

“The History of the Relationship Between Science and Theism”

(A Christian Perspective)

Holland Professional Club

October 12, 2012

(Slide-Title Slide)

Tonight I would like to discuss, which for some, is a rather contentious subject, the relationship of science and theism. I will review their historical relationship over the past 15 centuries or 1500 years. My science perspective will involve astronomy, geology, and biological evolution.

My theism perspective will come primarily from my Christian faith background. But most of the alleged conflicts between faith and science have to do with theism; belief in whether there is such a person as God, rather than the doctrines that separate Christian beliefs from other religions such as Judaism and Islam. What I discuss, therefore, will apply to the other monotheisms as well as to Christianity. Therefore I hope my discussion will be appropriate for this secular organization.

(Slide-John Calvin)

There is an age old adage that says: “There are no atheists in foxholes.” And John Calvin, the great reformation theologian of the 16th century coined the term “sensus divinitatis” referring to the innate sense of the divine that he believed all human beings possess. So I would like to explore this concept and discuss the historical relationship between science and theism.

(Slide-XTN Today)

In June of last year Richard Ostling a Calvin graduate and former longtime religion editor for Time magazine wrote an article in Christianity Today entitled: “The Search for the Historical Adam.” In that article the veteran and well respected Christian editor says that “The center of the evolution debate has shifted from asking whether we came from earlier animals to whether we could have come from one man and one woman.” This really shakes up our traditional interpretation or understanding of the biblical Adam and Eve story, and threatens to rival

Galileo's trials as one of history's most contentious times in the science/theism debate.

Currently theologians and scientist are now trying to reconcile this new scientific information with their biblical understanding of Scripture.

(Slide-The Language of Science and Faith)

This new scientific information which uses current mitochondrial DNA and Y chromosome DNA genomic technology indicates that anatomically modern humans, Homo sapiens, emerged from other Homo ancestors perhaps 150,000 years ago—long before the apparent Genesis time frame—and originated with a population that numbered about 10,000, not two individuals.

This counters the traditional Judao-Christian belief that Adam and Eve were specifically created and were biologically different from all other creatures.

As a result, some theologians are now suggesting that it might be more appropriate to understand Genesis as presenting "a poetic and powerful allegory" about God endowing humanity with a spiritual and moral nature?

(Slide-Garden of Eden)

Rev. Joel Hunter suggests that we decouple the view of scripture from the "either or" mentality, which stems from our culture's polarization and politicization of the interpretation of scripture. Hunter advocates that a view of scripture as the "inerrant Word of God" does not mean that the scriptures should be read literally, but rather, it means that God is inerrant. That does not imply that the person interpreting the scriptures is inerrant.

The original Old Testament consisted of oral traditions or stories starting around 2400 BC, consonant with the then current culture; and written by Moses 1000 years later in about 1450 BC in Aramaic and Hebrew scripture. The New Testament was written during the last half of the first century in Greek. Since that time there have been many Bible translations, usually written by committees of scholars. All seek to correctly interpret the inspired and inerrant Word of God. But, they give a slight variation that they feel presents a more accurate understanding of the original Hebrew and Greek; and a clearer view of what God had intended, but now stated in contemporary languages and culture.

(Slide-The Language of Science and Faith)

This book is destined to become a classic for those who, with an open mind, are willing to seriously wrestle with these questions about the relationship of modern science and faith. The authors are concerned about the long history of disharmony between the findings of science and large sectors of the Christian faith. They believe that science and faith can exist peacefully and complement each other.

Francis Collins originated the BioLogos Foundation in 2007. Referencing its website at biologos.org, and examining its FAQ, gives a wonderful synopsis of tonight's topic.

(Slide-In the beginning)

My evangelical (~~Christian~~) world view is guided by scripture and faith/ as well as scientific knowledge. I relate to “in the beginning God created”//, “created man in His image”//, “gave man dominion”//, and emphasized the need for “faith”//;

(Slide-Michelangelo's Creation)

Being created in his image, basically the ability to love God and neighbor and have dominion is the result of the evolution of the human brain especially over the last 50,000 years. This enables us to intellectually have this discussion of the relationship of theism to science.

My hope is that our discussion tonight will be respectful and hospitable to all of our various points of view.//

(Slide-St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas)

This is an age-old question:/ Are faith and reason,/ or in this case theism and science,// in conflict with each other? // Two famous theologians, St Augustine in the 5th century and Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century// felt strongly that faith and reason were not in conflict with each other.

