the late Vincenzo Galilei of Florence, seventy years of age ... I have been judged vehemently suspected of **heresy**, namely of having held and believed that
 - [1] the **sun is the centre of the world** and motionless
 - [2] and the **earth is not the centre** and moves ...
 With a sincere heart and unfeigned faith I abjure, curse, and detest the aforesaid **errors and heresies.**” Galileo Affair, 292
- COMMENTS: S10
- Galileo was 70 yrs old & sick → wants to get home
 - returns to Florence & was under house arrest for rest of his life
 - continues his scientific work
 - NOT in a dungeon & in chains!!!
 - another myth concocted by 19th century anti-religious individuals
- BUT**
- Galileo becomes the SYMBOL of the WARFARE relationship of Sci & Rel
- 1642 dies January 8 & was buried in Florence, Italy S11
- 1992 Pope John Paul II issues “Apology to Galileo” → theologians hermeneutically incompetent! S12

IV. GALILEO'S HERMENEUTICS AND SCIENCE & RELIGION RELATIONSHIP S2

1. FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLE: THE TWO DIVINE BOOKS S3

Scripture & Nature Rooted in the Trinitarian God S4

3. "For the **Holy Scripture** and **nature** derive **equally** from the **Godhead**, the former as the dictation of the Holy Spirit and the latter as the most obedient executrix of God's orders."

"Letter to Christina" Finocchiaro, 93

COMMENTS: S5

balance between the Two Books → both "derive equally" from God
 "Godhead" a term for the Holy Trinity—Father, Son & Holy Spirit

Scripture & Nature Reveal God S6

4. "God **reveals** himself to us **no less excellently** in [1] the **effects of nature** than in [2] the **sacred words of Scripture**, as **Tertullian** [theologian; 160-220 CE/AD] perhaps meant when he said, 'We postulate that God ought **first** to be known [1] by nature, and afterward further known [2] by doctrine—[1] by nature through his works, [2] by doctrine through official teaching.'

"Christina" 93

COMMENTS: S7

balance between the Two Books → both equally "excellent"
 strong view of Intelligent Design (natural revelation)
 • start 1st with nature in order to know God

Priority of Scripture over Nature in Theological Issues S8

5. "I have no doubt at all that, **where human reason cannot reach**, and where consequently one **cannot have a science**, but only opinion and **faith**, it is appropriate piously to conform absolutely to the **literal meaning of Scripture**."

"Christina" 104

COMMENTS: S9

reflects Metaphysics-Physics Principle
 theology (metaphysics) is **beyond** science (physics)
 accepts the literal meaning of theological statements

Priority of Nature over Scripture in Scientific Issues S10

6. "I think that in disputes about natural phenomena **one must begin NOT** with the authority of scriptural passages, but with sensory experience and necessary demonstrations [science] ... after becoming certain of some physical conclusions, we should use these as **very appropriate aids** to the **correct** interpretation of Scripture."

"Christina" 93 my capitals

COMMENTS: S11

REJECTS scientific concordism

Science Contributes to Hermeneutics S12

• "very appropriate aids to the correct interpretation of Scripture"

QUESTION S13

Is **evolutionary biology** a "very appropriate aid to the correct interpretation" of the creation accounts in Genesis 1 & 2?

2. NATURE: THE BOOK OF GOD'S WORKS

S2

God Created Faithful Laws of Nature

S3

7. Nature is “the most obedient executrix of God’s orders ... Nature is inexorable and immutable, [and] **never** violates the terms of the laws imposed on her.” “Christina” 93

COMMENTS:

S4

implications: we can trust nature & practice science
laws of nature → God is faithful & not deceptive

Science is a Gift from God

S5

8. “I do not think one has to believe that the same God who has given us our senses, language, and intellect would want us to set aside the use of these ... Indeed, **who wants the human mind put to death?** ... When one is in possession of this [scientific information] it too is a **gift from God.**” “Christina” 94, 96, 105

COMMENTS:

S6 H1

DESTROYS Science vs. Religion Warfare (Dichotomy)

human epistemology & knowledge rooted in God

S7

☛ science is ultimately rooted in God!

QUESTION

S8

Is **evolutionary biology** also a gift from God?

Nature is Intelligible & Written in Language of Mathematics

S9

9. From Galileo’s book *The Assayer* (1623):

“Philosophy [i.e., natural philosophy, or science] is written in this **grand book**, the universe, which stands continually open to our gaze. But the **book** cannot be understood unless one first learns to comprehend the language and to read the letters in which it is composed.

It is written in the language of mathematics ... without which it is humanly impossible to understand a single word of it; without these, one wanders about in a dark labyrinth.”

S. Drake, *Discoveries & Opinions of Galileo* (NY: Doubleday, 1957), 237-8

COMMENTS:

S10

accepts the Two Divine Books Metaphor

nature “grand book” & “the book”

nature is rational & understandable → strong view of ID

Albert Einstein:

S11

“The eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility.” Q7 N16

BUT

no mystery for Galileo → God wrote mathematics into nature

rationality of nature reflects the Mind of God

QUESTION

S12

What do we need to “first learn” before understanding origins?

geology, palaeontology, genetics

Otherwise, will we “wander about in a dark labyrinth”?

3. SCRIPTURE: THE BOOK OF GOD'S WORDS

S2

Purpose of Scripture is Theological, NOT Scientific

S3

10. "The **primary purpose** of the Holy Writ [is] the **worship of God** and the **salvation of souls.**"

"Christina" 93

COMMENTS:

S4

The Bible is intended for: (1) worshipping God
(2) revealing the path of salvation

Scripture is Inerrant, NOT its Interpreters

S5

11. "Holy Scripture can **never lie or err**, and its declarations are **absolutely and inviolably true** ... Though the Scripture was **inspired by the Holy Spirit** ... we cannot assert with certainty that **all interpreters speak by divine inspiration** since if this were so then there would be no disagreement among them about the meaning of the same passages ... Holy Scripture can **never lie**, as long as its **true meaning has been grasped**."

"Letter to Castelli" in Finocchiaro, 49, 51; "Christina" 92, 96

COMMENTS:

S6

accepts Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration

"Scripture was inspired by the Holy Spirit"

accepts Doctrine of Biblical Inerrancy

Bible "can never lie or err"

Biblical "declarations" → "absolutely & inviolably true"

BUT "as long as its true meaning has been grasped"

The Bible is not the problem → human interpreters are the problem!

S7

☛ we need hermeneutics!

Science in Scripture is INCIDENTAL

S8

12. The Scripture "speak[s] **incidentally** of the earth, water, sun, or other created thing ... **sciences** [are] discussed in Scripture to a **very minor extent** and with **disconnected statements**; such is precisely the case of **astronomy**, so little of which is contained therein that one does not find there even the names of the planets, except for the sun, the moon, and only once or twice Venus, under the name Morning Star."

"Christina" 93-4

COMMENTS:

S9

reflects the Message-Incident Principle

science in Scripture → "**incidental**"

science in Scripture is not significant

"very minor extent and with disconnected statements"

QUESTION

S10

Do the creation accounts in Genesis 1 & 2 "speak incidentally" of the origin of the world?

13. “Propositions **dictated by the Holy Spirit** were expressed by the sacred writers in such a way as **to accommodate** the capacities of the very unrefined and undisciplined masses ... in order **not to sow confusion** into the minds of the **common people** and make them more obstinate against dogmas involving **higher mysteries** ...

S3

Indeed I shall further say that it was not only **respect** for **popular inability**, but also the **current opinion of those times** ... This doctrine [accommodation] is **so commonplace** and so definite among all theologians that it would be superfluous to present any testimony for it.”

“Christina” 92, 106

COMMENTS:

S4

reflects the Message-Incident Principle

science in Scripture is “the current opinion of those times”

science-of-the-day → ancient science

Principle of Accommodation (Hermeneutical Principle #3)

S5

refers to accommodation 8 X in “Letter to Christina”

“so commonplace” in the 17th century

reason for accommodation:

to avoid confusing people

“in order not to sow confusion into the minds of the common people”

QUESTION:

S6

Why is evolution not in the Bible?

☛ to avoid confusing people

4. THE CONFLICT BETWEEN GALILEO & HIS CRITICS

S7

Main reason for this conflict → poor hermeneutics

QUESTION:

Are the issues similar today with Anti-Evolutionism?

