Science and religion are two topics that continue to be discussed, challenged, and analyzed. How the two fit together in everyday life and personal beliefs is an interesting discussion. Throughout this year I have been presented with information about how science and religion work together instead of against each other. I have heard of different beliefs Christians have about science and how their faith in God is strengthened by science, not rejected by it.

The fact that belief in God is still around makes the idea that science causes it to be obsolete, false. Science does not make belief in God obsolete. If science caused a belief in God to be obsolete, why do people still believe it? There are many things that have been found in science that has caused me to be in awe of the God I believe created it all. Simply the fact that everything is made of atoms makes me in awe of God. In awe of a God that can create such complex beings and such a complex earth.

I realize the fact that things are made up of atoms doesn’t prove that God is obsolete or not. However, I do not believe that science has proved God to be obsolete because it has never found a way to disprove God. Until someone can disprove God, science will not make the belief in God obsolete. It takes faith to believe in God and it takes faith to not believe in him. In both cases neither of them is proven but is believed on account of the person’s personal decision and interpretation of the “facts”.

The response written by William D. Phillips says that science does not make God obsolete. His answer is under the category titled “Absolutely not!” and in it he starts by explaining that science and religion are often seen as irreconcilable enemies even though in reality they are not. Phillips then goes on to explain that even though he is a scientist he is also a person of faith, and he points out that he is not the only person who accepts scientific knowledge and still has faith. He makes clear that the reason he can be both is the fact that belief can not be proved false. Belief is not to be looked at through scientific eyes or reasoning, because science is not the sole source for information. There are several non-scientific statements that are rational. Phillips then moves on to discuss the idea that whether

one is an atheist or a believer in God they both must possess faith in what they believe. Neither ideas can be conclusive but neither can be falsified either. He ends with the fact that simply believing in God doesn’t make him a better person or a better scientist. Even though he realizes that he still has questions about what he believes, he acknowledges that science does not cause him to believe in God less and it does not cause God to be obsolete, but he knows that faith in the unseen is what he is hoping in.

Phillips and I agree on mostly all of the ideas he presented. We both do not believe that science and religion are irrevocable enemies. Even though I believe in God as the creator, it doesn’t mean that I do not believe in scientific knowledge and the search for continued growth in knowledge as well. I agree with the point that belief is not supposed to be looked at through scientific knowledge, for it can never be proved false. Everything can not be looked at in a scientific way, and as Phillips gave examples to prove his point, there are always comments that can not be proved or disproved. But just because these things can’t be looked at in scientific ways doesn’t mean that they should be ignored or thrown out. They are still ideas, beliefs, statements, opinions, whatever they may be, and they all carry weight. I have heard that both atheism and Christianity take faith. Everyone has to choose and reason on their own what to place their faith in. I believe in a loving God because I have experienced him, I have felt him move, and I continue to see him in my everyday life. I have chosen to place my trust in a God I have experienced because logically to me this earth could not have happened through evolution. Without God I see no purpose, I have no answer to why I am here, I can’t reason love, right or wrong, good or bad, or even the sin I know I possess. Just like Phillips, even though I can’t explain it, I have faith in what I can not see.

The response made by Steven Pinker under the category “Yes, if by…” answered the question by saying that science, if reason and knowledge is included, does make God obsolete. Pinker said that science has taken away a need for God to answer our questions. He says we now know through reason that the world could not have been created in six days and through science it has been shown how we came about through natural selection. Pinker says that evolution has evidence to support its claims which include the fossil record, DNA, our own anatomy and physiology, and the distribution of life. Pinker also says that evolutionary psychology and cognitive neuroscience is now working to explain why we have a conscience to overturn earlier claims that biology could not explain.
such a feature. He then explains that morality can be found, and right and wrong can be determined without God in the decision process at all.

I disagree with Pinker, even though respect his writing and the way he was able to articulate his thoughts and beliefs well. If I was unsure about what I believed, Pinker would have swayed me in his direction. He made some very interesting suggestions and even though I disagreed with them, it is hard for me to explain. First I will try addressing his idea that we no longer need God to answer our deepest questions. If God’s sole purpose was to help us understand life, then Pinker wins. However, God is so much more than an answer book. He is our creator, he is our source for love, and he is the father of our salvation and redemption. He is life. It is impossible for the human mind to understand God. Pinker claims that the earth could not have been created in six days, but God is God. Of course we aren’t able to understand this. But that is why we are the creation and God is the creator. Evolution sounds good on paper, but it has its hiccups as well. Pinker asks the questions “Where did God come from.” But I am also curious as to “Where did all the stuff come from for us to begin evolving? And if we evolved from monkeys where is the in-between? We have monkeys and we have people. Why are people not still evolving?” I know that I do not have all the answers and I do not know if my conscience is just some chemical thing in my brain or if it was instilled in me by God. Yet, I am still not convinced that science will ever be able to make God obsolete.

While reading all the responses, I remembered having some of the same questions when I was younger while lying in bed at night. This was a time in my life before I repented and decided to submit to the Lord, allowing him reigning control over my life. It was good to hear other people’s views and it made me realize how difficult it is to explain what I believe. I do not feel informed in this area and I do not feel like I have prepared myself for such discussions. While I was reading, my thinking was challenged in a way that I had to revert back to my old ways of thinking. It was a challenge to see the opposite side and try to understand that people really do believe these things. I don’t expect everyone to believe exactly what I believe. Yet, in some instances I felt the author was over the top and it was hard for me to even understand what they were thinking. I didn’t not feel like my ideas were swayed and my belief in God remains unraveled. In any case I feel the need to better prepare and become more informed on the relationship between science and religion.