

José Câncio Gomes<sup>12</sup>

**Science and Faith.**

**Charles Taylor's Approach to Make It Compatible**

**Abstract:** From the earliest days of the relationship between Christianity and philosophies, the debate between knowledge and faith has become a subject of discussion. Augustine and many others after him followed the path of conciliation. This is a very heated issue in the current debate between science and religion, and Charles Taylor's approach to this problem offers elements that contribute to a good reflection on the subject. Here I present Taylor's claim that reason is the articulation of incipient perceptions or experiences that intrigue human agents, making them restless. From Taylor's perspective, I try to deconstruct the mechanistic

<sup>2</sup> Programa Doutoral em Filosofia, Universidade do Porto.

*Civitas Augustiniana*, 10-12 (2024) pp.121-153

ISSNe: 2182-7141

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21747/civitas/11a4>

perspective that pits science against religion by showing some evident claims in the Bible that came before science.

**Keywords:** Secularism; Science and Faith; Creationism.

**Título: O compatibilismo entre Ciência e Fé – A abordagem de Charles Taylor**

**Resumo:** Desde os primórdios da relação entre o cristianismo e as filosofias, o debate entre conhecimento e fé tornou-se um tema de discussão. Agostinho e muitos outros depois dele seguiram o caminho da conciliação. Esta é uma questão muito acesa no atual debate entre ciência e religião, e a abordagem de Charles Taylor a este problema oferece elementos que contribuem para uma boa reflexão sobre o assunto. Apresento aqui a afirmação de Taylor de que a razão é a articulação de percepções ou experiências incipientes que intrigam os agentes humanos, deixando-os inquietos. Na perspectiva de Taylor, procuro desconstruir a perspectiva mecanicista que opõe a ciência à religião, mostrando algumas afirmações evidentes na Bíblia que são anteriores à ciência.

**Palavras chave:** Secularismo; Ciência e Fé; Criacionismo.

The hegemony of science over religion, or reason over faith, has been a dominant thesis in the contemporary world with the argument that its cumulative effect has made religion far less plausible to well-informed people who employ reasonable standards of evidence. The thesis has been endorsed by the mechanistic view of the world, showing the incompatibility between science and faith.

I intend to discuss and refute the thesis of the incompatibility, in this case between science and Biblical religion, Christian faith. Taylor’s discussions on the related questions to secularization and his arguments on the link between reason and faith have gained reinforcement and impulse from other renowned scientists who have adverted that religion and science are not incompatible. In the shift from a naïve condition of belief to the reflective one, we can capture the idea that faith in its reflectivity is reasonable. With the impulse of science, faith becomes more and more reflective. Thus, either reflectivity or reflexivity involve reason. I try to debunk the mechanistic perspective which puts science against religion by showing some evident claims in the Bible which came ahead of science. The reason to negate the incompatibility is grounded on the results of a thorough and in-depth analysis of the Biblical literature and scientific hypotheses and theories. Science could have added new details over time but not anything inconsistent with pre-existing knowledge from religious sources.

Reason links science to religion in a dialectical way, which means that both sides are mutually enriching in the quest for truths. Here I present Taylor’s claim of reason as articulation of insights or inchoate experience which puzzles the human agents, making them unquiet. Religious people attempt to make sense of the experience through the creation of new paradigms. Many scientists, artists, thinkers, and philosophers have been converted to Christianity because of the paradigm shifts that make faith more comprehensive.

Reason helps us to change the frameworks making faith more rational, the notion of heaven and hell can be explained in a more reasonable way. Philosophy gives further impulse to theological reflection in using new paradigms adequate to capture more people's attention. Taylor, as a Catholic philosopher, follows this line of thoughts stressing on the relationship between faith and reason in a dialogical perspective. He does not negate the contributions of science in the paradigm shifts which involve religion's frameworks, at least Christianity, in the development of its spirituality and theological reflection. He also acknowledges the limit of science and refutes some streams of philosophy which lead us to the exclusive humanism.

I try to link the Biblical genesis to the evolutionary theory of science, which has diverged the scientists and the religious thinkers. Some anomalies in physics, or astrophysics, especially in the quantum physics put human reason into limit. Scientific evidence in the Bible concerning the origin and the end of the Universe is not lacking. The conversion of some scientists has not only based on the paradigm shifts but also the inferences they have made from the results of their scientific knowledge. They show the fact of evolution and some accurate information in the Bible concerning the finite space and time which are consistent with that of science. There is no proof of the existence of God because He doesn't belong to the space-time dimension and He is the Maker or the Designer of atoms. We can only detect evidence and phenomena in the space-time

dimension which may guide us to make sense of the religious experience through the unfathomable nature. The idea of God is not just a speculation, nor a scientific fiction, which is created by reason alone. Science can help us to discover God’s existence, except in the perspective of the “closed spin of immanent frame”.