Scientific Concordism is the Root of the Conflict

S8

14. “So the reason they [Galileo’s critics] advance to condemn the opinion of the earth’s mobility and sun’s stability is this: Since in many places in Holy Scripture one reads that the [1] **sun moves** and the [2] **earth stands still**, and since the **Scripture can never lie or err**, it follows as a necessary consequence that the opinion of those who want to assert the [1] sun to be motionless and the [2] earth moving is **erroneous** and **damnable** ...

S9

They want to **extend**, not to say abuse, its [ie, the Bible’s] **authority**, so that even for purely **physical** [scientific] **conclusions**, which are **not matters of faith**, one must totally abandon the senses and demonstrative arguments [ie, scientific] in favour of any scriptural passage whose apparent words may contain a different indication.”

Ibid, 92, 90

COMMENTS: S2

Galileo's critics accepted **Scientific Concordism**

“authority” of the Bible “extends” to “physical conclusions”

a superficial logic to the argument of the critics: S3

- The Bible states the “sun moves” & “earth stands still”
- The Bible “never lies or errs”

Therefore:

belief the sun stands still & earth moves is “erroneous & damnable”

BUT critics fail to appreciate the Message-Incident Principle:

☛ “physical conclusions ... are not matters of faith”

RECASTING GALILEO'S WORDS FOR TODAY: S4

“So the reason **anti-evolutionists** advance to condemn the opinion of the **evolution of life** is this:

- Since in many places in Holy Scripture one reads that **life was created *de novo*** [quick & complete; Gen 1 & 2], and
- since the Scripture can never lie or err,

[Therefore]:

it follows as a necessary consequence that the opinion of those who want to assert the **evolution of life** is erroneous & damnable.”

QUESTION: S5

Can you **empathize** with scientific concordists & anti-evolutionists?
on the surface this argument is reasonable

BUT

in the end falls short hermeneutically

similar to Galileo's critics, it assumes scientific concordism is a feature of the Bible

Excessive Biblical Literalism S6

15. “Though the **Scripture cannot err**, nevertheless some of its interpreters and expositors may sometimes err in various ways. One of these would be very serious and **very frequent**, namely to want to limit oneself always to the **literal meaning of the words.**”

“Castelli” 4 9

COMMENTS: S7

The Bible is not the problem → human interpreters are the problem!

“frequent” error is reading Scripture literally all the time

2004 ABC TV survey asked if the Genesis 1 creation account is: S8

“literally true, meaning it happened that way word-for-word”

87% Evangelical Protestants

51% Roman Catholics

☛ accept Gen 1 is literal → Young Earth Creation

V. CONCLUSION: RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF GALILEO	S2
1. Galileo did <u>NOT</u> view Science & Religion in a Warfare Relationship	S3
He was a Conservative Christian & believed:	S4
• The Trinitarian God of Conservative Christianity referred to as the “Godhead” Quote 3	
• The Bible was inspired by God “the Scripture was inspired by the Holy Spirit” Q 11	
• Intelligent Design (Natural Revelation)	S5
1 st stage of knowing God: “God ought first to be known by nature” Q 4	
• Divine Action in Nature <i>Cosmological Providentialism in Operations</i> nature is “the most obedient executrix of God’s orders” Q 7	
2. Galileo had Academic Hermeneutics	S6
He accepted the hermeneutical principles of:	S7
• Accommodation Q 13	
• Incidental Ancient Science in the Bible Q 12	
• Message-Incident Principle (Implicit) EG he used Cardinal Baronio’s famous aphorism to summarize his hermeneutical views	S8
16. “The intention of the Holy Spirit is to teach us how one goes to heaven, and <u>NOT</u> how heaven goes.”	“Christina” 96
<u>MESSAGE OF FAITH:</u>	S9 H5
How to go to heaven	
<u>INCIDENTAL ANCIENT SCIENCE:</u>	
How heaven goes (ancient astronomy) in the Bible	
3. Time for a New Symbol for Science & Religion?	S10
Galileo as a symbol of a <u>PEACEFUL</u> relationship between Science & Religion?	
Time for a new aphorism?	S11
17. “The intention of the Bible is to teach us THAT God is the Creator, and <u>not</u> HOW the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit created.”	
	D. Lamoureux, <i>Evolutionary Creation</i> (2008), 35

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF DARWIN

I. KEY THOUGHTS	S2
1. Darwin thought seriously about God throughout his life	S3
his religious beliefs were closely connected to his scientific theories	
<u>Personal Question:</u>	
is thinking about God & science (especially evolution) part of your story?	
2. Intelligent Design was a major part of Darwin’s story	S4
nature struck Darwin with “overwhelming force” throughout his life (see Q20)	
☛ Argument from Nature to Design	S5 H14
I will term this experience the “ Psalm 19 Factor ”	S6
<u>Personal Question:</u>	
do “the heavens (& biology) declare the glory of God?” Ps 19:1	
OR	
is Intelligent Design nothing but an illusion?	
3. Darwin’s story demonstrates the problem with the God-of-the-Gaps	S7
he was educated in the science-of-the-day in the early 19 th century:	
<u>GEOLOGICAL CATASTROPHISM</u>	S8
• by 1800 geologists accepted that the layers of stratification in the earth were laid down slowly over millions of years.	
BUT they could not explain some surface features	S9
EG huge U-shaped mountain valleys with small rivers	
• geologists assumed that multiple catastrophic floods caused these surface features	
Noah’s Flood was often seen as the last catastrophic event	
☛ God-of-the-Gaps in Geology	S10
they did not know about glaciers → <i>Gap in Knowledge</i>	
<u>PROGRESSIVE CREATION</u> (aka Day-Age Theory)	S11
• by 1800 all scientists accepted the earth was very old	
BUT they did not accept biological evolution	
EG James Dana & Day-Age Theory	S12-14 H18
• most scientists assumed that the Creator intervened into the world at different times to create different kinds of living organisms	
☛ God-of-the-Gaps in Biology	S15 H18
they did not fully understand biological evolution → <i>Gap in Knowledge</i>	
as Darwin’s Gaps in Knowledge close → rejects God-of-the-Gaps in <u>both</u> Geology & Biology	S16
<u>Personal Question:</u>	S17
is struggling with the God-of-the-gaps part of your story?	

II. BRIEF HISTORY OF CHARLES DARWIN (1809-1882)	S2
1809	S3
born 12 February at Shrewsbury, England raised in an affluent family & educated in an Anglican school	
1826	S4
studies medicine at Edinburgh University, but drops out	
1828-1831	S5
studies theology at Cambridge University, but decides not to be ordained as a priest	
1831-1836	S6
5 year voyage around the world on HMS <i>Beagle</i>	
1837-1838	S7
formulates his theory of evolution ☛ rejects Christianity, but not God → still believes in a Creator	
1859	S8
<i>Origin of Species</i> Darwin's most famous book on the Theory of Evolution by Natural Selection	
1871	S9
<i>Descent of Man</i> Darwin's book on human evolution	
1876	S10
<i>Autobiography of Darwin</i> Darwin's mature views on religion in section entitled "Religious Beliefs"	
1882	S11
dies 19 April at Down, England. Buried Westminster Abbey	

III. CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY (1828-1831) S12

Charles drops out of medicine & his father sends him to study theology & become an Anglican priest
he doesn't want a family disgrace

1. "I did not then in the least doubt the **strict literal truth of every word in the Bible.**" S13

Darw in, *Autobiography of Charles Darwin*
N Barlow, ed (London: Collins, 1958), 57

COMMENT:

Darwin was a biblical literalist → SCIENTIFIC CONCORDIST

William Paley (1743-1805) S14

- his famous book was required reading:

Natural Theology: Or Evidences for the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature (1802)

Natural Theology = Natural Revelation = Intelligent Design

a classic example of the Argument from Nature to Design S15 N38 H14

- claims Paley was the best part of his Cambridge U education
- ☛ Darwin was powerfully impacted by ID

Geology

S2

a passion begins

in the last year at Cambridge U, Darwin goes on a geological field trip

he has an “epiphany”

gripped by how science works:

2. “Nothing before had ever made me thoroughly realize, though I had read various scientific books, that science consists in **grouping facts** so that **general laws** or conclusions may be drawn from them.” *ACD*, 70 S3

COMMENTS:

Inductive Method

“grouping facts” → “general laws”

CONCLUSION: Cambridge University

S4

1. Darwin begins to take ownership of his worldview

2. Darwin is steeped in Paley’s Natural Theology S5

developing more of a philosophical faith than a religious faith

will lead him eventually to **deism**

IV. HMS BEAGLE VOYAGE (27 Dec 1831 to 2 Oct 1836)

S6

5 year voyage around the world S7 H19

Geology

S8

Darwin leaves with Charles Lyell’s 1st volume of *Principles of Geology* (1830)

field experience converts him to Lyell’s uniformitarian geology

Principle of Uniformitarianism:

S9

DEF: explaining the earth’s past through the processes observed on earth today using the same forces & same intensities

3. “When I was starting on the voyage of the Beagle, the sagacious Henslow S10

[Darwin’s former professor], who, **like ALL other geologists** believed at that time

in successive cataclysms [i.e., Catastrophism] advised me to get and study the first

volume of the *Principles [of Geology]*, which had just been published, **but on no**

account to accept the view therein advocated ... I am proud to remember that S11

the first place, namely, St Jago, in the Cape Verde Archipelago, which I geologised,

convinced me of the **infinite superiority of Lyell’s view** over those advocated in

any other work known to me.”

