

The Perseverance of Pure Science *Intellectually* Depends on Reverence for God

"I have never found a better expression than 'religion' for this trust in the rational nature of reality...Where this trust is lacking science degenerates into an uninspired procedure." – Albert Einstein¹

It is doubtless that secularists will seize on the accounts of Galileo vs. the Catholic Church, as proof to the contrary that “religion” is the arch-enemy of scientific integrity and freedom. This story is indeed a spotty blot in Church history regarding science.² It exudes an exaggeration of the authority of the Church by its *insistence* on its unproved construal of Genesis. But recent former Pope, the late John Paul II, correctly (in my opinion) stated, “*There exists two realms of knowledge, one which has its source in revelation and one which reason can discover by its own power.*”³ At the same time however, just as theologians at times overstep their bounds, so un-tethered scientists can abuse their authority too.

Last night I witnessed on Fox’s *Tucker Carlson Show* the announcement, 6 days **after** Election Day, of the impending arrival of the Covid19 vaccine. A day later, Pfizer CEO Albert Boerla sold 62% of his stock at skyrocketing prices. Carlson’s criticism predictably resulted in being charged as delusional.⁴ Yet given their track record, it is certain that they would draw that the very same conclusion. Secondly, Google-owned newscasts adamantly refused to show video documentation of the ongoing nightly rioting leading to destruction of sectors of especially Democrat-governed cities. Missing in their broadcasts was any connecting of dots between the *fact* of the rioting and the Party “in charge” so to speak. Similarly, Google AND Facebook-owned outlets utterly censored the views of scientists who disagreed with the prevailing “scientific consensus” regarding to Covid19 considerations. In so doing those who call themselves champions of science were in violation of one vital principle of scientific methodology which is that every bit of available evidence be exhaustively considered prior to advancing toward valid conclusions. Fourthly, these same people tacitly allow that biological males should, if they desire, be treated as females despite their anatomical and genetic indicators, even as, fifthly, they also refer to a fetus as the mother’s body in spite of the fact of its differing blood type, genes, and sex, potentially.

Over the past months ever since Memorial Day evening, in each of the above cases, factual information that is vital for the public to know, was, in the first case *conveniently withheld temporarily* while in the 2nd and 3rd cases they were censored completely. As for cases 4 and 5, the ignorance which perpetuates them is sustained by a chronic refusal to engage with the facts. In every last case, the Left’s apparent assessment of the value of *factual* (scientific) knowledge is determined solely by its pragmatic usefulness in a self-serving way (“*Does it serve my Party’s wishes?*”), as opposed to being true in an absolute sense. Indeed, it is this distinction between absolute truth and pragmatic jockeying which I will firstly argue, is vital to the ongoing healthy existence of the investigational scientific enterprise. Secondly, I will make the case that Christian belief is essential to the well-being of science.

Effective scientific inquiry requires firstly mathematics in order to measure and quantify entities and the forces that interact between them. It also needs philosophy for framing *logical* investigative methods and valid deductive tools. Yet neither of these tools, in themselves, inspired the birth of the natural sciences. Scientific curiosity requires an understanding about its objects of study that inspire the inquirer that its pursuit is worth the study. **Prior to** the acknowledged beginning of classical science as we know it, there were, of course, numerous discoveries which advanced early technology in a general

¹ Quoted in Antony Flew. *There is a God: How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind*. (Harper One, 2007), p. 101.

² Gary Ferngren. *Science & Religion*. (Johns Hopkins, 2002), pp. 108-113

³ www.academia.edu/1055103/Could_There_BE_Another_Galileo_Case_Galileo_Augustine_and_Vatican_II, p. 12.

⁴ <https://www.thewrap.com/tucker-carlson-says-pfizer-wanted-to-hurt-trump-election-by-delaying-vaccine-news-video/>

sense. Examples include the capacity to work with metals, build steam engines, and produce gunpowder.⁵ Yet even though the prospect of practical benefits such as these, is a desirable outcome of scientific inquiry, the driving **first step** of scientific investigation is to understand nature itself in a way that differs vastly from, for example, the ancient Greek view of nature which held that nature's objects "*were a world of human artifacts with [their] qualitative forms representing inherent purposes.*" That assumption considered the actual *makeup* of the object being studied to be unimportant ("accidents")⁶ since what was most vital for the ancient Greek to know about the object studied was its inherent *form* and consequently its purpose. In stark contrast to that view is to understand the structure of the basic physical composition of natural entities (cells, atoms, minerals and rocks, living things, etc.).⁷ I for one argue that it is by *beginning* one's study of nature at this basic level, that the whole of the cosmos, either upward (the heavens) or all around us, becomes an inexhaustively exciting arena of inquiry.

Yet even more to the point of my thesis is focusing on that factor which history shows is the *reason* why "natural philosophers" (NP)⁸ rejected the above view of nature and turned to analyzing its *fundamental* makeup instead. The word "*unimportant*" that I employed earlier actually understates what was indeed a *negative* appraisal of matter. Apart from the Bible's estimation, all other ancient cosmogonies⁹ regarded the stuff of nature as innately irrational, impure, and chaotic. Such qualities plainly discourage examination! It is for this reason that *modern* science began in a Bible-affirming culture instead. I highlight this source; not to imply an intellectually superior on the part of Bible-believers, but instead to point out that it is the premise which serves as the springboard from which the question of whether to pursue an investigation into nature is assessed. In contrast to pagan cosmology in general, the Bible teaches that God alone, who stands outside of (transcends) nature, created the universe out of nothing.¹⁰ and also that He judged his creation to be "*very good!*"¹¹ This stark contrast of worldviews clarifies why science began where it did. Even contemporary atheism, apart from what theism-inspired science has already taught us (remember its' roots!), likewise offers no rational grounds for breaking away from pagan presumptions. Historically speaking, science has Christian roots.

To substantiate that the *birth* of science is *rooted* in Christian belief,¹² obviously doesn't logically prove that secularists must, solely by its disbelief in God, wander from scientific method that the scientific enterprise has instilled. Yet there are at least two further factors which, though they aren't derived *from* research as scientific *conclusions*, are essential for both arriving at them validly and putting their ramifications into practice. Firstly, insights from the biblical doctrine of human sin and the philosophical reality of our finitude, entail the rationale for submitting research to the strictures of scientific methodology. Secondly the concept of truth, which has two prongs, is essential to doing legitimate science. Yet though truth is an essential *tool* of science, it is both a philosophical and religious concept.

Rev. Gary Jensen © January 11, 2020

Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA

MDiv degree from Luther/Northwestern Theological Seminary and MA degree in "Science and Religion" with Honors from BIOLA University

⁵ Smithsonian. *Science Year by Year*. (Penguin/Random House, 2017),

⁶ That perception sought for inherent purposes that were evident in the shapes of the objects, like sharp edges implying the purpose of a knife or a bowl-ish shape indicating that one is to drink from it. (Langdon Gilkey. *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. (Doubleday, 1959), pp. 111-13).

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ William Whewell...

⁹ "Cosmogony:" cosmos/generate. A cosmogony is a potential accounting of the beginning of the cosmos.

¹⁰ Genesis 1:1

¹¹ Genesis 1:31

¹² Rodney Stark. *For the Glory of God: How Monotheism Led to Reformations, Science, Witch-hunts, and the End of Slavery*. (Princeton, 2003), pp. 148-9 where he quotes from ** Alfred North Whitehead. *Science and the Modern World*, (The Free Press, 1967), p. 13.