According to Coyne, there is no single process that constitutes the scientific method. The hypothetic-deductive reasoning is admittedly very important to science, and scientists frequently make conjectures, or propose hypotheses, about unseen causal mechanisms, deducing what further observations could be expected if their hypotheses are true, then one needs to test to see what he really observes. Coyne argues that experiments are important to science, but not to all its disciplines and sub-disciplines. A combination of reason, logic and observation will always be involved in scientific research. Testing whether by experiment, or observation, is important to filter out non-viable hypotheses. However, experiments are not the only way to test hypotheses, we can sometimes search the traces of the past events.<sup>3</sup>

### **Reason as Articulation**

<sup>3</sup> J. COYNE, *Faith versus Fact: why Science and Religion are Incompatible*, University of Newcastle Press, Newcastle 2016. Against accommodationism: how science undermines religion.

The link between science and religion is basically in reason because religion is not just naïve belief rather it's also a reflection on the Creator, on our origin and destiny. In other words, it is the reflection on the revealed truths which should have challenged scientists and other genuine intellectuals. In one side, revelation needs reason for articulation and sense-making of the religious experience, and in the other, reason needs insights coming from revelation. They are not incompatible in discerning the truth.

In the article entitled *Reason, Faith, and Meaning*, Taylor explores the contemporary debate on religion and science. He focuses on the reason and Christian revelation contained in the Biblical stories. The unbelieving position has been founded on reason alone and reinforced by the scientific evolutionary theory. Taylor attempts to a conciliation between faith and reason while criticizing the illusion made by the Enlightenment which has ignored, or even negated, the third dimension of reason, as articulation of the insight. The distinctions of natural science and social science, like ethics, aesthetic, among others, are clearly hermeneutical. Reason can know the truths and create new paradigms to solve anomalies and overcome obstacles and comes to the knowledge of truths.

In his critique of reason, Taylor shows two common illusions in our secular age. The first consists of making a very sharp distinction between reason and faith, even defining faith as believing

without reason; The second is the disengaged reason, exaggerating the capacities of reason alone.<sup>4</sup> The notion of *reason alone* has been developed by the Enlightenment. Taylor uses the theological notion of Revelation as an argument to defend the revealed truth which religion preserves. In fact, the hegemony of *reason alone* dispenses with Revelation, however, he takes the Scholastic Tradition to demonstrate that there was an important continuity, because the Tradition affirmed that reason could establish important truths on its own. It could demonstrate the rational nature of human beings from which derived the ethic. And it could also establish the existence of a Creator, but it needed Revelation to take us farther, by bringing us insight that this Creator was the Triune God of the Bible. He explains that there is a convergence between pre- and post-Enlightenment positions that reason and Revelation can be clearly considered as distinct sources of truths. According to him, reason doesn’t offer univocal and reliable answers in all domains. However, he admits that there is the basis on which the belief in *reason alone* has been grounded. It gets close to univocal validity in a kind of reasoning whose rules are codified in formal logic and mathematic. Indeed, the discovery of reliable truth in natural science is the result of reason.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. C. TAYLOR, «Reason, Faith, and Meaning» in *Faith and Philosophy: Journal of Society of Christian Philosophers*, vol. 28, issue 1, article 2, Jan. 2011. The critique is allusion to Kant expressed in his book «Religion within the Limit of Reason Alone».

It means that being rational here involves applying a correct method<sup>5</sup>.

In his critique on reason alone, Taylor admits that the Vienna positivists' view may suffice (adequate) to generate valid scientific theories, but he reiterates the reflections of philosophers of science like Georges Canguilhem and Thomas Kuhn who have adverted that we need more. Our explanations can improve radically with the shift in paradigms. Commenting on this, Taylor argues that sometimes our grasp of some domains is very incomplete, and full of unexplained anomalies, until we transform our understanding of the crucial questions through a paradigm shift. He gives a historical reference like post-Galilean mechanics arose through shifting the crucial question. These had the Aristotelian mechanics as background which had tried to solve the anomalies; in order to explain the continued motion of a projectile after it has left the canon mouth one had to find some agency which went on propelling it. All motion required a motor force contemporary to it. This had started with a crucial question: *what causes continuing movement?* All answers proved unsatisfactory, and the continuing movement remained an anomaly until the new discovery arose with the inertial perspective which changed the question: *what causes changes of*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Faith and Philosophy*, p. 6. Good explanation depends on an adequate conceptualization. We painstakingly validate our observations, and then we infer from them to the best explanation.