Saint Augustine took the view that the Biblical text, if it contradicts what we know from science and our God-given reasoning; it should not be interpreted literally, but rather as metaphorical. Saint Aquinas said: “A judgment is said to be true when it conforms to external reality”

(Slide-John Calvin)

John Calvin, held fast to Augustine's principle of accommodation between faith and reason, or religion and science. // He comments on the biblical description of the cosmos and how it relates to the then current scientific discoveries.// He stated and I quote:" Moses wrote in the popular style of that time; things which, without instruction, all ordinary persons, endured with common sense, are able to understand; but astronomers investigate with great labor/ whatever the sagacity of the human mind can comprehend.// Calvin instructed emphatically, that the Bible has nothing to say about astronomy. / Science was "very useful" and must not be impeded/ "because some frantic persons are wont boldly to reject whatever is unknown to them". End of quote.

(From the Calvin Translation Society's 30 volume set: "The Commentaries of John Calvin on the Old Testament" where it speaks to his interpretation of Genesis)

(Slide-Nicolaus Copernicus)

Calvin's comments were probably a response to the Polish Catholic astronomer Copernicus who during Calvin's time was the first person to formulate a heliocentric cosmology.

Copernicus is often regarded as initiating modern astronomy.

(Slide-Geocentric vs Heliocentric Model)

His heliocentric model, with the Sun at the center of the universe, demonstrated that the observed motions of celestial objects can be explained without putting Earth at rest in the center of the universe. His work stimulated further scientific investigations, becoming a landmark in the history of science that is often referred to as the Copernican Revolution.

Slide-Galileo Wikipedia June 2012.)

However historically, the most famous incident involving the relationship between science and faith or theism was between The Italian Galileo and the Catholic Church. He was a dedicated Catholic and known as the father of modern science.

His promotion of the heliocentric model conflicted with Psalms 93 (1), 96 (10), and first Chronicles 16 (30) which included text that "the world is firmly established, it cannot be

moved.” In the same manner, Psalm 104 (5) says, "The Lord set the earth on its foundations; it can never be moved."

Galileo took Augustine's position on Scripture. That is not to take every passage literally, particularly when the scripture in question is a book of poetry and songs, not a scientific textbook.

Galileo was repeatedly tried by Vatican Councils and later their Inquisition found him "vehemently suspect of heresy"; and he spent the rest of his life under house arrest.

(Slide-The Inquisition of Galileo)

The Inquisition was delivered in 1633 in three essential parts. Galileo was found guilty of having held the opinions:

#1. That the Sun lies motionless at the center of the universe;

#2. That the Earth is not at its center and moves; and

#3. That one may hold and defend an opinion as probable after it has been declared contrary to Holy Scripture.

In broader terms, his work marked another step towards the eventual separation of science from both philosophy and religion; a major development in human thought at that time.

(Slide- Darwin)

The next major discussions regarding science and theism were associated with Charles Darwin as a result of his publishing: “The Origin of the Species” in 1859.

(Slide-Darwin’s Four Categories of Evidence)

His evidence for evolution fell in four categories:

Biogeography: the study of geographical distribution of living creatures.

Paleontology: the investigation of extinct life forms, as revealed in fossils.

Embryology: the study of developing embryos before birth, which revealed the animal in it’s less modified state; and the structure of its progenitor or parents.

And, **Morphology:** the science of anatomy.

(Slide-Doctrines of Evolution)

Biological evolution, simply stated, is a formal theory with these principles:

1st. All current species have descended from common ancestors. Ultimately, all the life that has ever existed on earth is descended from a single-cell life form that lived almost 4 billion years ago.

2nd. Changes in species occur gradually over time as a result of mutations in their nuclear DNA. Most mutations are irrelevant; many are harmful; but some are beneficial and enhance the reproductive success of their hosts in their current culture and environment.

3rd. Species change, when beneficial mutations allow certain of them to have more offspring than others and therefore dominate. This, in a nutshell, is the theory of evolution.

Note that it does not deal with the origin of life. It also does not say anything about morality or whether the processes that drive it have purpose. Such questions are theological, not scientific.

With few exceptions, the leading Christian thinkers in Great Britain and America came to terms quite readily with Darwin's theory of biological evolution. And, it was accepted by all the mainstream Christian denominations by the 1880s and 1890s.

(Slide- Ellen White)

One exception, however, was Ellen White. She was an important religious leader in a new sect known as the Seventh-day Adventist. She sowed the tiny seed that led to the modern creationist movement and the fuss about evolution.

