Understanding and Resolving the Alleged Conflict Between Science and Religion

By John Feakes, JF-M-525

The tremendous importance of both science and religion is undeniable. Virtually everyone recognizes that the knowledge gained through scientific investigation has led to greater understanding of how the world works, and that this in turn has led to a plethora of societal benefits. Scientific investigation and discovery are directly responsible for lengthening the average human lifespan and for making life much more prosperous and enjoyable than it otherwise might have been. With respect to the authority exercised by the scientific establishment in the Western world, Roger Jones observed that:

> In a sense, science has taken over the role of state religion in modern culture, and it has become a very influential religion at that. Who can deny that the scientific establishment has become a modern priesthood? The pronouncements of scientists are respected and accepted by today's public just as the doctrines of the church fathers were respected and accepted by people a thousand years ago. . . . If anything, modern science incurs far less challenge and criticism than the church ever did. The church fathers would have given their eyeteeth to command for medieval Catholicism the kind of obedience and blind faith that we freely lavish on science today.[1]

Nevertheless, religion, which is often portrayed as being aligned against science, remains at least as significant. Numerous "mega-churches" with memberships numbering in the thousands can be found throughout Canada and the U.S. Countless smaller churches, temples, synagogues and mosques thrive in cities across the developed world. Timothy Keller observed that "virtually all major religions are growing in number of adherents. Christianity's growth, especially in the developing world, has been explosive."[2]

---

[1]Roger S. Jones, *Physics for the Rest of Us: Ten Basic ideas of Physics That Everyone Should Know...And How They Have Shaped Our Culture and Consciousness*, (Contemporary Books, 1992), pp. 134-135.

[2]Timothy Keller, *The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism* (New York: NY, Dutton, 2008), p. 5.

Numerous websites as well as local and national television and radio news programs all feel obliged to report on, and in many cases provide commentary about, the election of a new pope or other development impacting those who exercise religious faith. Keller further notes that,

> Because of the vitality of religious faith in the world, efforts to suppress or control it often serve only to make it stronger. . . . Religion is not just a temporary thing that helped us adapt to our environment. Rather it is a permanent and central aspect of the human condition. This is a bitter pill for secular, nonreligious people to swallow. Everyone wants to think that they are in the mainstream, that they are not extremists. But robust religious beliefs dominate the world. There is no reason to expect that to change.[3]

Clearly, both science and religion occupy a tremendously important place in the world, particularly in Western culture. A proper understanding of relationship between the two, however, has proven difficult. This is largely due to the fact that both terms, *science* and *religion*, have become so incrusted with layers of popular meaning that their standard definitions have become obscured. Obviously these terms must be properly defined and these definitions must be consistently applied before the relationship between science and religion can be understood. The word *Science* is derived from the Latin *scientia*, which simply means "knowledge."[4] The Webster's New World Dictionary expands on this, defining science as "systematized knowledge derived from observation." The Oxford Dictionary's definition is even more precise: "[Science is] a branch of study which is concerned either with a connected body of demonstrated truths or with observed facts systematically classified and more or less being brought under general laws, and which includes trustworthy methods for the discovery of new truth within its own domain."

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 5-6

[4] Henry M. Morris, *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 302.

Religion on the other hand, is a much more nebulous term, permitting a wide range of definitions, many of which appear only loosely related if at all.[5] Winfried Corduan's definition of a religion is arguably the most helpful. On his view, "a religion is a system of beliefs and practices that by means of a cultus directs a person toward transcendence and thus provides meaning and coherence to a person's life."[6] This definition encompasses the most popular conceptions of religion, as well as the generally shared intuitions on the subject. To hold to a religion, as Corduan defines the term, does not necessarily entail antipathy toward the scientific method. It is certainly possible to hold a religious worldview and, without contradiction, be generally affirming of the methods and conclusions of modern science.