*velocity?* At once it became possible to make sense of the whole domain of imparted motion. Therefore, the anomalies were explained and overcome.

Taylor concludes that reason in the domain of natural science must include this third dimension, *a creative recasting of the problem*, which cannot be delivered through the reliable pre-existing method. It requires something in the nature of insight, which can be validated through the overcoming anomalies. He calls this the result of the validated paradigm shifts. Indeed, he admits that this kind of progress can be credited to reason alone through a strict form of self-restriction, scientific language with literal claims which excludes metaphor. Therefore, this is a special insulated form of expression.

However, the insolate language is inadequate to the explanation and evaluation of human life and actions, such as social science, ethics, history, literature, philosophy, aesthetics. New creations of our theoretical imagination, or moral-anthropological imagination, are not lacking, but it is very difficult to arrive at a kind of universal consensus. For instance, people of different cultures, different ethical outlooks, different aesthetic and moral intuitions, adopt very different paradigms for their accounts of human actions and the nature of our moral life. Taylor sees that this divergence can lead some to conclude to relativism, although he disagrees that there is no fact of the matter as claimed by the relativists. His background argument is that in the continued disagreement springs from the profound connection between the explanatory paradigms we find

convincing in explaining human life, on one hand, and our moral and aesthetic, or spiritual sensibility, on the other. As Taylor signs out, the human nature is shaped by interpretations we offer of it and there is no given basis on which we must eventually converge.

Taylor argues that our reasoning always involves a third dimension, beyond accurate observations and reliable inference, which he calls theoretical imagination in connection with natural science and the moral-anthropological imagination in relation to human affairs. In other words, reason has a creative component, it can and must generate new ways of conceiving the reality it is trying to understand. But he raises this question: how do we generate this? According to him, there is no standard answer, no sure method, but in general we can do that by articulating what start as barely definable hunches, or inchoate insights. These unformed insights draw us strongly and we are willing to engage our attention very deeply in them. Thus, we have an unfounded and nonetheless powerful anticipatory confidence in them.

The conclusion is that reason is not only the property of science but also of religion in having clarified the content of the faith through this third dimension, or insight moved by Revelation. Faith should enlighten reason in the quest for truths with unnecessary data, direct evidence, theories, or models, proofs. There is evidence of truths which science with its method is incapable to prove.

Taylor takes theological analogy of *fides quaerens intellectum* to explain further the link between science and faith

because of the similarity of structure which can be discerned in all uses of imagination. Although this theological method of *faith seeks intellectual expression* sounds an impoverished mode in scientific hunch, but it can set the path for more certain knowledge. In fact, our faith emerges from and is nourished by our whole sense of what is of ultimate importance in life, whereas the scientific hunch relates to a much more circumscribed area. Here Taylor distinguishes faith from science according to its own specific area of approach although it shares with science the same direction to the truth. In the context of this theological framework, he explains that faith in God which seeks intellectual expression defines a direction for the intellect only to the extent that this faith gives a direction to our whole being. He argues that the dawning sense of a new paradigm leaps ahead of what we know and defines the direction of further enquiry aiming to clarify what draws us to it. Thus, we may understand that this method brings us to the knowledge of God through the sense-making of the insight from Revelation.

Against the Enlightenment illusion of reason alone, Taylor adverts that the richer notion of reason has often been neglected or forgotten in recent centuries, but he uses Plato’s notion of *logos*, reason, to reinforce his argument. *Logos*, or reason, involves the articulation in words of insight, whose full nature can nevertheless not be fully communicated in words. Reason cannot be simply reduced to explicit reasoning, the methodical rational operations

which we carry out on our already articulated insights<sup>6</sup>. He refutes Descartes who undermined the notion that reasoning relies on articulations, which then only justify themselves, if they ever do so, *a posteriori*, by the sense they manage to make of the reality under study. Taylor quotes from Gadamer, explaining that these articulations transform our understanding, so much so, that even the kind of sense we end up making may be undreamt of before the articulation is made.<sup>7</sup> Against Descartes, he also refutes that the path through reason to truth inevitably involves a phase of near-blind groping which only later may be ratified in the clarity of the sense-making that ensues. He presents two facets of ratification. The first comes from the clarity of the sense we make, which everybody may experience for himself. The second comes from the general agreement of all those engaged in reasoning, that we have really made sense of things. Thus, the dialogical dimension of reasoning was dropped from sight altogether by the disengaged reason.