Next, in the early 20th century, a group of about 90 Christian scholars put together a four volume set of basic Christian issues entitled: "The Fundamentals."

Of about 90 articles, 20% dealt with evolution. But there was almost a total absence of the six-day creationist viewpoint. One author maligned evolution, calling it the enemy of the Christian faith. The leading "Fundamentalist" thinkers however spoke approvingly of progressive creationism, the historical linkages between species, and an ancient earth.

Current creationist should reflect on the fact that 'The Fundamentals' of the early 20th Century contains no call to take up arms against evolution.

(Slide-Saving Darwin)

My recent comments come from this excellent book: "Saving Darwin" by Karl Giberson. In great detail he discusses how to be a Christian and believe in evolution.

Therefore, it is surprising that in the U.S., after 1920, a vigorous campaign was carried out by a "Creationist" subset of the fundamentalist movement against evolution. And this neo-creationist faction is still very much alive today.

(Slide-William Jennings Bryant)

This fundamentalist movement was initially headed by William Jennings Bryant, a Presbyterian layman, a three time unsuccessful US presidential candidate, and one of America's greatest orators and populist reformer of that era.

By the end of the 1920's more than twenty state legislatures had debated anti-evolution laws/ and four of them proceeded to ban the teaching of evolution in state-funded high school science programs.

(Slide-The History of teaching Evolution-Scopes I, II, & III)

This leads me to review the history of this controversy as addressed in our judicial court system over the past century. This might be aptly thought of as Scopes I, II, & III; which in turn focuses on the teaching of evolution, creation science, and intelligent design in public school science classes. It also addresses the issue of the constitutional separation of church and state.

(Slide-Scopes I)

Let's start with Scopes I.// In the 1920's, the creationist tried to ban the teaching of evolution altogether. Most famously, 87 years ago, in the legendary monkey trial, John Scopes was found guilty for breaking a Tenn. law outlawing such instruction, and fined \$100.//

In 1967, the Tenn. law was repealed on a technicality.//

And, in 1968, the US Supreme Court overturned the Arkansas state law, which banned the teaching of evolution.//

This provoked a second anti-evolution outbreak during the 70's and 80's.// Creationism was repackaged as “creation science”, /and 26 states tried to legislate equal time for the teaching of creation science along with evolution in high school science classes.

(Slide-Scopes II)

This led to Scopes II, /when the federal courts became involved in whether Creation Science can be taught in Public Schools?

(Slide-Essential characteristics of science)

In that trial Judge Overton declared that, “The essential characteristics of science are:

1st. It is guided by natural law;/

2nd. It has to be explanatory by reference to natural law;/

3rd. It is testable against the natural world; /

4th. Its conclusions are tentative, i.e., not necessarily the final word; and,/

5th. It is falsifiable meaning that scientific knowledge is constantly changing or improving.

Actually, most scientific facts and technology are time limited.

(Slide-Scopes II)

In 1982 Judge Overton concluded:// Creation Science failed to meet these criteria, and therefore could not be taught as science.// He said the Arkansas Board of Education law violated the 1st. Amendment's Establishment Clause,// which states that:/ “no law should be made respecting an establishment of religion,/ or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” // And, that the Board promoted a sectarian religious idea which is inappropriate for public school science classrooms. And in 1987 the U.S. Supreme Court concurred.//

(Slides-Scopes III)

In September 2005,/ this lead to the Scopes III trial in Harrisburg Penn,/ involving the Dover Public School Board requiring the teaching of Intelligent Design in their 9th grade high school science classes.

(Slide-Scopes III-2)

And, in late 2005 Judge John E. Jones III,// ruled://“it is unconstitutional to teach Intelligent Design as an alternative to evolution in a public school science classroom,”

(Slide-Judge John E. Jones)

A key statement in the ruling said:/ “Both Defendants and many of the leading proponents of Intelligent Design make a bedrock assumption which is utterly false.//

“Their pre-supposition// is that evolutionary theory is anti-thet-ical to a belief in the existence of a supreme being// and to religion in general.** “**

(Slide-Various Early 21st Century Perspectives)

After the last Scopes trial,/ the official Vatican newspaper said the Pennsylvania judge’s decision was "correct."//

The Archbishop of Canterbury,/ the Most Rev. Rowan Williams,/ made it clear that science is compatible with religion. He is the recently retired leader of the Church of England and the worldwide Anglican Communion,/ which includes the American Episcopal Church.//

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church says:/ “There is no contradiction between an evolutionary theory of human origins and the doctrine of God as Creator.”//