As noted earlier, science is about knowledge. As a verb, science is a particular method employed for acquiring particular types of knowledge. To understand the relationship between religion and science therefore, one must endeavour to understand something of the nature knowledge itself. Virtually all theorists agree that true belief is a necessary condition of knowledge. Though it was once popularly thought that justification added to true believe created the necessary and sufficient conditions for knowledge, various counterexamples have called this view into question.[7] The causal theory holds that knowledge consists of true belief that has an appropriate causal connection to the fact in question. Reliability theories, on the other hand, maintain that a

---

[5] *The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions* (New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. xv.

[6] Winfried Corduan, *Neighboring Faiths: A Christian Introduction to World Religions, 2nd Ed.* (InterVarsity Press, 2012), p.28.

[7] Alvin Goldman, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy, New Edition*, Ed. Ted Honderich, s.v. "Knowledge" (New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2005), p. 478.

person knows only if their true belief was acquired by a reliable process or method.[8] Epistemologists often look to theories of knowledge to settle the problem of scepticism, but, as Alvin Golden notes, "how easy this problem can be settled is questionable."[9] One theory states that a person knows something only if he discriminates it from relevant alternatives. Of course the anti-sceptic sees some alternatives within the pool of bare possibility as more relevant than others. For the sceptic, however, every logically possible alternative may be equally relevant. Goldman ends his study of knowledge by asking several profound questions, which secularist thought seems incapable of answering:

> Who is right in this dispute and is there a determinate answer? This raises methodological issues about the theory of knowledge. Is it a theory of some evaluator-independent 'stuff,' on the model of the chemical theory of water? Or is it a theory of human concepts and their deployment? On the former approach, there should always be a fact about whether someone knows, but why should our ordinary judgements be reliable guides to such facts? On the latter approach, knowledge may be a very fuzzy concept that has determinate applications only when certain parameters are set, and these parameters can legitimately be set either to the sceptic's or to the anti-sceptic's taste.[10]

Clearly, all reasoning, even reasoning about knowledge itself, must begin with an appropriate faith commitment. In other words, a person must have certain metaphysical faith commitments in place before they can begin working out there epistemology. Of course those methods that confirm one's particular metaphysical commitments will no doubt be judged reliable, but the circularity in this line of reasoning is obvious. It seems inescapably true that one's ultimate metaphysical presuppositions are largely immune to

---

[8] Ibid., p. 479.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

falsification or justification; they form an interpretive framework—the lens through which all the data are interrelated and interpreted.

Similarly, certain faith commitments must be made before one can justifiably reckon the scientific method a reliable arbiter of truth. First, one must assume that the external world actually exists. Because the external world is not necessary but contingent, its non-existence is possible. For the sceptically minded, this possibility is just as significant as its opposite. The external world's existence cannot be proven empirically or logically. It simply must be assumed on the basis of experience. This assumption, however, is highly questionable on naturalistic metaphysical theories, particularly the multi-verse hypothesis (MVH). On this view, innumerable universes have bubbled into existence, each randomly ordered with its own unique set of physical qualities, quantities, and parameters. Given such a scenario, it is possible that the brain that is contemplating these things is all that has fluctuated into being. To the extent that one sees the MVH as a plausible theory, the actual existence of the external world must remain uncertain at best. One cannot even say that the external world probably exists, because probabilities are generated on the assumption that natural processes continue to unfold in a generally uniform way. Obviously this is simply begging the question; it assumes the very thing in dispute, namely, that the external world actually exists.

Secondly, one must assume that contingency, being real and not imagined, may be studied in order to gain legitimate knowledge about the world. For many ancient Greek thinkers, true reality consisted of unchanging, non-material forms. For philosophers who held to this view, order was rationalistic and not material. Thus actual scientific investigation was not seen as a reliable method of genuine knowledge

acquisition. Thirdly, one must assume the general reliability of both sense data and memory. Fourthly, the scientific method requires the assumption that past cases are a reliable guide to future or unobserved cases. In other words, one must presuppose the law-like regularity of natural processes. Without this presupposition, the practice of drawing general conclusions from specific instances, which lay at the heart of the scientific enterprise, is entirely without justification.