Taylor raises the question: what does this understanding of reasoning do to the post-Enlightenment notion of reason alone? He attempts to respond to it with the argument that if reason alone is defined in opposition to faith, then it threatens to collapse as a

<sup>6</sup> Cf. TAYLOR, *Faith and Philosophy*, cit., p. 9, where he targets Descartes with others for the loss of this broader understanding of reason. Descartes held that reasoning could be from start to finish guided tightly by a defined method.

category when we see the role of faith in our inchoate insights must play. If it is opposed to revelation, then the problem is that revelation is a category which we come to articulate in order to make sense of our most fundamental insights. Therefore, revelation itself becomes the fruit of *reason-as-articulation*. The inchoate insight has been articulated in a new paradigm once being ratified by reason through a process of the sense-making of things we experience.

The domains in which reason can easily dispense with faith are the privilege field of the disengaged reason, which prescind from life meanings or the significances things have for us as embodied, social beings, who mark moral and aesthetic distinctions in things and actions. This disengaged reason prescinding from life meanings was the essential founding step of modern post-Galilean, post-Baconian natural science. Natural science as such can be convincing to everyone, regardless of culture, because its explanations recur to factors which are not defined by their meanings for us, but simply their efficient-causal relations. However, in the domains of social science, ethics, history, literature, the disengagement of reason is impossible. Reasoning is something one

don't only do alone but which also inescapably involves dialogical collaboration and exchange<sup>8</sup>.

### **The Conversion Moved by Reason**

Reason has pushed many people to acknowledge the existence of a God as Creator of the universe. It empowers human agents to consciously applying logic by drawing conclusions from new existing information aiming to discern the truth which captures our attention. This characterizes humans as rational beings who can inquire things and reliable information so that to come to the knowledge of the truths, including the revealed truth of the Bible. Reasoning is associated with the act of thinking and cognition involving the use of our intellect to discern the truth. The Biblical faith is more reasonable contrary to those who think otherwise. This reasonableness has moved many thinkers to believe and to give up to the truth.

I want to reiterate Taylor's description of some thinkers who have undergone conversion to faith because they felt profoundly

<sup>8</sup> On TAYLOR, *Faith and Philosophy*, cit., p. 9, Taylor is able to debunk Descartes who didn't only neglect the interplay of groping and ratification, but he also supposed the ratification as self-authenticating in the certainty of clarity and distinctness.

moved by certain experience, like of Bede Griffiths and Vaclav Havel; they both share a self-authenticating experience<sup>9</sup>. Walker Percy’s conversion to Catholicism was pushed by the paradigm shift in anthropology due to its consideration of human agent as part angel and part beast. This view of man as deeply divided being, a creature suspended between two infinities, replaces the orthodox scientific view of human being as mere organism in an environment<sup>10</sup>. Another convert that Taylor refers to as consequence of the shift in moral perspective was Dostoyevsky. Percy and Dostoyevsky are all breaking beyond systems of immanent order, which can be explained and accounted for in their own terms<sup>11</sup>. These systems are natural because they are tracked by natural science, such as the generally shared understanding by both believers and unbelievers, they can be explained by their own terms. Thus, the totality of sense-making is grasped by the current dominant theoretical terms. One must have recourse to the subtler language so that to be credited by the systems. Consequently, so many influential converts in the last two centuries,

<sup>9</sup> See TAYLOR, *A Secular Age*, Harvard University Press, Harvard 2007, p. 729-731. The experience of fullness or experience of epiphanic moment. V. HAVEL, *Letters to Olga*, Knopf, New York 1984, pp. 331-332.

<sup>10</sup> See TAYLOR, *A Secular Age*, cit., p. 731. He takes from P. ELIE, *The Life Your Safe Maybe Your Own: An American Pilgrimage*, Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, New York 2004, p. 160.

<sup>11</sup> See TAYLOR, *A Secular Age*, cit., p. 732.

according to Taylor, have been writers and artists. Reasoning has helped them to conversion to the Christianity, or back to their faith, instead of turning them away from religion.