And a quote from the Central Conference of American Rabbis:// “Students’ ignorance about evolution will seriously undermine their understanding of the world and the natural laws governing it.// And their introduction to other explanations described as ‘scientific’ will give them false ideas about scientific methods and criteria.”//

In October 2006,/ the Michigan State Board of Education took a stance against language in the course content expectations,/ that would have left the door open for schools to avoid teaching evolution. // And, the state now gives guidelines/ as to what students should know about

evolution. // And the State does test them for this content on the Michigan Merit exam, // which is administered to all state high school juniors each year. //

Clearly, the Fundamentalist meaning of ‘evolution’ has been far removed from its Darwinian natural science roots. // Darwin focused on the descriptive process of biological evolution, but not on the purpose of evolution. // He taught that the science of evolution has no relationship to morals or ethics. // Therefore the application of scientific knowledge can be used in either a moral or immoral way, or ethical or unethical fashion depending on an individual, group, or institutional perspective. The use of the atomic bomb is an important example.

(Slide-The creation/evolution continuum 1)

This slide presents a continuum of the various religious and non-religious views, // with respect to Creation and Evolution.

The YOUNG EARTH CREATIONIST,/ the leading proponents being Henry Morris and Ken Ham,/ reject modern science and believe that the earth is 6-10,000years old.

The terms Flat Earthers and Geocentrist are self-descriptive.

All YEC reject the big bang theory, and deny biological decent with modification. ///

Since the mid-19th century, OLD EARTH CREATIONIST believed that the earth is ancient. // Old Earth Creationism is not considered a radical idea by either the Church of England or the Catholic Church. // They see God as the underlying originator of the observed changes.

Progressive Creationism:/ Accepts the theories of modern physical science,/ but only parts of modern biological science. // They do not dispute the Big Bang, or the age of the earth./ They believe God first created simple, single celled organisms,/ then more complex ones,/ and so on up until the present time./ But, PC’s do not accept that the species evolved from one another.

Evolutionary Creationist:/ believe that the Creator God uses evolution to bring about the universe according to His plan. // The difference between Evolutionary Creationism and Theistic

Evolution is not in science but in theology.// The Evolutionary Creationist belief is held by more conservative Christians,/ who view God as being more actively involved in the ongoing evolution process.

Theistic Evolution: is a theological view in which God creates through the laws of natural science.// They accept all the laws of modern science; in anthropology and biology as well as in astronomy, physics, and geology. They accept that one species gives rise to another; by means of DNA mutation, descent with modification and natural selection./ However, Theistic Evolutionist vary in how much God continues to be involved in nature. Theistic Evolution is the view of creation taught at the majority of mainline Protestant Seminaries/ and it is the position of the Catholic Church. That God created,/ evolution happened,/ and humans descended from more primitive forms.

The next two views are non-theistic.

Agnostic Evolutionism: This view is promoted by Thomas Henry Huxley, who believes that in this life it is impossible to know if there is a God./ But they tend not to be dogmatic about this conclusion./ Agnostics accept the scientific evidence that evolution occurred,/ but have difficulty accepting faith as a supernatural phenomenon.

Materialist Evolutionism: They are nonbelievers who explain natural causes are sufficient to explain natural phenomena.// To a philosophical naturalist, or atheist, there is no God; and they deny that the supernatural exist.

I am not aware of any faculty at Western Theological Seminary, the Calvin Seminary, or the Hope religion, philosophy, or chapel dept.// who accept the YEC or a creation science perspective.// Most accept the Theistic Evolution concept. If I am wrong, please let me know.

(Slide-2010 Gallop poll answers)

Today 95% of scientist, and most philosophers and theologians believe in biological evolution,/ but almost half of the U.S. public does not. // Why the disparity?

40% of the public believes that “God created human beings pretty much in their present form, at one time within the last 10,000 years or so.”// 38% think “Human beings have developed over millions of years, but God guided the process.”// And, 16% take the atheist point of view.

(Slide-Gallup Poll 1982-2010)

If we focus on the first column; #1// that God created human beings pretty much in their present form, at one time within the last 10,000 years or so;// we observe that the public viewpoint has changed very little over the last three decades. // This point of view is primarily limited to fundamentalist people of the United States since about 1920.