ACD, 101 my capitals

COMMENT:

S12

☛ Darwin rejects God-of-the-gaps in geology (Catastrophism)

origin of the earth can be explained thru natural processes ONLY

Biology

S2

Darwin is still a Progressive Creationist

EG he notes a similarity between the Ant Lion pitfall (trap) in England & Australia S3

4. “Would any two workmen ever hit on so **beautiful**, so simple, & yet so **artificial** S4

a contrivance [Ant Lion pitfall]? It cannot be thought so. The **one hand** has

surely worked throughout the universe. A Geologist perhaps would suggest that S5

the **periods of Creation** have been distinct & remote the one from the other;

that the **Creator** rested in his labor.”

Darw in, *Diary of the Beagle in Works of Darwin*
N. Barlow ed (London: Pickering, 1986), I:348

COMMENTS:

S6

- **God is part of Darwin’s science!**

“The one hand” & “the Creator”

- Darwin is a Progressive Creationist

S7

“periods of Creation” & periods “the Creator rested in his labor”

☛ God-of-the-gaps in biology

Intelligent Design

S8

Darwin powerfully IMPACTED by nature:

5. “Amongst the scenes which are **deeply impressed on my mind**, none exceed in **sublimity** the primeval forests [of Brazil] ... [they] are temples filled with the varied productions of the **God of Nature**. **No one can stand unmoved** in these solitudes, without **feeling** that **there is more** in man than the mere breath of his body.” *Diary*, 388

COMMENTS:

S9

let’s interpret this passage using Biblical ID Categories (plse review Notes 39)

Intelligent Design in Nature:

- Active

“deeply impressed on my mind”

“no one can stand unmoved”

- Intelligible

“feeling that there is more in man”

humans are not just physical, but we have a soul (see Q 11)

- Non-Verbal Revelation

use of the word “feeling”

- Universal

S10

“no one can stand unmoved”

- Revelatory

“varied productions” point to “the God of Nature”

PSALM 19 FACTOR

S11

do the primeval forests of Brazil declare the glory of God?

does nature reflect ID?

OR

was Darwin experiencing an illusion?

nothing but social conditioning from his religious Cambridge education?

Religion	S2
Christianity	
little evidence in diaries, notes & letters of a firm religious faith during the 5 year voyage	
Darwin rejects his Christian faith during the 2 year period after his voyage	S3
6. “I came to disbelieve in Christianity as a divine revelation. ” <i>ACD</i> , 86	
Natural Theology	S4
Darwin still believed in a God	
strong philosophical faith & even part of Darwin’s science → moving toward deism	
CONCLUSION: HMS Beagle Voyage	S5
1. God is part of Darwin’s science	
still an anti-evolutionist & progressive creationist	
2. Darwin does not sense the tension between his:	S6
Geology	
Uniformitarianism	
☛ NO God-of-the-gaps interventions → natural-laws-only	
Biology	
Progressive Creation	
☛ God-of-the-gaps interventions for the creation of living organisms	
QUESTION:	S7
IF	
the formation of the earth is understood only through natural processes,	
THEN	
shouldn’t the formation of living organisms also be understood only through natural processes?	
V. ORIGIN OF SPECIES (1859)	S8
Darwin returns to England and formulates his theory of evolution between 1837-1838	
he takes 20 years to write <i>Origin of Species</i>	
<i>Origin of Species</i> has 7 positive & affirming references to the “Creator”	S9
Darwin NOT an atheist!	
The Creator Made Living Organisms through the Laws of Nature	S10
7. “ Authors of the highest eminence [ie, progressive creationists] seem to be fully	
satisfied with the view that each species has been independently created.	S11
To my mind it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter	
by the Creator , that the production and extinction of the past and present inhabitants	
of the world should have been due to secondary causes like those determining	
the birth and death of the individual. ”	

Darw in, *Origin of Species* (1859), 488

COMMENTS:

S2

- REJECTS Progressive Creation → science-of-the-day
“Authors of the highest eminence”
- REJECTS God-of-the-gaps in the origin of living organisms
- ACCEPTS Teleological Evolution
“the laws impressed on matter by the Creator”

EMBRYOLOGY-EVOLUTION ANALOGY

S3

IF

God does not use God-of-the-gaps miracles to create **each individual creature** today,

THEN

God did not use God-of-the-gaps miracles to create **all creatures** in the past

IF

God creates **each individual creature** today through natural processes,

THEN

God created **all creatures** in the past through natural processes

S4

Famous Last Sentence of *Origin of Species*

S5

8. “There is **grandeur** in this [evolutionary] view of life, with its several powers, having been **originally breathed** into a **few forms** or into **one**; and that, whilst this planet has gone on cycling according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms **most beautiful** and **most wonderful** have been, and are being, evolved.”

Origin, 490COMMENTS:

S6

2nd edition (1860) to 6th edition (1872) Darwin changes:

“originally breathed” to “**breathed by the Creator**”

PSALM 19 FACTOR

S7

- does the “grandeur” of evolution creating living organisms that are “most beautiful & most wonderful” declare the glory of God?
- does the process of evolution reflect ID?

CONCLUSION: *Origin of Species* (1859)

S8

1. Rejects the God-of-the-Gaps in the origin of living organisms

2. Accepts a Creator

3. Accepts teleological evolution

S9

4. **God is part of Darwin’s evolutionary science in his most famous book!**

VI. AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES DARWIN (1876)	S2
mature views on religion presented in a section entitled “Religious Belief”	
• Intelligent Design a central issue	
<u>Argument Pattern:</u>	S3
Darwin gives an Argument & then a Rebuttal to it	
stalemate leads him → Agnosticism	
9. “The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic. ”	ACD, 94
<u>ARGUMENT FOR GOD’S EXISTENCE: 1ST DESIGN ARGUMENT (PSYCHOLOGICAL)</u>	S4
10. “At the present day the most usual argument for the existence of an intelligent God is drawn from the deep inward conviction and feelings which are experienced by most persons ... Formerly I was led by feelings such as those referred to, ... to the firm conviction of [1] the existence of God, and of [2] the immortality of the soul ... whilst standing in the midst of the grandeur of a Brazilian forest.”	ACD, 91
<u>COMMENTS:</u>	
Intelligent Design in Nature:	S5
• Active	
impact of the “grandeur of a Brazilian forest”	
• Universal	
“experienced by most persons”	
• Intelligible	S6
use of word “feelings” (2X) → non-verbal revelation	
leads Darwin to understand two “firm convictions” (next)	
• Revelatory	
nature convicts Darwin of: [1] “the existence of God”	
[2] “the immortality of the soul”	
PSALM 19 FACTOR	S7
Does the “grandeur of a Brazilian forest” declare the glory of God?	
does nature point to the “existence of God” & “immortality of the soul?”	
OR	
Was Darwin experiencing an illusion?	
“nothing but” social conditioning from his religious Cambridge education?	
REBUTTAL	S8
11. “But now [1876] the grandest scenes would not cause any such convictions and feelings to rise in my mind. It may be truly said that I am like a man who has become colour-blind. ”	ACD, 91
<u>QUESTION:</u>	S9
Can you become “colour-blind” to Impact of ID in Nature?	
• see Darwin’s view in the last year of his life in Quote 15	

ARGUMENT FOR GOD’S EXISTENCE: 2ND DESIGN ARGUMENT (RATIONAL)

S2

12. “Another source of conviction in the existence of God, connected with the **reason** and not with the feelings, impresses me as having **much more weight**. This follows from the **extreme difficulty** or rather **impossibility** of conceiving this immense and **wondrous** universe, including man with his capacity of looking backwards and far into futurity, as a **result of blind chance** or **necessity**. **When thus reflecting** I feel compelled to look to a **First Cause** having an **intelligent mind** in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a **Theist**. This conclusion was **strong** in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the *Origin of Species*; and it is since that time that it has very gradually with **many fluctuations** become **weaker**.”

