

## QUESTION 6: HASN'T SCIENCE DISPROVED THE BIBLE & CHRISTIANITY?

### *Motivation:*

Try to get at the motivation and thinking behind the question. What heart-issues might be underlying this question? Serious questioning, or seeking argument?

### *Possible Responses / Questions:*

- Why do you ask that? Can you explain why you are considering that question?
- Can you tell me how science speaks as such?
- Can you tell me where you learned that?
- Are you open to hearing some evidence to the contrary?
- Can you think of a question that science doesn't answer?
- Do you yourself have a faith background?
- Are there certain things related to faith that you find hard to believe? And why is that?
- Have they ever investigated the claims of say, design versus random chance and evolution?
- "Would you consider the possibility of a designer behind all of the things that we see around us (e.g. life, creation, the world and cosmos)?"
- "Would you allow me a moment to share my foundational thinking on which I base my belief system and my response?"

### *Key Points:*

- ✓ Science is limited and cannot address purpose and values.
- ✓ Miracles: some refuse to believe in any miracles whatsoever. The existence of God, creation, His workings in history including the resurrection and life changes in people are evident (Romans 1) but some minds are closed to that truth.
- ✓ Suggested ask for them to *begin* to consider that there might be something out there beyond what they currently accept e.g. a Designer, and Creator.

### *Scriptures*

- God Creator, Uniqueness of Man in God's image [Gen. 1]
- Value: We are precious before God [Psalm 139]; Son to die for us [Rom. 5:10].
- Purpose/Value: Without God, there is no purpose. [John 10:10].
- Accomplishment: Mankind's achievements, vs. true satisfaction [Mark 8:36-37]
- "(W)hat does it benefit a person to gain the whole world, and forfeit his soul?"

*Additional Notes:*

Personal Thought:

I love science. The more we learn, the more is revealed about the amazingness of God as Creator. His glory only grows as we learn – i.e. if we *give* Him the glory. But many steal His glory and assign it elsewhere.

- Some say that science replaces religion.
- **Hawking** stated: “*Science can answer every question.*”
- But science is limited. Science can’t answer the “why”.
- Peter Medawar (*a committed atheist*) asked in **The Limits of Science** (Oxford University Press, 1988, p. 59 :
  - “*How did everything begin?*”
  - *What are we all here for?*
  - *What is the point of living?*” (purpose, meaning)
- Gus Speth, an agnostic who served under Barak Obama re: environmental concerns came to the conclusion that years of science to address the problem would not solve the issue, while the true issue was and is “. . . *selfishness, greed and apathy*” for which science has no solution, noting that “*we need a cultural and spiritual transformation*” and “*we scientists don’t know how to do that*”.

*Word of Encouragement / Invitation:*

- Greatest problem is in the human heart with its “brokenness” issues. God made us to be like Him (image) and to be in relationship with Him. Value is derived therein. But most often we want to *be* God and in charge and rule our lives.
- We know *about* the world through science, but how does one answer the questions, “Why we are here?” and, “What life is for?”
- Get to know that *there is* a designer, and get to *know* the designer.
- My hope is that all would discover the incredible opportunity of what a relationship with God looks like, and that God freely offers it to all. In that relationship, one can find true value, meaning, and purpose.

### *Case Studies:*

Evolution and a Phylogenic Tree: [Genesis 1](#) - 'created after their own kind' speaks to a non-evolutionary explanation for different animals; no intermediary "linking" fossils that bridge development between species have been found as Darwin had predicted there would be.

### Molecular Complexity

DNA and its length and complexity. Mutations usually destroy the recipient and it takes few to cause such destruction. Science continues to find out how more and more complex gene pairs are and how they function e.g. on/off controls. This is not the simplistic model proposed by Darwin.

Irreducible Complexity thwarts claims of 'step by step' evolution. E.g. the 'flagellar motor' requires some thirty plus parts to be present instantly to make the unit functional; evolution would preclude the development of such a 'motor' or so many other complex 'systems' that we observe.

### Darwin's Finches

Quite popular and oft cited are the changed beak shapes of Darwin's finches due to changes in environmental conditions, *but* many don't know that ten years later, further observation of the finch beaks showed that their beaks had returned to their original shape. Suggestion is that the genetics for said variation were, and remain present as designed within the DNA genetic code of the finches for adaption to changing conditions as required.

### *Assumptions*

Science claims to rely on observable and evidence (and that faith works without any evidence) but science ignores that claim when relying on

- 1) evolution (a theory) and for instance, and
- 2) treatment of carbon dating as a 'law' – while there have been enough mistaken dating readings to make it unreliable as a 'law'

Miracles don't fit 'science' but can we conclude from the surrounding evidence that they do occur? Can we infer that there must be a designer, maker, creator of what we see today? It can be agreed that faith is required, but the intellectual choice to *not see* a designer behind what we observe can be considered by some to be 'intellectually bankrupt.'