However, a July 2009 Pew Research Center Poll of 2000 public members and 2500 ~~AAAS~~ scientist reveals that two-thirds of Americans hold scientist in high regard;// but 85% of scientist said that public ignorance was a major problem,// especially with respect to climate change and the teaching of evolution

(Slide-Survey of 32 Countries)

In this survey of 32 European countries, the US and Japan, Prof. Miller reported that only Turkey, a largely Islamic country, is less willing than the US to accept evolution as fact.

(Slide-Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle to Control America’s Classrooms)

In Jan 2011, Plutzer and Berkman from Penn State U. reported in “Science” on a sample of 926 nationally represented public high school biology teachers;// and found that less than a third crafted their lesson plans around evolution.// The study found that it depends on the individual classroom; where the teacher decides whether evolution is taught.

Actually:

- 1. State Standards have little impact on teaching.**
- 2. As expected, the Major factors affecting the teaching of science are teachers personal values and beliefs; and the values and culture of their community.**
- 3. 11% of science teachers do not accept human evolution. (~~in the least conservative districts~~);// but, 40% do not in the most conservative districts.**

4. 60% of teachers are not advocates of either biological evolution, nor nonscientific alternatives// because they prefer to avoid the controversy. They do not feel equipped to answer controversial questions from students, parents, or school board members.

Since evolution is the fundamental concept unifying biology,/ it is surprising how many high school biology teachers are unaccepting or uneasy with it.// Unfortunate, but true.

It cries out for better instruction during a prospective biology teacher's college training.

(Slide Dr. Francis Collins)

I would like to refer again to Francis Collins, the current director of NIH, previously the head of the Human Genome Project, and a world-renowned Christian geneticist. And I quote.

“We humans have the privilege of discerning the truth from both of God's books--

(Slide-Two Books)

- the book of God's words (the scriptures) and the book of God's works (nature). But when the Bible is read as a scientific textbook,// or when scientific findings are taken to prove purpose or disprove certain spiritual conclusions,// trouble ensues.

It is a sad reality that this kind of misunderstanding has led to an increasingly hostile battle of worldviews, //especially in the United States. The conversation is particularly dominated by those at the extremes of the spectrum.// Some of those are religious fundamentalists. //Some are scientific fundamentalists.// This contentious atmosphere has often discouraged a more deep and meaningful dialogue. And the battle is having a lot of innocent casualties.

The voice that is not being heard is one that strives for theological and scientific rigor;// that takes seriously the claims of both theism and science;// and that finds compelling evidence for their compatibility.” End of quote.

(Slide-Albert Einstein)

And I would like to finish with a few more quotes. “Science without religion is lame;// religion without science is blind.”

(Slide- John Paul II

“Science can purify religion from error and superstition; religion can purify science from idolatry and false absolutes. Each can draw the other into a wider world, a world in which both can flourish.”

(Slide-Evolution at the Vatican)

The initial reactions of Catholic theologians, intellectuals, and priests to Darwin’s Theory in the mid 19th Century were generally negative. However, it is not widely appreciated that declarations by Pope John Paul II in October, 1996/ and Pope Benedict XVI in November, 2006/ have both asserted the “full accordance of Catholic doctrine and evolutionary biology.”

Recently, Monsignor ~~Gianfranco~~ Ravasi, head of the Pontifical Council for Culture, //said there was “no incompatibility between evolution and the message of the Bible.”// The Vatican is now pursuing a real dialogue with the natural sciences.

In collaboration with Notre Dame University,/ they sponsored this conference at one of the six pontifical universities in Rome.// This is where most Cardinals and other Church leaders receive training.// They are incorporating more science into their curricula,/ and have initiated extensive dialogues on how Catholic theology should approach modern science,/ including this conference on “Biological Evolution: Facts and Theories.

(Slide-Chris Kaiser)

Recently retired Prof. Christopher Kaiser.// He is a Harvard and Univ. of Colorado Ph.D trained astrophysicist/ who then took on a ministry degree at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary/ and his PhD divinity degree at the University of Edinburgh.// For the last 35 years he has been Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology at WTS.//

At the end of his book:/ Creational Theology and the History of Physical Science,/ he writes:

“The lawful operation of nature, need not be seen as an alternative to the activity of God.// Nor, does the action of God necessarily violate the laws of nature.// Instead, the laws and energies of nature should be viewed as direct expressions of the word and act of God and continuously responsive to the divine will.”//

(Slide-Alvin Plantinga)

Prof. Alvin Plantinga. Having made philosophy safe for theism, he's now turning to a harder task: making theism safe for science. And I quote: "Theism, with its vision of an orderly universe superintended by a God who created rational-minded creatures in his own image, "is vastly more hospitable to science than naturalism.