ACD , 92-93 my underlines

COMMENTS:

S5

REJECTS dysteleology

the universe is not the result of “blind chance or necessity”

☛ that’s an “impossibility”

Darwin was a **theist** & believed in **ID** when he wrote *Origin of Species*

S6

NOT an atheist!!!

Intelligent Design in Nature:

S7

• Active

impact of the “wondrous universe” → “compelled to look”

• Intelligible

“connected with the reason”

• Revelatory

nature points to a “First Cause having an intelligent mind”

REBUTTAL

S8

13. “But then arises the **horrid doubt**—can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animal, **be trusted** when it draws such **grand conclusions**?”

ACD, 93

DARWIN’S EPISTEMOLOGICAL DILEMMA: “THE HORRID DOUBT”

S9

• Darwin states he can’t trust his mind:

(1) on the subjects of Intelligent Design & God

(2) to make “grand conclusions”

• BUT what did Darwin just do?

S10

he trusted his mind to make a “grand conclusion” about not being able to trust his mind!!!

☛ **Self-Referential Incoherence**• Did Darwin rebut his “Rational ID Argument” for God’s existence? **NO** S11

ID remains a POWERFUL rational argument for belief in a:

“First Cause having an intelligent mind”

VII. THE FINAL YEARS (1879-1882)

S2

Darwin “softened” on: (1) agnosticism → he had deistic periods

(2) intelligent design → he wasn’t so “colour blind” Quote 11

Letter to John Fordyce (1879)

S3

14. “It seems to me **absurd to doubt** that a man may be an **ardent theist & an evolutionist** ...

I may state that my judgment often **fluctuates** ... In my most **extreme fluctuations** I have S4

never been an Atheist in the sense of denying the existence of a God. I think that generally

(and more & more as I grow older), **but not always**, that an **Agnostic** would be the more

correct description of my state of mind.”

To Fordyce (7 May 1879)

COMMENTS:

S5 H1

- DESTROYS the Origins Dichotomy in one short sentence!

- it is perfectly reasonable to be “an ardent theist & an evolutionist”

- up to **1879** Darwin was NEVER AN ATHEIST (he dies in 1882)

S6

- most of the time an **Agnostic**

- “not always” periods → likely a deist → impact of ID

Conversation with the Duke of Argyll (last year of Darwin’s life)

S7

15. “I said to Dr. Darwin, with reference to some of his own remarkable works [on living

organisms] ... it was **impossible** to look at these without seeing that they were the

effect and the **expression of mind**. I shall never forget Mr. Darwin’s answer. He looked S8

at me very hard and said, ‘Well, that **often** comes over me with **overwhelming force**;

but at other times,’ and he shook his head vaguely, adding, ‘**it seems to go away.**’”

Life & Letters of Darwin, I:316

COMMENTS:

S9

Intelligent Design in Nature:

- Active

impact of ID in living organisms “comes over me with overwhelming force”

- Intelligible

“the effect and the expression of mind”

- Incessant

S10

“often comes over me” → makes 1876 “color-blind” comment doubtful (Q11)

- Revelatory

“impossible” not to see the work of a mind in nature → Mind of God

PSALM 19 FACTOR

S11

Was Darwin’s experience in biology declaring the glory of God?

OR

Was Darwin suffering from an illusion when studying living organisms?

VIII. CONCLUSION: RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OF DARWIN

S2

1. Darwin was Never an Atheist!

S3

during the writing of *Origin of Species* (1859):

Darwin claimed he: (1) was a theist

(2) believed in Intelligent Design

2. Darwin was Impacted by Intelligent Design throughout his Life

S4

nature struck Darwin powerfully & often “with overwhelming force” Quote 15

TO ASK YOU THE QUESTION ONE LAST TIME:

S5

Is the Psalm 19 Factor real?

Do the heavens & living organisms declare the glory of God?

OR

Is this experience in nature nothing but an illusion?

TO ASK YOU RELATED QUESTIONS:

S6

If you believe in intelligent design, is it due to social conditioning from you being raised in a religious community?

OR

If you reject intelligent design, is it due to social conditioning from you being raised in a secular community?

3. Darwin Destroyed the “Evolution” vs. “Creation” Dichotomy

S7-8

“It seems to me **absurd to doubt** that a man may be an **ardent theist & an evolutionist.**”

Quote 15

☛ THANKS to Darwin,

S9

being both a Christian theologian & an evolutionary biologist is perfectly reasonable

GENESIS 1-3: BIBLICAL CREATION ACCOUNTS

I. KEY THOUGHTS S2

1. Literary Genre S3

THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION:

What is the literary genre of Gen 1-3?

- a strict literal word-for-word scientific record of HOW God actually created the universe and living organisms, including humans

OR

- a complex literature featuring: S4

Spiritual Truths → 1st & foremost

ancient origins science

ancient story/allegory

ancient poetry (structured writing)

2. Ancient Creation Accounts S5

most have 3 basic components:

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

spiritual truths & values of a community

ANCIENT ORIGINS SCIENCE

origin of the universe, living organisms, humans & the first communities

☛ origins science-of-the-day

origins understood from an *ancient phenomenological perspective*

CENTRAL FEATURE: ***De Novo* Creation**

ANCIENT STORY/ALLEGORY

cast in a story-like account

often uses allegorical features

Message-Incident Principle: 1st New Application for Genesis 1-3 S8 H21

Ancient Origins Science & Ancient Story/Allegory are incidental vessels that deliver inerrant Spiritual Truths

Therefore: SEPARATE DON'T CONFLATE

3. The Beginning of REAL HISTORY in the Bible S9

lots of debate on this issue

many conservative theologians like me see real history “phase in” around Gen 12 with Abraham

Common Concern:

IF Gen 1-3 is not historical,

THEN the New Testament & Jesus are not historical

Academic Response:

Gen 1-3 is a completely different Literary Genre than the New Testament

☛ NT is based on eyewitness accounts of real people that saw real events

II. ANCIENT CREATION ACCOUNTS: INTRODUCTORY CATEGORIES S2

ETIOLOGY S3

DEF: the cause or reason for something or someone

ALL creation accounts ask the basic etiological questions:

What is the cause or reason for the existence of:

- the universe: heavens, sun, stars, etc
- living organisms: plants & animals
- humans: our community and other communities around us

ANCIENT CREATION MOTIFS S4

DEF of Motif:

recurring concept, symbol, character, theme, etc

DEF of Ancient Creation Motifs:

recurring ancient scientific concepts found in creation accounts

basic concepts in the origins science-of-the-day in the ancient world

appear in: (1) many creation accounts throughout the world

(2) creation accounts in Ancient Near East (ANE)

EG Hebrews, Egyptians, Mesopotamians, etc

(1) *De Novo* Creation Motif S5

quick & complete origin of the universe & life

many times humanity begins with a 1st man & 1st woman

Etiological Question:

what is the cause or reason for the origin of the world & people?

(2) Lost Idyllic Age Motif S6

a something-went-wrong-in-the-world account

points back to the disruption of an original harmony in the world

negative effects of this event continue into the present

Etiological Question:

what is the cause or reason for the **bad things** in the world?

(3) Tribal Formation Motif S7

origin of a community or nation from a single founding male individual

☛ ALL of humanity often descends from the 1st man & 1st woman

Etiological Questions:

what is the cause or reason for the origin of our community?

other communities around us?