Taylor insists that literature is one of the prime loci of expression of these newly discovered insights. It is newly discovered because people came at them from the immanent order, either from belief or at least from a powerful sense of pressure that this order exerts on us all. Flannery O'Connor who felt this pressure keenly, speaking of the conflict between an attraction for the Holy and the disbelief in it that breathe in air of our time. Taylor describes her position by exposing the term she applied, like grotesque, because she uses an extreme image to join an instance from everyday life with a point not visible to the naked eye, but believed in by him firmly, just as real to him, really, as the one that everybody sees<sup>12</sup>. The point no visible is the point outside of self-contained system of everyday explanation, the one in relation to which all our ordinary meanings change, the hinge of the paradigm shift. His conclusion is that the convert's insights break the limits of the regnant version of immanent order, either in terms of accepted theories, or of moral and political practice. Flannery was required to invent a new language or literary style, breaking from the immanent order to a larger and more encompassing one which includes the immanent order and at the

<sup>12</sup> TAYLOR, *A Secular Age*, cit., p. 732.

same time disrupting it. They felt that reason alone cannot capture the whole truth they had experienced.

The convergence between science and religion, Christianity, implies a dialogical complementarity because they have the same goal to achieve knowledge of the truths. On the one side, science helps faith to be more reflective and developed, and on the other, faith gives insights to science in its quest for truths. The insights need reason for articulation in view of their validation. According to Taylor, in order to understand people outside of any frame of human meaning we must go deeper into their world, to live and analyze the puzzlement they awaken in us until a liberating insight comes into where the differences lie. This kind of science can be possible while one inhabits the meanings things have for us, rather than by disengaging himself from them. This can be applied for our spiritual outlooks.

Taylor presents some other converts, like Dawson and Eliot, whose critiques of modernity are clearly manifested the deepest sources of European civilization in Christianity and that this culture must lose force and depth to the extent that moderns depart from it. Jacques Maritain exposed the basic error of modernity in subjectivism, which stressed on the powers of the free individual subjects. He has targeted Luther, Descartes, and Rousseau, who progressively had contributed to the apotheosis of the modern. According to Maritain, the great and necessary remedy was a renewed Thomistic philosophy which would once more bring about

a recognition of objective reality. This philosophy can liberate because it forces us to lift our heads, to consider ‘the object as other, it makes me subordinate myself to a being independent from myself’<sup>13</sup>.

The modern condition itself has brought about the conversion of the intellectuals, scientists, to Christianity. Taylor reiterates what the critique of modernity considered the Christianity as the only bulwark against a menacing disintegrating and disorder. This theme was woven together with that of the deep roots of the European culture and that of the dangers of self-indulgent subjectivism. He argues that the task of breaking out the dominant immanent orders today is already defined by the model of Christendom. The issue remains open of how much we can go back, but this early civilization gives us both our paradigm language which we are seeking, and perhaps also a model of a society and culture which is not in tension with, but fully expresses the faith<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> TAYLOR, *A Secular Age*, cit., p. 733. He quotes from J. BARRÉ, *Jacques et Raissa Maritain*, Stock, Paris Stock, 1997, p. 256. He also refers to Evelyn Waugh in her article of 1930 described such condition saying that «in the present state of European history the essential issue is no longer between Catholicism, on one side, and Protestantism, on the other, but between Christianity and chaos (...). Civilization has not power of survival».

<sup>14</sup> See *Ibid.*, p. 75.

Taylor is consistent with his thought that secularization essentially involves the paradigm shifts. Epistemic changes, which he elaborates, are based on the interpretations of realities observed and through a process of epistemic doubt. Any knowledge of unseen mechanisms of reality or forces, which may have influenced on physical world, should be counted although they are immeasurable, even their essence is undetectable. Not everything is proved and measured in the laboratory or any other experiments in micro level or quantum level, which is more complicated. There are limits for our observation, and most scientific observations are based on the observable and detectable world. Even theory of Big Bang diverges scientists because they are not sure about it, even they don’t have a direct observation of the black holes although they exist. Thus, there is a limit when they speak of singularity, which they cannot prove in laboratory. Who gave the origin or who is the Beginner of this immense universe? Who is the Designer of the immeasurable atoms with their complicated constitution? Science should not ignore these questions just because lack of proof. It is like what the scientists do with some theories which remain in hypothetical level or a fiction.