Belief in God, he argues, is what philosophers call a basic belief: It is no more in need of proof than the belief that the past exists. "You really can't sensibly claim theistic belief is irrational without showing it isn't true," Mr. Plantinga said. And that, he argues, is simply beyond what science can do.

Mr. Plantinga says he accepts the scientific theory of evolution, as all Christians should.

He argues that atheism and even agnosticism themselves are irrational.

He thinks there is such a thing as a sensus divinitatis, but in some people it doesn't work properly. He is referring to the innate sense of the divine that Calvin believed all human beings possess.

(Slide-Evolution, Creationism, and the Battle to Control America's Classrooms)

This study and other recent psychological social research indicates that public conflicts, // their thinking, and behavior, // are not entirely the result of irrational thinking; // but also that their reasoning powers have become disabled by a polluted science-communication environment.

People with different values draw different inferences from the same evidence. // Present them with a PhD scientist who is a member of the US National Academy of Sciences, for example, // and they will disagree on whether he really is an 'expert', depending on whether his view matches the dominant view of their cultural group.

Last April a friend invited my wife and me to go to The Calvary Chapel in Fort Lauderdale.

The charismatic Rev. Bob Coy preaches to 20,000 parishioners every weekend. After their song leader keeps us standing for 30 minutes and singing 7 words 40 times and getting the worshipers emotions to a high pitch, Rev. Coy spends the first 13 minutes of his sermon stating that evolution is a lie. This is a denial that God created the natural world as understood by university scientist such as astronomers, cosmologist, geologist, paleoanthropologist, anthropologist, geneticist, and evolutionary biologist.

Now if you are a barber whose patrons come from that congregation, you do not bring up the subject of evolution. If he would take a position that conflicts with his cultural group;// it would be disastrous for him socially and economically. In other words, if people's beliefs are at odds with those of the people with whom they share their basic cultural commitments;// they risk being labeled as weird and obnoxious in the eyes of those on whom they depend for social and financial support.

(Slide- The Truth Project- Dr. Del Tackett)

Dr. Del Tackett of the Truth Project, which is sponsored by Focus of the Family, also is misguided in his understanding of faith and science;// the two forms of truth that God created. He does not accept fossil or genomic scientific evidence for evolution. // He believes and I quote: “that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked as the greatest deceit in the history of science. // And that evolution destroys any foundation for a standard of ethics or morality—and man has exchanged the truth of God for a lie (evolution) so that he may be free to follow his inner desires.”

(Slide-Billie Graham)

And I quote Billy Graham from a writing he wrote in 1964:

“I don't think that there's any conflict at all between science today and the Scriptures. I think ... we've tried to make the Scriptures say things they weren't meant to say The Bible is not a book of science. The Bible is a book of Redemption, and of course I accept the Creation story I believe that God created man, and whether it came by an evolutionary process ... makes no difference as to what man is and man's relationship to God.”

(Slide-Pat Robertson)

And then this interesting event happened on Pat Robertson's “700” Club in late November, 2012. In response to a listeners question he said: “Look, I know that people will probably try to lynch me when I say this, but Bishop [James] Ussher wasn't inspired by the Lord when he said that it all took 6,000 years. It just didn't.

And although Robertson's Christian Broadcasting Network in 2007 promoted Ken Ham's “Answers in Genesis” Creationist Museum; he know has changed his perspective and he now

says and I quote: "If you fight science, you're going to lose your children, and I believe in telling it the way it was."

(Side-final summary slide)

So, after 1500 years, or 15 centuries, it seems nothing has changed.// It remains a contentious issue.// There is an unwillingness of fundamentalist at both extremes to acknowledge the difference between the supernatural and the natural.// An unwillingness to recognize that God has given us two forms of truth that have different paradigms.// One involves the book of God's words (the scriptures) and one the book of God's works (nature).//One involves theism or faith, the other involves science. // One that is responsible for our morals, and one that is responsible for our natural laws or scientific facts.

This contentious atmosphere has often discouraged a more deep and meaningful dialogue. There is an unwillingness to recognize that these two truths are compatible and complementary. It isn't a theism versus science issue.// And it is not just unique to the Christian faith. No matter what your monotheistic faith perspective might be; we should all give our Creator the credit. And we should strive to integrate God given spiritual and scientific truths,// including evolution,// and combine them into a comprehensive, healthy, holistic worldview.// Spiritual truths address purpose, and answer the Who and the Why of creation // the natural sciences give us the knowledge of How and When. Thank you.