Message-Incident Principle: 2nd New Application for Genesis 1-3 S8 H21

Ancient Creation Motifs in Gen 1-3 are incidental vessels that deliver inerrant Spiritual Truths

Therefore: SEPARATE DON'T CONFLATE

ANCIENT STORY/ALLEGORY

S2

Bible uses non-historical stories & allegories to reveal Spiritual Truths

Parables of Jesus

S3

DEF of Parable: earthly story with a heavenly message

☛ 1/3 of Jesus' teaching is in parables

The Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:33-36)

S4

A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, when he was attacked by robbers.

They stripped him of his clothes, beat him and went away, leaving him half dead. A **priest**

happened to be going down the same road, and when he saw the man, he passed by on the

other side. So too, a **Levite**, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other

side. But a **Samaritan**, as he travelled, came to where the man was; and when he saw

him, he took pity on him. He went to him and bandaged his wounds, pouring on oil and

wine. Then he put the man on his own donkey, brought him to an inn and took care of him.

The next day he took out two silver coins and gave them to the innkeeper. "Look after him,"

he said, "and when I return, I will reimburse you for any extra expense you may have."

COMMENTS:

S6

these people NEVER existed & these events NEVER happened!

Message → Be Merciful

S7

Story → INCIDENTAL

Book of Job

S8

Could this be a **Holy Spirit inspired story** to reveal Spiritual Truths about suffering?

IF this is a historical account, (as recorded in Chapters 1 & 2)

THEN it means that:

- Satan can just walk into God's presence & bait him to prove a point
- God allows Satan to murder Job's 10 children & his servants
- God allows Satan to inflict Job with a debilitating disease

QUESTION:

S9

does this sound like something that God would allow?

OR

is this a story to reveal Spiritual Truths?

☛ is the story INCIDENTAL?

Garden of Eden Account in Genesis 2-3

S10

Features: • fast-talking snake

- idyllic garden paradise
- mystical tree with fruit that imparts eternal life
- mystical tree with fruit that imparts knowledge of good & evil
- mystical creatures → cherubim (composite creatures like Egyptian Sphinx)
- flaming sword flashing back & forth to protect the garden

QUESTION:

S11

does this sound like a **historical account** about real events?

OR

is this a **story with allegorical features** to reveal Spiritual Truths?

☛ is the story INCIDENTAL?

THEORY OF ORIGINAL SOURCES

S2

- states that Gen 1-3 is the combination of two original creation accounts:

(1) PRIESTLY CREATION ACCOUNT

S3

Genesis 1
 written about 500 BC/E
 Priestly author (P) uses divine Hebrew name *'Elōhîm* (God)

(2) JAHWIST CREATION ACCOUNT

S4

Genesis 2-3
 written about 1000 BC/E
 Jahwist author (J) uses divine Hebrew name *Yahweh* (Lord)

- an editor put P & J creation accounts together to become Gen 1-3

S5

called the “Redactor”
 redaction of sources occurred around 500 BC/E

- evidence for two sources:

S6

Differences in the order of creation events between Gen 1 & Gen 2

Genesis 1 (Priestly)		Genesis 2 (Jahwist)	
vegetation (fruit to eat)	3 rd Day	man	v. 7
birds	5 th Day	vegetation (fruit to eat)	v. 8-9
land animals	6 th Day	land animals & birds	v. 19
man & woman	6 th Day	woman	v. 22

QUESTION:

S7

is the order of creation events the Message of Faith?

OR

is it INCIDENTAL?

Differences in writing styles between Gen 1 & Gen 2-3 → two different authors

S8

EG Gen 1 (P) has no allegorical features

Gen 2-3 (J) has many allegorical features (mystical trees) see list above in S10

- produces a creation account with two **complementary** perspectives

S9

EG Gen 1 (P): God transcendent & in heaven

Gen 2-3 (J): Lord immanent & on earth

CONCLUSION: Ancient Creation Accounts & Introductory Categories

S10

1. Divine Inspiration of the Bible:

interactive process between human authors & the Holy Spirit

NOT simply passive secretaries

EG God allowed them to use their ancient creation motifs → ACCOMMODATION

2. Parallel between the Two Divine Books

S11

Origin of the BOOK OF GOD’S WORKS:

ordained & sustained natural evolutionary process

Origin of BOOK OF GOD’S WORDS:

ordained & sustained **ancient literary process** → literary evolution

III. AN EXEGESIS OF GENESIS 1-3

Each chapter will identify:

Etiology

Motif

Author

Origins Debate Implications

Messages of Faith

S2

S3

1. Genesis 1: The Creation Week

S4

VERB “TO CREATE”

S5

Hebrew word *bārā’*

has many nuances:

to create, form, separate, divide, split, fashion by cutting

ANE creation accounts often feature creation by separation of opposites

EG heaven separated from earth

Gen 1: waters above separated from waters below

sea separated from dry land

Etiology

S6

What caused the origin of the heavens, earth, plants, animals & humans?

Answer: God created all of them

Motif

De Novo Creation

quick & complete → typical of ancient creation accounts

Author

S7

Priestly (P) Author

- uses divine name *’Elōhîm* (God)

appears 35 times in Gen 1 (7 X 5)

- P author often uses stylistic number 7 & its multiples

EG Gen 1:1 has 7 words & Gen 1:2 has 14 words = 21 (3 X 7)

Gen 1: “earth” 21X

“heaven/firmament” 21X

“it was good” 7X

- often uses a Poetic Format → very structured writing style

S8

(1) Parallel Panels

S9 H52

- built off Gen 1:2 & the two rhyming Hebrew words: *tōhu* (formless)
bōhu (empty)

- God solves the problem of the formless & empty earth

1st panel of three days he forms the world

2nd panel of three days he fills the world

- forming days & filling days are parallel to each other

S10-11 H22

Day 1 light → sun, moon & stars Day 4

Day 2 air space & sea → birds & sea creatures Day 5

Day 3 dry land → land animals & humans Day 6

Classic “Contradiction” in the Bible

Day 1: creation of light

Day 4: creation of the sun

IF Gen 1 is a scientific account, THEN there is a problem

BUT

IF this is **Poetic Freedom**, THEN no problem

☛ P author certainly knew that light comes from the sun!

(2) Creation Day Formula

S3

highly structured & repetitious → typical of P author’s style

Introduction: God said, “. . .”

Command: “Let it be . . .”

Completion: It was so.

Judgment: God saw it was good.

Time Reference: “There was evening & there was morning—the nth day”

Debate over the Word “Day”

S4

Hebrew *yōm*: (1) 24 hour day

(2) period of time

In the Old Testament:

when the word “day” is with a number → 24 hour day

Genesis 1:

uses numbers: first day, second day, etc

each day ends with:

“There was evening & there was morning—the nth day”

Therefore:

days of Gen 1 are 24 hour days

Origins Debate Implications

S5

PROGRESSIVE CREATION (Day-Age Theory)

days of Gen 1 are NOT 100s of millions of years long

☛ Scientific Concordism FAILS

PARALLEL PANELS & POETIC FREEDOM

S6

point away from Gen 1 being a scientific record of actual events

☛ Scientific Concordism FAILS

Messages of Faith

S7

• There is only one God who is the Creator of the universe & life

• Affirms the Sabbath Commandment (4th Commandment)

P author casts his creation account in the Hebrew work week

7th day for resting & honouring God

• God created humanity in the **Image of God**

S8

term “Image of God” was used in ANE for kings

kings were believed to be the representatives of the gods on earth

RADICALLY TRANSFORMED in Gen 1:

ALL humans are God’s “kings” & representatives on earth

2. Genesis 2: The Creation of Adam & Eve

S2

TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION:

S3

Gen 2 offers details of the events on the 6th day in Gen 1

Adam & Eve are REAL PEOPLE that actually existed in history

most Christians accept **Scientific Concordism**

BUT

S4

differences in the order of creation events between Gen 1 & Gen 2

evidence for TWO different creation accounts

- ☛ Gen 2 does not offer details of the events on the 6th day in Gen 1
- it is an entirely different creation account

Etiology

S5

Where do humans come from?

Answer: God created them

Motif

De Novo Creation

Adam & Eve are created quick & complete

de novo creation of a 1st man & a 1st woman often found in ancient creation accounts

Genesis 2:7

S6

“The Lord God formed [*yatsar*] the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man [Adam] became a living being.”