### **Unfolding the Astrophysical Evidence in the Biblical Narratives**

The Biblical studies afford hermeneutics because the Bible is full of metaphors and symbols, subtler language, and narratives, wrapped in the literary forms they employ, providing not only with

meaningful insights but also scientific sources. With reason as articulation one can solve the puzzles or the mysteries hidden in these narratives. The Bible contains the truth about God, about our origin and destiny, about the universe, its beginning and end, about time and space, which science is concerned. The book of Genesis, first book of the Bible, narrates the origin, and the last book of Apocalypse contains the dramatic end from which will emerge a new form of heaven and earth.<sup>15</sup> These two events must evoke our reason to get involved and not just disengaging from them as unreasonable. The Biblical creation story shows our evolutionary process starting from the soil until we became conscious and intelligent beings sharing the image and likeness of the Creator, who gave origin to the process of beings and becoming. The seven-day creation cannot be understood literally, rather symbolical expression of the evolution itself, which was originated from the time out of mind. This time out of mind can be understood in the astrophysical term of the Big Bang, or whatever terms one might use, but it's a Supreme Good who gave origin to the cosmic order, and our coming to be.

The Bible unfolds the state of a primitive universe, which was full of chaos, and it was the Word of God (Logos) who created order in this primitive world, originating life and other beings. The

<sup>15</sup> These two events show how the universe began and how it will end together with its time dimension.

Word here makes us remember Plato’s *logos*, *λόγος*, which means reason that made sense of things. God’s Word implies the Divine Reason, the Beginner, or *αρχή*, as founding principle of all things visible and invisible, detectable, and undetectable. Scientists should not ignore this Biblical information if they are intellectually honest; they are challenged to study and to articulate this literature rich of meanings and significances, not judging it as naïve, unreasonable. Religious belief, in this case Christianity, contains evidence concerning evolution of the universe in the time frame from the beginning to the end; chaos and order (*cosmos*) in the Creation account and in the Apocalypse show the events occurred at the beginning and will occur in the end of history. Indeed, these Biblical cosmic events are approved by natural science, at least astrophysics, including quantum physics, although some scientists have ignored and even simply deny them because lack of proofs. The Biblical accounts of the primordial *cosmos* and its end, accompanied by chaos and order (*cosmos*), should evoke our intellectual curiosity to search the hypotheses which can lead us to validate them through hermeneutic approach to the subtler language and metaphors involving. Reason cannot disengage from these descriptions, stories, which are also fundamental insights for science.

In what follows I want to present the affirmations of some well-known scientists with valid arguments concerning the existence of God as Creator of the universe, or Beginner and Designer of the atoms. Astrophysics and quantum physics show the evidence of the

Transcendence of a highest Supreme Intelligent who had designed the structure of atoms, the basic structure of matter, creating the space and setting the beginning of time. Some astrophysicists through the equation of general relativity of Einstein have concluded that the universe was created. It has a beginning, there must exist a beginner who is God. Time was created because it has the beginning, corresponding to the Judeo-Christian Bible that in the beginning God created the universe through a process, which means in the primordial time and there will be its end. God as Creator is independent from the entire physical cosmos of space, matter, and energy. The universe that we detect was made from an undetected force. We are only capable of detecting within matter, energy, length, width, height, time, and space, but not beyond. Time is a dimension in which phenomena of cause and effect take place. Only God has capacity to operate through cause and effect before the time dimension of our universe. It is linear and any entity confined to half of a line of time must have a beginning and must be created. Only God is not confined to the time because he is the Entity that brought the universe into existence.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the universe has the spiritual origin. Contrary to the unbelievers who assume that God is confined to time in the same way that we are, therefore, no God at all.

<sup>16</sup> See in M. JAMMER, *Einstein and Religion: Physics and Theology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 2002.

Concerning the evolution, the astrophysical scientist (Ross) adverts that we don’t have a lot of evidence, except only one coffin full of bones of a bipedal primate that God created maybe before Adam and Eve. He argues that they existed very long time ago, and, unlike the dinosaurs, these bones of bipedal primate found are only 30%<sup>17</sup>. This species was extinct very long time ago, thus, these fossils prove nothing about our origin. God created human beings as the only species naturally spiritual on Earth, Adam and Eve were just personages representing humanity (Hugh Ross, in *More a Theory*). All other species of life are either body only, or body and soul, and it is only human species comprised of a complex unity of body, soul, and spirit. The conversion of Paul Wallace back to his Christian faith was a testimony of an astrophysicist who discovered that science has limits and it helps us to get closer to God<sup>18</sup>.

Hugh Ross exposes the problem of the physicists that their models of nature don’t hold up once reaching the quantum level. Quantum physics have revealed that matter and energy don’t operate the same on a micro level as they do on a macro level. Physicists are currently looking for more forces and particles to explain why space,

<sup>17</sup> H. ROSS, *More a Theory: Revealing Model for Creation*, Baker Publishing Group 2012. All of physics must be based on the standard model.