Fifthly, because any conclusion drawn from observed phenomena must presuppose the existence of a universal and prescriptive standard of reason, science must assume the validity and applicability of the laws of logic to the physical world. Sixthly, in order to engage in the scientific enterprise one must believe that the physical world is capable of mathematical idealization. Ian Stewart explains that:

> Science is our most successful method for understanding the natural world. The development of science, and that of mathematics, have gone hand in hand for about five hundred years. Newton invented calculus to understand the movements of the planets. Independently, Gottfried Leibniz developed much the same ideas for purely intellectual reasons. These two sources of mathematical inspiration can be roughly characterized as 'applied' and 'pure' mathematics. The differences are motivation and attitude, rather than content.[11]

As with the laws of logic, the crucial question is how mathematics, which is abstract, universal, invariant, and prescriptive in character, can meaningfully describe the particular, transient physical phenomena that attend the actual world.

Seventhly, one must presuppose the actual existence of both unity and diversity. If unity did not actually exist, predication, and therefore knowledge acquisition, would be impossible. Similarly, if there were no diversity there would be no legitimate particular study. Scientific investigation requires the existence of both.

---

[11]Ian Stewart, "Behind the Scenes: The Hidden Mathematics That Rules Our World," *Seeing Further: The Story of Science and the Royal Society* (Doubleday, 2010) p. 282.

The above seven assumptions—the existence of the external word, contingency, the reliability of sense data, the validity and applicability of induction, the laws of logic, and mathematics, and the actual existence of unity and diversity—are not themselves derived from scientific investigation. Rather, they must be simply presupposed as part of an overall worldview. Worldviews (even "religious" ones) in which these assumptions are affirmed have at least some rational justification for engaging in scientific investigation. Secular Humanism, Baha'ism, and some forms of Buddhism for instance, fully accept the methods and conclusions of modern science. If such religious worldviews are to be rejected, it must be due to some deficiency other than being outwardly antithetical to science. The crucial task in adjudicating between worldviews is to determine *which has the necessary metaphysical and explanatory resources to account not only for science, but also for the rational standards according to which competing worldviews are to be evaluated.* Christianity appears to meet these criteria.

On Christian Theism, God created the world (Genesis 1:1) and equipped mankind with the rational and cognitive faculties sufficient to understand it (Psalm 94:8-10; Proverbs 20:12). God guarantees the general uniformity of natural processes (Genesis 8:22), and endorses inductive reasoning (Luke 12:54-57). Christ alone, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Colossians 2:3), informs the mind of man with the knowledge of universals (e.g., parallel, equality, numbers and mathematics) in order for predication, rational deliberation, communication, and mathematical idealization to take place (Job 38:36). Furthermore, God's dominion mandate virtually necessitates that man engage in legitimate scientific research (Genesis 1:26-28; Psalm 8:6). God's moral law obligates man to tell the truth (Leviticus 19:11; Zechariah 8:16;

Ephesians 4:25; Colossians 3:9), and obedience to this moral imperative would guarantee that experimental results are reported honestly. Such honesty in reporting is essential to the progress of science. Not only does Christianity encourage scientific investigation, it provides the necessary metaphysical preconditions for doing so. This is precisely why it was Christian thinkers who founded the modern scientific enterprise. Dan Graves explains:

> Like the Jews, Christians believe that God has provided two revelations: Scripture and nature. Since both come from the same source, they must be reconcilable. But scientifically minded Christians went a step further. It was they who first attempted to synthesize all knowledge into a unified whole, setting the stage for later minds who would establish self-replicating science, that is, a methodology for building on prior discoveries to systematically and effectively make new discoveries. Christian theologians first constructed the basis on which modern science has subsequently built.[12]

Alfred North Whitehead noted that "There can be no living science unless there is a widespread instinctive conviction in the existence in an *Orderer of Things*, and in particular, and *Orderer of Nature*." According to Whitehead, confidence in this proposition was inspired by the "medieval insistence upon the rationality of God."[13] "It is surely one of the curious paradoxes of history," notes Loren Eiseley, "that science, which professionally has little to do with faith, owes its origins to an act of faith that the universe can be rationally interpreted, and that science today is sustained by that

---

[12]Dan Graves, *Scientists of Faith: Forty-Eight Biographies of Historic Scientists and Their Christian Faith* (Grand Rapids: MI, Kregel Resources, 1996), p. 11.