COMMENTS:

S7

- God is like a craftsman
uses earth to make Adam
- Hebrew verb *yatsar* (to form) is the root of the term “potter”
“We [humans] are the clay, you [God] are the Potter,
we are all the work of your hand.” Is 64:8

Craftsman-Like Mechanism in ANE

S8

gods use earth to make humans → origins science-of-the-day

EPIC OF ATRAHASIS

a goddess mixes clay & blood of dead god to fashion 7 males & 7 females

ENKI & NINMAH ACCOUNT

an intoxicated god uses earth to make imperfect humans

EGYPTIAN TEMPLE IMAGE FROM DENDERA

S9 H23

god Khnum fashions humans on a potter’s wheel

goddess Isis gives life to the clay form

Author

S10

Jahwist (J) Author

- uses free-flowing narrative
- uses divine name *Yahweh* (Lord)

Author (continued)

Jahwist (J) Author

- uses word play

Hebrew *'ādām*: man, human, humankind & personal name “Adam”

'ādāmāh: earth, ground

1st *'ādām* was made from *'ādāmāh* → could be translated “earthling”

- uses allegorical features

idyllic paradise (Garden of Eden)

mystical tree with fruit that imparts eternal life

mystical tree with fruit that imparts knowledge of good & evil

S3

- uses **Archetypes** Greek *arché*: first, beginning *tipos*: type, model, example

DEF: an original type or model from which similar things/beings are patterned

EG Adam & Eve are archetypes to represent all humans

S4

☛ Adam & Eve are YOU & ME

- uses a Story/Allegory to reveal Spiritual Truths

similar to a parable

common literary technique in ANE

S5

Stylistic Differences Between Genesis 1 & 2

S6-9

	Genesis 1 (P)	Genesis 2 (J)
Literary Style	Poetic Structured & Repetitive	Narrative Free-Flowing
Allegorical Features	None	Many
Stylistic Numbers	7 & its Multiples	None
Scene Setting	Cosmic	Rural (No Sea)
Divine Name Hebrew	God <i>'Elōhîm</i>	Lord <i>Yahweh</i>
Creative Action	Verbal Commands	Hands-On
Divine Being	Transcendent & Heavenly	Immanent & Earthy
Relationship to Humans	Kingly Distant from Humans	Personal Near Humans
Food Commands	Without a Prohibition Focus on Sustenance	With a Prohibition Focus on Obedience

EVIDENCE for two *different yet complementary* original creation accounts

S10

REDACTION (under the inspiration by the Holy Spirit) results in a divine revelation that the Creator is BOTH:

Transcendent

in total control of the entire Cosmos (Gen 1)

Immanent

personally near each and every one of us (Gen 2)

Origins Debate Implication

S2

CONFLICTS in the order of creation events between Gen 1 & Gen 2 indicate some events:

DID NOT HAPPEN

- ☛ Scientific Concordism FAILS

Messages of Faith

S3

- God created humans to be relational with him

ANE:

humans are inconsequential

were created to be slaves of the gods & relieve them of their work!!!

- God created humans to be relational among themselves → Marriage

S4

- God set limits on human freedom

- Humans are accountable to God with regard to the way they behave & live their lives

3. Genesis 3: The Fall

S5

Adam & Eve sin by disobeying God and eating fruit from the forbidden tree

God judges them for their sin

Fall of Humanity

S6

sin enters the world because of Adam & Eve

- ☛ accepted as HISTORICAL by most Christians

Cosmic Fall

S7

God launches suffering & death into the world in judgment for sins of Adam & Eve

- ☛ accepted as HISTORICAL by most Christians

PHYSICAL CHANGES IN NATURE:

S8

- snake loses its legs
- birth pain increases for women
- ground/earth is cursed → thorns & thistles appear → human work becomes painful
- physical death enters the world

Etiology

S9

Where does sin come from?

Answer: Adam & Eve

Where do suffering & death come from?

Answer: God's judgment of Adam & Eve

Where do people come from?

Answer: they ALL descend from Adam & Eve

NB NB NB:

S10

understandable why most Christians believe Adam & Eve were real people

QUESTION: is there a **non-concordist hermeneutic**?

Motif

S11

Lost Idyllic Age

a something-went-wrong-in-the-world account → explains the origin of **bad things**

points back to the disruption of an original harmony in the world

negative effects of this event continue into the present

The Fall in Gen 3 → explains the origins of bad things → sin, suffering & death

Tribal Formation	S2
ALL of humanity descends from two people → 1 st man (Adam) & 1 st woman (Eve)	
Genesis 3:20	S3
“Adam named his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all the living.”	
<u>COMMENTS:</u>	S4
Monogenism Greek <i>monos</i> : one <i>genesis</i> : beginning	
DEF: ALL of humanity descends from a ONE individual	
Author	S5
J author → Gen 2 & 3 are one literary unit	
• uses word play	
name “Eve” means “life” and is similar to verb “to be”	
• uses allegorical features	S6
eating mystical fruit of forbidden tree makes Adam & Eve realize they are naked & sinful	
mystical creatures → cherubim (composite creatures like Egyptian Sphinx)	
flaming sword flashing back & forth to protect the garden	
• uses Personification	S7
DEF: attribution of human characteristics to animals & objects	
fast-talking snake who tempts Eve	
common literary technique in ANE	S8
EG <u>ETANA LEGEND</u>	
talking snake & talking eagle	
<u>DISPUTATION BETWEEN THE HOE & THE PLOW</u>	
talking hoe & talking plow	
• uses Archetypes	S9
Adam & Eve represent all sinful humans	
they not only sin, but attempt to rationalize/justify their sin → BLAME GAME!!!	
Eve <u>blames</u> the snake	
Adam <u>blames</u> Eve and then <u>BLAMES</u> GOD for putting Eve with him!!!	
☛ Adam & Eve are YOU & ME	
Origins Debate Implications	S10
<u>YOUNG EARTH CREATION</u>	
claims the Cosmic Fall is a real historical event	
IF this is true,	S11 H25
THEN suffering & death should first appear <u>WITH</u> humans in fossil record	
there needs to be a human sinner (Adam) for God to launch the Cosmic Fall	
BUT	S12 H25
Fossil Record: suffering & death appear 100s of millions of years <u>BEFORE</u> humans	
☛ Cosmic Fall NEVER HAPPENED	
☛ Scientific Concordism FAILS	S13
<u>PROGRESSIVE CREATION</u>	S14
claims Gen 3 refers to the Spiritual Death of humans	
BUT God’s judgment deals with Physical Death :	
To Adam: “For dust you are and to dust you will return” Gen 3:19	

EVOLUTIONARY CREATION

claims Gen 1-3 is **NOT** a scientific record of how God created the world

The Bible features:

(1) an ancient understanding of the **Origin of LIFE** (*De Novo* Creation)

CONSISTENCY argues that the Bible also features:

(2) an ancient understanding of the **Origin of DEATH**

Messages of Faith

S3

- Humanity's greatest problem: sin against God → NOT obeying his Commands
- Sin is serious & has consequences
- God judges humans for the sin of disobeying him

IV. CONCLUSION. GENESIS 1-3: BIBLICAL CREATION ACCOUNTS

S4

1. What is the Literary Genre of Genesis 1-3?

S5

Genesis 1-3 is an Ancient Creation Account [Incidental]

S6

inspired by the Holy Spirit to reveal inerrant Spiritual Truths [Messages of Faith]

INERRANT MESSAGES

S7

God created the universe & life (Gen 1 & 2)

God created humans in the Image of God (Gen 1)

the creation is very good (Gen 1)

humans are sinful (Gen 3)

God judges humans for their sins (Gen 3)

INCIDENTAL ANCIENT FEATURES

S8

ancient origins science

de novo creation of the universe and life

ancient phenomenological perspective of nature

perfectly logical for that time

ancient motifs

De Novo Creation, Lost Idyllic Age & Tribal Formation

ancient story/allegory

fast-talking snake, mystical trees,

ancient poetry

parallel panels

ancient methods of redaction

J & P sources

The SUGGESTION:

S9

SEPARATE DON'T CONFLATE

2. The CHALLENGE

S2

Many Christians find it very difficult to accept that God used non-historical stories in Gen 1-3

BUT

this is what ancient people did in their creation accounts in the ANE & throughout the world

REMEMBER **Parables of Jesus**

S3

☛ 1/3 of Jesus' teaching was in parables & he used non-historical stories

3. The CAUTION:

S4

DO NOT use the hermeneutics of Genesis 1-3 for the New Testament

DO NOT use the hermeneutics of the New Testament for Genesis 1-3

S5

Gen 1-3 & NT are completely different types of literature (Literary Genres)

different hermeneutical principles are needed for different types of literature

4. The BOTTOM LINE:

S6

The Bible does NOT reveal how God actually created the universe and life, including humans