<sup>18</sup> P. WALLACE, *Love and Quasars: An Astrophysicist Reconciles Faith and Science*, Fortress Press, USA 2019.

time, and matter function differently on the smaller levels, quantum. Gravity is one of the four forces in the standard model of physics, alone with electromagnetic (light, radio waves, etc.) and the strong and weak nuclear forces. The scientists have no idea what gravity is. They think it is made up of gravitons, like light is made up of photons, but they haven't discovered gravitons yet. Gravity is defined as the attraction between all objects that have mass and energy, but beyond that there is no explanation of what it is, how it works, or what is it having mass that is attractive to other things of mass. He adverts that people who say that they believe what they observe have no clue why we are not flying off the planet. What is significant about this is that much of the experimentation where precise measurements and calculation need to be determined is based on the consistency of gravity. They know the mass of distant stars based on how much gravity these stars create. The scientists of Astrophysics know where blackholes are, based on the way the gravity of the nearby stars is affected. In analogy, Ross illustrates gravity like an invisible person making breakfast for us every day in the exact hour, but we never see him, never notice anything being cooked. That is how scientists understand gravity, no explanation where it came from, but it is something we need to survive<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Hugh Ross, in the *Reasonable Faith Conference* (2019), published in the article «The False Conflict Between Science and Faith: An Astrophysicist Examines Genesis», by Geraldine Tan, March 28, 2019.

Ross testifies that the book of Genesis provides us with one of the best reasons to believe that the Bible is the inspired, authoritative, and inerrant word of God. What the Bible declares about nature, indeed, is accurate and testifies of a supernatural Creator. Not just any kind of supernatural creator, but the Creator God of the Bible (Hugh Ross, in *Reasonable Faith Conference*). In his testable creation model, Dr. Hugh Ross proves that faith and science are not incompatible. He affirms that the Bible predicted the future scientific discoveries and historical events. The testable hypothesis, variable and falsifiable predictions, are scientific terms, which usually people use to contest the Biblical faith. His creation model offers greater predictive success and a more comprehensive explanation<sup>20</sup>.

In the creation narrative we can see the evolutionary process with primordial state of the universe unfolding that before the orders there had been chaos and formless universe. The first chapter of Genesis accounts the coexistence of chaos and order. We can articulate this as more reasonable and realistic account because

<sup>20</sup> Hugh Ross in an interview conducted by Corné Bekker, dean of the Regent University School of Divinity, in winter 2020. He is an astrophysicist and founder of Reasons to Believe, an organization dedicated to demonstrating the compatibility of science and the Christian faith. See also in <https://reasons.org/hugo-ross>. The Foundation of Reason to Believe was launched with a goal to build a testable and predictable creation model.

nature shows this coexistence. The volcanic explosions are essential for the order in the ecosystems, or environmental orders, resulting life in abundance on Earth's surface. This means that order necessitates chaos, they are coexisting so that to provide equilibrium and harmony on Earth. They were pre-existing to humans and from which we emerged. Our survival as organisms depends on the intracellular explosions substituting the dying cells with new ones and producing energy for activities; and even the universe itself has permanent tension because of the chaos and orders. Reason may question why chaos and order coexist; reason alone cannot grasp such illogical truth before trying to make sense of it.

Some scientists consider consistency of the truths in the Bible. The ancient Greek philosophy had been dealing with the question of origin/beginning, *ἀρχή*, the foundation of natural science, searching for the primordial cosmic elements that constituted the physical world in the universe. They (ancient Greek philosophers) tried to observe and articulate things before making conclusion, which served as the foundation for the modern science. Thales had claimed that the primordial substance of cosmos was the water, but Heraclitus contested that it was the fire, and the two elements coexist in the nature. But Plato went further with his idea of *logos* who gave order to all these in the beginning, or in Christian

faith it was the *Divine logos*, λογός του Θεου<sup>21</sup>, transcendent to the universe. The Christians believe that this *Divine Logos* was God, the Creator of the universe, or space-time dimension.