[13] Alfred North Whitehead, *Science in the Modern World,* as quoted by Stephen C Meyer, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 2009), p. 142.

assumption."[14] Any claimed antipathy between Christianity and science is more than unsubstantiated; it is patently false.

Despite their strenuous endorsement of modern science, Christianity's competitors do not have the requisite metaphysical resources to account for the scientific enterprise. Secular Humanism, for instance, claims that science is a reliable, perhaps the most reliable, avenue to truth. Nevertheless, the Secular Humanist view of the universe as random, accidental, and meaningless[15] would make chance ultimate, thereby casting all of the requisite presuppositions for scientific inquiry into serious question. After all, if chance is ultimate, literally anything may have happened in the past, may be happening now, or may happen in the future. It is obviously contradictory to claim that meaningful information can be gained from that which is essentially meaningless. Secularism not only affirms that the universe is ultimately meaningless, but that the mind of man, which has reached this conclusion, was not developed under the pressure of discovering scientific truth.[16] On the secularist view then, scientific investigation is a reliable way for a person to gain meaningful information about the world, even though the world is ultimately meaningless and the person engaging in the scientific enterprise has a mind whose proficiency at arriving at true conclusions is in serious question.[17] These types of

---

[14] Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century: Evolution and the Men Who Discovered It* (Anchor, NY: Doubleday, 1961), as quoted by Jonathon Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1999), p.25.

[15] Jones, p. 131.

[16] Steven Pinker, as quoted by Mario Beauregard and Denyse O' Leary, *The Spiritual Brain* (San Francisco, CA: Harper Perennial, 2007), p. 122.

[17] Patricia S. Churchland, "Epistemology in the Age of Neuroscience," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (October 1987): 548.

invalidating systemic contradictions attend not just Secularism, but all non-Christian worldviews.

As noted earlier, because *science* and *religion* are often not defined correctly, their relationship is frequently misunderstood. This definitional problem, particularly with respect to science, is, in at least some cases, almost certainly intentional. Because science in Western culture has become indivisibly associated with progress, discovery, achievement, luxury, and longevity, there is a strong incentive to describe one's own worldview as "scientific." The implication, of course, is that competing worldviews are, to one extent or other, *anti*-scientific. Though this approach is present in the apologetic strategies of Hinduism,[18] Buddhism,[19] and Baha'ism,[20] it is Secular Humanism that has by far made the greatest use of it.

On popular Secular Humanist philosophy, the whole of reality is reducible to space, time, matter, and energy, [21] the actions of which are wholly determined by the laws of physics and chemistry.[22] Thus, Secular Humanism rules out, *a priori*, any possibility of divine action in the world. To explain the present world the secularist appeals exclusively to what he refers to as *natural processes.* As noted earlier, science must assume a general uniformity of natural process, which is an assumption justified only by a faith

---

[18] Stephen Cross, *the elements of Hinduism* (Rockport, MA: Element Books Inc., 1994), p. 5.

[19] Kogen Mizuno, *Basic Buddhist Concepts* (Tokyo: Kosei Publishing, 1987).

[20] The Offical Website of the Baha'i Community of Canada, http://www.ca.bahai.org/teachings#science-and-religion (Accessed September 26, 2014).

[21] Greg Graffin and Steve Olson, *Anarchy Evolution: Faith, Science and Bad Religion in a World Without God* (New York, NY: Harper Perennial, 2010), p. 6

[22] Bertrand Russell, *Why I Am Not a Christian* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1957), pp. 48-50.

commitment to the Christian God. Not only does the secularist not have a reason for assuming the uniformity of natural process (the very heart of the inductive principle), he moves on to adopt a strict *uniformatarianism* as his overriding methodological principle. The secularist argues strenuously that the only valid conclusions to be drawn regarding the origin and development of the universe are those that are based on empirical investigation as interpreted through this uniformatarian lens. The fact that this assertion itself is not based on any empirical investigation seems to escape the secularist's notice.