Open the Book of God's Works → **Do the Science!**

MODERN ORIGINS DEBATE

I. KEY THOUGHTS	S2
1. Anti-Evolutionism is <u>common</u> in United States & Canada	S3
<u>GALLUP POLL</u> (1982-2017) conducted 13 times	S4
38-47% of Americans accept: “God created man pretty much in his present form at one time within the last 10,000 years”	
<u>ANGUS REID POLL</u> (2012)	S5
39% of Canadians reject or are uncertain that: “human beings evolved from less advanced forms over millions of years”	
2. Scientific Concordism is a central factor contributing to Anti-Evolutionism	S6
<u>ABC PRIME TIME POLL</u> (2004)	S7
87% of American Evangelicals & 51% of American Catholics believe that the 6 Days of Creation in Genesis 1 is: “literally true, meaning it happened that way word-for-word”	
3. Nearly ALL scientists today accept evolution	S8
<u>PEW SURVEY</u> (2014)	S9
98% of American scientists accept: “humans and other living things have evolved over time”	
 II. CATEGORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE & LIFE	 S10
<u>THE CHART:</u>	S11 H24
• 5 basic origins positions	
• 12 categories on left margin	S12-13 H24
• Christian bias	S14 H24
but applicable to other religions	
could add: “Spiritual but not Religious” category	S15 H24
Religious Agnostics → uncertain about the existence of God	
Scientific Agnostics → uncertain about evolution	
• Choose & Combine different categories	S16 H24
you will create your own new position!	
 <u>THE KEY CATEGORICAL CONCEPT</u>	 S17 H24
SEPARATE DON’T CONFLATE:	
(1) God’s Activity in the Origin of the Universe & Life	
Cosmological divine action in origins	
FROM	
(2) God’s Activity in the Lives of Men & Women	
Personal divine action in relationships	

1. Young Earth Creation

common understanding of the “creationist” position (aka Creation Science)

STRENGTHS

S7

- YEC best describes the view of origins of the biblical writers
- YEC is the traditional view of origins held by most Christians through most of history

WEAKNESSESScientific Issues

S8

- rejects every evolutionary science:
cosmological evolution, geological evolution & biological evolution

QUESTION

are **98%** of American scientists wrong?

- YEC Fossil Pattern Prediction

S9-10 H25

bones of every living organism should be at the bottom of the fossil record
EG humans & dinosaurs should be together

BUT fossil record does not align with YEC prediction

S11 H25

it shows an evolutionary sequence:

fish → amphibians → reptiles (→ birds) → mammals (→ whales) → humans

Hermeneutical Issues

S12

- accepts strict & literal scientific concordism in Gen 1-3

BUT

- ☛ scientific concordism → FAILS → Bible is NOT a book of science

S13-15 H26-35

EG we do not live in a 3-Tier Universe

2. Progressive Creation (Day-Age Theory)

S16-20 H24

view of origins often held by Christians who first move away from YEC

STRENGTH

S21

- PC attractive to many Christians because it aligns the Bible & science

WEAKNESSES

S22

Scientific Issues

- rejects biological evolution, but accepts cosmological & geological evolution → Inconsistent?

QUESTION

are **98%** of American scientists wrong?

- PC Fossil Pattern Prediction

S23 H25

claims living organisms appear on earth in the order they are created in Gen 1

BUT fossil record does not align with Gen 1

S24 H25

EG Bible: birds (day/age 5) appear BEFORE land animals (day/age 6)

Fossil Record: birds appear millions of years AFTER land animals

Hermeneutical Issues

S25

- claims that the days in Gen 1 are periods that are millions of years long

BUT each day ends with:

“There was evening & there was morning—the nth day”

- ☛ days of Gen 1 are 24 hr days

3. Evolutionary Creation

S2-6 H24

view of origins held by a small but growing number of conservative Christians

STRENGTH

S7

- EC accepts the Bible & accepts ALL the evolutionary sciences

WEAKNESS

S8

- conflicts with 2000 yrs of Christian tradition
 - most Christians throughout history have been:
 - (1) anti-evolutionists
 - (2) scientific concordists in Gen 1-3

Hermeneutical Solution

S9 H21

- accept Message-Incident Principle
 - statements about origins in Gen 1-3 are based on ancient origins science → INCIDENTAL
- reject scientific concordism in Gen 1-3 S10 H25
 - The Bible is not a book of science
 - ☛ cannot be used to make fossil pattern predictions

Embryology-Evolution Analogy

S11

EC believes BOTH of these natural processes:

- (1) are **Ordained & Sustained** by God
 - self-assembly** of humans in the womb
 - self-assembly** of ALL living organisms on earth

- (2) reflect Intelligent Design S12

- (3) manifest Spiritual Realities

Image of God & human sin appear in everyone during human development

Image of God & human sin entered the world during human evolution

Key Categorical Concept

S13 H24

direct challenge to the Origins Dichotomy

SEPARATE DON'T CONFLATE:

God's activity in origins

FROM

God's activity in lives of men & women

4. Deistic Evolution

S14-18 H24

deism is sometimes called "God without religion" & provides a God with no accountability to him/her

Comments

S19

- Why would this God create such personal & relational creatures like humans, and not have a relationship with them?

- Deism is intellectually attractive to some intellectuals S20

BUT fails to meet spiritual needs of most people & rarely does it transform lives

EG deism did not give birth to any church, school, hospital, etc

5. Dysteleological Evolution (Atheistic Evolution)

common understanding of the “evolutionist” position

Comments

S7

- Mass Delusion Problem?

are most people delusional because they believe in God?

EG

90% of Americans believe in “God or a universal spirit” (Pew Survey 2015)

40% of US scientists believe God answers prayer

Notes 3

- Personal & Practical Problem?

S8

who can say to someone they love:

“I love you, but in reality love is **nothing but** an evolutionary herd response”?

- Personal Problem with the 1st Commandment?

S9

nothing but a personal preference?

Summary of Chart

S10

4 “creationist” positions

S11 H24

YEC PC EC DeE

3 “evolutionist” positions

EC DeE DysE

2 positions are BOTH “creationist” & “evolutionist”

EC DeE

THEREFORE:

The Origins Dichotomy is a FALSE DICHOTOMY

Other Features:

S12 H24

5% of US & Canada accept dysteleology

2 Christian positions accept the universe is old

PC EC

2 positions reject biological evolution

S13 H24

YEC PC → **God-of-the-Gaps** interventions → SCIENTIFIC CONCORDISM in Gen 1-3

2 positions accept God created life through evolution

S14 H24

EC DeE → **Self-Assembly** of the world

3 positions accept Conservative Christianity

S15 H24

YEC PC EC

Accept:

- teleology
- intelligent design
- God created the universe & life
- personal God & divine action (dramatic & subtle)
- Bible is Word of God
- Spiritual Correspondence → inerrant Spiritual Truths
- humans created in Image of God & humans are sinful

Suggestion:

S16 H24

let origins be a **difference** between Christians & NOT a reason for a **division** between Christians

III. HUMAN ORIGINS: THE GREATEST CHALLENGE

THE BIG QUESTION:

Was Adam a real person?

The Bible & Human Origins

Genesis 2

- states Adam & Eve were created *de novo* (quick & complete)

Jesus

- refers to Adam & Eve
- quotes Gen 1:27 & Gen 2:24

MATTHEW 19:4-6

1. “Haven’t you read that at the beginning the Creator ‘made them male and female’ [Gen 1:27], and said, ‘For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh’ [Gen 2:24]? So they are no longer two, but one. Therefore what God has joined together, let man not separate.”

COMMENTS:

NOT a debate over human origins

BUT a debate over divorce

- ☛ Jesus uses Adam & Eve as **Archetypes**
they are examples of how marriage should be

Apostle Paul

- accepts a historical Adam

ROMANS 5:12, 14

2. “Just as sin **entered** the world through **one man**, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned ... Death reigned from the time of **Adam**.”

1 CORINTHIANS 15:21-22

3. “For since death came through **a man**, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a man. For as in **Adam** all die, so in Christ all will be made alive.”

COMMENTS:

REMEMBER:

Paul accepted the 3-Tier Universe (Notes 17)

KENOTIC HYMN Phil 2:10

Jesus is Lord: (1) in heaven

(2) on earth

(3) in the UNDERWORLD

THEREFORE:

- Paul accepted **ancient astronomy & ancient geography**

CONSISTENCY argues he also accepted **ancient biology**

- ☛ *de novo* creation of Adam

ANCIENT BIOLOGY of the origin of humans

- The Bible does not reveal how God created humans

Christian Tradition & Human Origins

S2

St. Augustine

S3

- often regarded as the greatest theologian in history
huge impact on Catholic & Protestant theology
- accepts Adam is historical & that ALL humans descend from him

Christian Creeds

S4

- accept Adam is historical & that ALL humans descend from him
- EG *Council of Carthage* (418) Catholic Church
Augsburg Confession (1530) Lutheran Church
Thirty-Nine Articles (1571) Anglican Church
Westminster Confession (1646) Presbyterian Church

Conclusion: The Bible & Christian Tradition on Human Origins

S5

1. Both accept **Monogenism** Greek *monos*: one *genesis*: beginning
DEF: humanity arose from ONE individual

Polygenism Greek *polus*: many

S6

DEF: humanity arose from a GROUP of individuals

2. Both accept Adam & Eve are historical

S7

QUESTION:

S8

Is Christianity based on a HISTORICAL ADAM?**IV. CATEGORIES ON HUMAN ORIGINS**

S9

1. De Novo Creation (Traditional Monogenism)

S10

Adam & Eve were created as stated in Gen 2

Adam was made from dust of ground & Eve from Adam's side

- ☛ Adam & Eve DO NOT descend from any pre-humans

Hermeneutics

accepts scientific concordism

strict literalism → Young Earth Creation

2. Evolutionary Monogenism

S11

Adam & Eve appear at the end of evolution

happens quickly at one point in time

one single pre-human male & one single pre-human female given spiritual realities

- ☛ Image of God & Moral Consciousness

the man (Adam) & woman (Eve) then sin

Hermeneutics

accepts scientific concordism

general literalism → Adam & Eve descend from two pre-human ancestors

- 3. Evolutionary Punctiliar Polygenism** Punctiliar = one sharp point in time S2
- Many Adams & many Eves appear at the end of evolution
 happens quickly at one point in time
 one group of pre-human males & one group of pre-human females given spiritual realities
- ☛ Image of God & Moral Consciousness
 ALL the men (Adams) & women (Eves) then sin
- Hermeneutics
 accepts scientific concordism
 general literalism
- 4. Evolutionary Gradual Polygenism** S3
- NO Adam/s & NO Eve/s
 over many generations, spiritual realities appear **GRADUALLY & MYSTERIOUSLY**
- ☛ Image of God & Moral Consciousness
 ALL men & women are sinful
- Embryology-Evolution Analogy S4
- manifestation of the Image of God & sinfulness occurs during BOTH natural processes
- QUESTION:
 when do we in our development begin to bear the Image of God & act sinfully?
 for many Christians this is a → MYSTERY
- Manifestation of Image of God & Sin during Human Evolution S5-6 H27
- WHEN?**
 roughly 50,000 yrs ago with **Behaviorally Modern Humans**
 buried their dead with items suggests a belief in an afterlife → **Religion**
- HOW?** S7 H27
 manifested gradually & MYSTERIOUSLY
 over an extended period of time & over many generations of individuals
- Hermeneutics S8
 rejects scientific concordism → Evolutionary Creation
 The Bible does not reveal how God created humans
- ☛ *de novo* creation of Adam → **ANCIENT BIOLOGY** of the origin of humans
- COSMOLOGICAL EVOLUTION & BIOLOGICAL EVOLUTION ANALOGY S9 H27
- NO one would add a 3-tier universe at the end of cosmological evolution S10
 NO one should add Adam/s & Eves/s at the end of biological evolution
- ☛ CONFLATES modern science & ancient science
- 5. Deistic Human Evolution** S11
 NO Adam/s & NO Eve/s
 rejects scientific concordism, the Image of God, and human sinfulness
- 6. Dysteleological Human Evolution** S12
 NO Adam/s & NO Eve/s
 rejects scientific concordism, the Image of God, and human sinfulness → **nothing but molecules**

V. HUMAN ORIGINS & AND THE TWO FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION

S2

1. Human Origins & Metaphysics-Physics Principle

S3 H28

METAPHYSICS

God created humans

God ordained, sustained, and intelligently designed the creation of humans

humans have spiritual realities: (1) Image of God (2) sinfulness

PHYSICS

S4 H28

human evolutionary sciences offer:

OVERWHELMING evidence humans evolved from pre-humans

COMPLEMENTARY Relationship between Science & Religion

S5 H28

Religion → Spiritual Truths about humans

Science → scientific facts about the origin of humans

ALSO offers hermeneutical insights:

humans were not created *de novo*

☛ scientific concordism FAILS

2. Human Origins & Message-Incident Principle

S6 H28

MESSAGE

Inerrant Spiritual Truths:

- God created humans
- humans bear the Image of God
- humans are sinful
- God judges humans for sin

INCIDENT

S7 H28

Ancient Biology

De Novo Creation of Adam → **ANCIENT BIOLOGY** of human origins

☛ God ACCOMMODATED

VI. CONCLUSION: MODERN ORIGINS DEBATE

S8

1. Hermeneutics of Genesis 1-3 is the KEY to understanding the origins debate

most Christians accept some form of **scientific concordism**

☛ central reason for their **anti-evolutionism**

2. Most Christians ASSUME human evolution is a threat to the Bible and to human dignity

S11

BUT a final thought for Christians:

S12 H27

God has evolved a creature (the chimp) which is physically almost identical to humans (about 99% of the same genes). BUT can't you see that:

WE ARE MORE THAN JUST PHYSICAL BODIES!!!

We are creators like our Creator

because we have been created in the Image of God

CONCLUSION: POSSIBLE PEACE?

	S1
1. Science & Religion Warfare Continues to Be a Common Understanding Today	S2
held by <u>both</u> religious & non-religious people	
EG Richard Dawkins:	S3
1. “Are science and religion converging? No ... Convergence? Only when it suits. To an honest judge, the alleged marriage between religion and science is a shallow, empty, spin-doctored sham.”	
	<small>“Snake Oil & Holy Water: Illogical Thinking Is the Only Thing Joining Sci. & Rel. Together” <i>Forbes ASAP</i> (4 Oct 99) 235,237</small>
QUESTION: Is Dawkins correct?	
2. Problems with Science & Religion Warfare	S4
• Dichotomies	S5
Science vs. Religion	
Evolution vs. Creation	
• Conflations	
Science & Atheism	
Religion & Young Earth Creation	
• Concordism	S6
many people <u>both</u> religious & non-religious <u>assume</u> the Bible has scientific facts	S7 H1
3. Two Foundational Principles of Science & Religion: Toward A Peaceful Relationship	S8
<u>METAPHYSICS-PHYSICS PRINCIPLE</u>	S9 H5
Charles Darwin:	S10
2. “It seems to me absurd to doubt that a man may be an ardent theist & an evolutionist ”	
☛ destroys Dichotomies & Conflations	Letter to Fordyce (1879)
<u>MESSAGE-INCIDENT PRINCIPLE</u>	S11 H5
Galileo:	S12
3. “The intention of the Holy Spirit is to teach us how one goes to heaven and not how heaven goes ”	<i>Christina [Baronio] (1615)</i>
☛ destroys Concordism	
THE KEY: Non-Concordist Hermeneutic	S13 H35
☛ God ACCOMMODATED	
4. Two Divine Books: Complementary Relationship within an Evolutionary Creation	S14-15
integration of:	S16 H29
Metaphysics-Physics Principle & Message-Incident Principle	
RECIPROCAL exchange of information between Scripture & Evolutionary Sciences	
<u>BOOK OF GOD’S WORDS</u>	S17-18 H29
reveals Inerrant Spiritual Truths:	
God created the universe & life	
the creation is ordained, sustained & reflects intelligent design	
<u>BOOK OF GOD’S WORKS</u>	
reveals Scientific Facts:	
overwhelming evidence the universe & life evolved thru a self-assembling natural process	
breath-taking evidence of nature’s beauty, complexity & functionality → ID & IDer	

THANK YOU!

S19