Despite Secular Humanism's obvious philosophical deficiencies, its aggressive public relations campaign has convinced multitudes of people that its own creation myth, the evolution story, *is* science:

> Charles Darwin has rightly been described as the 'Newton of biology'; he did more than any single individual before or since to change man's attitude to the phenomena of life and to provide a coherent scientific framework of ideas for biology, in place of an approach in large part compounded of hearsay, myth and superstition. He rendered evolution inescapable as a fact, comprehensible as a process, all-embracing as a concept.[23]

Evolutionary philosophy is not limited to biology. "The evolutionary basis is also apparent in peripheral independent fields such as chemistry, geology, physics and astronomy. No central scientific concept is more firmly established in our thinking, our methods, and our interpretations, than that of evolution."[24] Pierre Teilhard De Chardin stated that evolution, "is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforth bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and

---

[23]Julian Huxley, "The Emergence of Darwinism," *The Evolution of Life*, vol. 1 of *Evolution After Darwin* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 1.

[24]Stanley D. Beck, "Natural Science and Creationist Theology," *Bioscience* 32 (October, 1982):738.

true. Evolution is a light which illuminates all facts, a trajectory which all lines of thought must follow."[25] According to Huxley, "The whole of reality is evolution—a single process of self-transformation."[26] Richard Dawkins dogmatically asserts that:

> Evolution is a fact. Beyond reasonable doubt, beyond serious doubt, beyond sane, informed, intelligent doubt, beyond doubt evolution is a fact. The evidence for evolution is at least as strong as the evidence for the Holocaust, even allowing for eyewitnesses of the Holocaust. . . .Evolution is a fact . . . No reputable scientist disputes it . . .[27]

Dawkins's claims are pure bluster. They represent his own particular faith commitment, which he is entitled to have, of course. However, when he states that no reasonable, sane, informed, intelligent, or reputable person doubts evolution, he is being arbitrary, and arbitrariness is a cardinal sin in philosophy. Dawkins's own particular criterion for reasonableness, saneness, intelligence, or reputability among scientists is their allegiance to the evolution story. Given this arbitrary criterion, it is little wonder that he sees no reasonable, sane, intelligent or reputable person doubting evolution. The problem with arbitrary claims, which Dawkins apparently fails to appreciate, is that they are reversible. That is, one could just as easily state that no reasonable, sane, intelligent, or reputable scientist believes in the evolution story. Once again, the stalemate is most effectively broken by asking which worldview, the Christian or the secularist, can make sense out of reasonableness, sanity, or intelligence in the first place. The secularist worldview seems hopelessly inadequate. There is no way imaginable how mere molecules in motion could produce universal, non-material, prescriptive laws. The laws of nature, logic, and

---

[25]Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, as quoted in Morris, p. 106.

[26] Julian Huxley, "Evolution and Genetics," *What is Science?* J. R. Newman, ed. (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 278.

[27] Richard Dawkins, *The Greatest Show in Earth: The Evidence for Evolution* (New York, NY: Free Press, 2009), pp. 8-9.

mathematics, which form the very foundation of the scientific enterprise, are only accounted for by the God of Christian theism.

Even if one chooses to focus only on the scientific evidence (leaving the question of what accounts for science aside), one is still confronted with an avalanche of data that makes Christian theism much more probably true than its negation. For instance, most scientists and philosophers agree that the universe's history does not extend infinitely into the past, but had a beginning a finite time ago.[28] This agrees with the biblical doctrine of creation ex nihilo (Genesis 1:1; Hebrews 11:3). Physical problems attend all naturalistic theories of stellar and planetary evolution.[29] Conversely, the planetary magnetic field strengths were accurately predicted based on the biblical teaching of a sudden creation less than 10,000 years ago.[30] Various worldwide physical process rates indicate a start date of far less than the billions of years called for by the evolution story. These include the rate of comet depletion in the solar system,[31] lunar recession,[32] earth's decaying magnetic field,[33] the erosion of the continents,[34] the accumulation of various sediments

---

[28]Alexander Vilenkin, *Many Worlds in One* (New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2006) p. 176.

[29]Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1999), p. 93-97.

[30]Russell Humphreys's predictions were first published in *CRS Quarterly*, Volume 21, Number 3 (December 1984). He wrote about the accuracy of those predictions in *Creation* 13(4):44-48, September 1991

[31]Denis R. Peterson, *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation*, (Alachuna, FL: Denis R. Peterson, 2002), p. 48

[32]Vance Ferrell, *Science vs. Evolution*, (Altamont, TN: Evolution Facts Inc., 2006), p. 135.

[33]Sarfati, p. 115.

[34]Harold Coffin, *Origin by Design* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983), pp. 335-336.

and metals in the world's oceans,[35] and the accumulation of helium in the earth's atmosphere.[36] The geological features of the earth's surface are likewise better interpreted as the product of the worldwide flood (Genesis 6-9) than slow, uniform processes. Sedimentary rock layers, which are remarkably pure and showing little sign of erosion over thousands of miles,[37] polystrata fossils,[38] surface features (raindrops, footprints, ripple marks) within the strata,[39] soft sediment deformation,[40] and fossil graveyards,[41] are all congruent with the flood account. The irreducible complexity found within the molecular machines present in even the "simplest" living things utterly defies naturalistic explanation.[42] There is no known naturalistic process that can create the kind of information-rich storage and retrieval systems found in living things. The only known mechanism for creating such systems is intelligent agency. These two facts not only help to make intelligent design a bona-fide scientific theory, but the best explanation by far for the origin of life.[43]

---

[35] Henry Morris, pp. 477-479.

[36] John D. Morris, *The Geology Book* (Green Forest, AR: 2000), p. 57.

[37] Ferrell, pp. 606-607.

[38] Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* (Toronto, ON: TFE Publishing, 1984), p. 114.

[39] Henry Morris, pp. 324-326.

[40] John Morris, pp. 44-46.

[41] Taylor, pp. 90-92.

[42] Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box* (New York, NY: Touchstone, 1998), pp. 172-173.

[43] Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 2009), p. 438.

Holding to Darwinism as a presupposition rather than a conclusion based on empirical investigation, the evolutionist routinely manufactures creative "rescuing devices" in order to harmonize the data with the evolution story. They typically respond with several lines of evidence of their own, which supposedly prove evolution beyond reasonable doubt. The fossil record, anatomic similarities between species, micro-evolutionary changes within species, evidence of poor design, and vestigial organs appear in virtually every apologetic for evolution.[44]

Fossils cannot be considered independent evidence for evolution, rather, the evolution story is superimposed upon the fossils; lines of ancestry are drawn between fossil and living forms on the *assumption* that evolution has occurred. The argument is obviously circular, as even secularists themselves have observed.[45] The fact that common anatomical features between species are often controlled by different genes[46] and follow different developmental pathways[47] is better interpreted as evidence of a common designer rather than common ancestry. The micro changes observed in species is due to genetic recombination rather than information-generating mutations. Darwinian processes seem hopelessly inadequate to account for large-scale evolutionary change.[48] The

---

[44] For instance, Jerry Coyne, *Why Evolution is True* (New York, NY: Viking, 2009).

[45] Tom Kemp, "A Fresh Look at the Fossil Record," *New Scientist* Vol. 108, Dec 5, 1985, p. 67.

[46] Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (London: Brunett Books,1986), p.149.

[47] Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution 2* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2002), pp. 109-111.

[48] Michael Behe, *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism* (New York, NY: Free Press, 2007).

arguments from poor design and vestigial organs are conspicuous for their unscientific, indeed, *anti*-scientific character. The former assumes a particular kind of God and then proceeds to argue that that kind of God would never design certain anatomic features seen in the world. Cornelius G. Hunter explains that these *theological* assumptions form the basis of the Darwinian paradigm. [49] The latter argues that because the function of a particular anatomic feature is presently unknown, it must be the result of unintelligent causes, which "cobbled" living things together in random, and in some cases, wasteful and bizarre fashion. Those holding this view have been tempted to stop looking for the function of certain anatomic features. On the other hand, those guided by the presupposition that God designed living things are encouraged to continue the scientific search. Again, it is Christianity that accounts for and encourages the scientific enterprise, while Darwinism, unable to do either, instead hinders scientific progress.

In conclusion, religion provides the only known conceptual framework in which science can flourish. That is to say, only by presupposing *Christian theism* does one have an appropriate foundation for engaging in the scientific enterprise. Even if one chooses to proceed with scientific investigation whilst ignoring its theistic foundation, the conclusions fairly and honestly drawn will necessarily falsify anti-Christian cosmogonies and cosmologies. In this way, science is not only justified by religious faith, but can establish criteria by which religious claims may be confirmed or falsified.

---

[49] Cornelius G. Hunter, *Darwin's Proof: The Triumph of Religion Over Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2003).

Bibliography

Beauregard, Mario and O' Leary, Denyse. *The Spiritual Brain*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Perennial, 2007.

Beck, Stanley D. "Natural Science and Creationist Theology," *Bioscience* 32 (October, 1982).

Behe, Michael J. *Darwin's Black Box*. New York, NY: Touchstone, 1998.

Behe, Michael J. *The Edge of Evolution*: *The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. New York, NY: Free Press, 2007.

Churchland, Patricia S. "Epistemology in the Age of Neuroscience," *Journal of Philosophy* 84 (October 1987).

Coffin, Harold. *Origin by Design*. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983.

Corduan, Winfried *Neighboring Faiths: A Christian Introduction to World Religions, 2nd Ed.* InterVarsity Press, 2012.

Coyne, Jerry. *Why Evolution is True*. New York, NY: Viking, 2009.

Cross, Stephen. *the elements of Hinduism.* Rockport, MA: Element Books Inc., 1994.

Denton, Michael *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. London: Brunett Books.1986.

Dawkins, Richard. *The Greatest Show in Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*. New York, NY: Free Press, 2009.

Evolution After Darwin. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Ferrell, Vance. *Science vs. Evolution*. Altamont, TN: Evolution Facts Inc., 2006.

Goldman, Alvin. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy, New Edition*, Ed. Ted Honderich. New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2005.

Graffin, Greg and Olson,Steve. *Anarchy Evolution: Faith, Science and Bad Religion in a World Without God*. Harper Perennial, 2010.

Graves,Dan. *Scientists of Faith: Forty-Eight Biographies of Historic Scientists and Their Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids: MI, Kregel Resources, 1996.

Humphreys, Russell. *CRS Quarterly*, Volume 21, Number 3 (December 1984).

_____. *Creation* 13(4):44-48, September 1991.

Jones, Roger S. *Physics for the Rest of Us: Ten Basic ideas of Physics That Everyone Should Know...And How They Have Shaped Our Culture and Consciousness*. Contemporary Books, 1992.

Keller, Timothy. The *Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism*. New York: NY, Dutton, 2008.

Kemp, Tom "A Fresh Look at the Fossil Record," *New Scientist* Vol. 108, Dec 5, 1985.

Meyer, Stephen C. *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design.* New York, NY: Harper Collins, 2009.

Mizuno, Kogen. *Basic Buddhist Concepts*. Tokyo: Kosei Publishing, 1987

Morris, Henry M. *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.

Morris, John D. *The Geology Book*. Green Forest, AR: 2000.

Peterson, Denis R. *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation*. Alachuna, FL: Denis R. Peterson, 2002.

Russell, Bertrand. *Why I Am Not a Christian*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

Sarfati, Jonathon. *Refuting Evolution*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1999.

_____. *Refuting Evolution 2*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2002.

Stewart, Ian "Behind the Scenes: The Hidden Mathematics That Rules Our World," *Seeing Further: The Story of Science and the Royal Society*. Doubleday, 2010.

Taylor, Ian. *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order*. Toronto, ON: TFE Publishing, 1984.

The Offical Website of the Baha'i Community of Canada, http://www.ca.bahai.org/teachings#science-and-religion (Accessed September 26, 2014).

The Oxford Dictionary of World Religions. New York: NY: Oxford University Press, 1997.

What is Science? J. R. Newman, ed. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1955.

Vilenkin, Alexander. *Many Worlds in One* .New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2006.