Therefore, the Biblical creationism has given most reliable information about the origin, like the ancient Greek, to scientists so that they can continue to explore the universe, providing more knowledge, unfolding the truths in this space-time dimension and even beyond, solving cosmic anomalies. Indeed, the message of the Bible is salvation of humankind implicit in the human flourishing, which means fullness, plenitude. Science is not only concerned with human flourishing but also the abundance of life, fullness, that has no end, the human fundamental desire for eternity or immortality. This desire aims to security, safety with abundance, which in the theological term is salvation, but in this world, we are not safe, therefore, there is not eternity here in this life, everything is inconsistent or changing. Science has limited itself to its method, gathering data, evidence, and proof. That is natural science, however, these data are inconsistent, the evidence doesn’t prove anything of our genesis. Everything is changing since at the dawning

<sup>21</sup> This means the either Word of God or the Reason of God (Divine Reason) that gave origin to the universe. The Divine Reason created Cosmos which means order, harmony, the world, or in astronomy meaning the entire physical universe considered as a unified whole.

of time, not only evolving but deconstructing, which gives way to the new beginning of another.

The Christian notion of faith is a process to become fully realized through the dialectical changes aiming towards a transformation beyond space-time dimension. There is no doubt that science questions the faith and their relation should be dialogical if science is really concerned to know about the truth of the Designer of atoms and particles that constitute the whole physical body and energy in the vast universe. The scientific question on the faith should be grounded on a methodic doubt. Some scientists with materialistic and mechanistic background find hard to reconcile science with faith creating a closed spin, impenetrable immanent frame. This is an intellectual deviation that ignores the doubt as a method to study the process to solve anomalies, enigmas, and the origin and the end.

The paradigm shift was implicated in Jesus's message to his disciples when he said that the new wine should be deposited in the new wineskin. The paradigms of the Old Testament of the Bible are irrelevant in the New Testament although both deliver the same message of salvation. The change in frameworks has inspired science in its method to settle certain anomalies in society and in nature. In this context, science is bringing us closer to the faith, to the knowledge of the revealed truths in the Bible.

Concerning our genesis, one may say that humankind had evolved from a primate but there is no proof, just a hypothesis based

on the evidence taken from several bones of hundreds of million years ago. So, these fossils are nothing, although they are discovered with rigorous scientific method. Indeed, one thing is true in the Bible that we are made of the soil. Undoubtedly our body is constituted of cosmic elements, like of animals and plants. But there is something sublime in human agents transcending cosmic elements, like conscience, consciousness, and intelligence, which make us cultural beings. These constitute the spiritual properties of human soul differing us from primates and other animals. Aristotle’s thinking on human soul can help us to understand that these properties are transcendent to our material body because they seem being made of the extra-cosmic elements. If the bestial origin of human beings is a possibility for science, then the Biblical account of our genesis is also a hypothesis which is being verified gradually along the history.

Faith involves reason, which is also fundamental for science, and it becomes more reflective and developed through theological studies. Secularization is not necessarily science against faith rather a new way of understanding the faith and new forms of living it. I want to reiterate that the link between faith and science is dialogical. Theology as science of faith has been trying to articulate revelation in the light of reason through the insight from the Holy Spirit, or inspiration in theological term. *Reason alone*, or *disengaged reason*, is not enough for science in its quest for truths. Also, certain issues in theology are not reliable to reason alone. We may take the experience of the Apostles with Jesus Christ as an explanatory

example. They hadn't understood the words and actions of their Master, even after the resurrection. The mystery of Jesus Christ came to be clarified and validated gradually through his apparitions after his risen from the dead. Later, they tried to articulate the experience by writing it down, and after the conversion of Paul of Tarsus the effort of making sense of the experience was expanded to the whole region with greater clarity. Fathers of the Church wrote down their reflection on religious experience in which they tried to grasp the meaning and the message it portrayed in consonance with Biblical revelation.

The resurrection of Jesus from the dead was a new revelation of the life after death. It reveals a new dimension of our existence which transcends this material world. The doubt of the Apostles had been gradually gone after having not only some visible but also physical contacts with the risen Christ, proving that he was not a ghost but the real Master, who was fully alive and really present among them. This set light to our human desire for eternity, or eternal life, with new dimension transcendent to the physical world. We may say that the post-secular humanism doesn't only deal with artificial intelligence but also guiding us to the knowledge of something beyond human. I reiterate that the artificial intelligence is immanent to us because the result of our own intelligence, which is within us, intra-human. The question is: what lies beyond human? Sure, it is not the AI (Artificial Intelligence). In the course of history human beings have undergone crises which can be understood as

moments of reflection and turning back to that fundamental question. Post-modernity can be defined as a move toward the infinity, not only in terms of the universe but also beyond space and time dimension.

Secularization has provided advantage for theological reflection, the development of hermeneutics in Biblical studies, even though many people have abandoned their faith but that doesn’t mean the end of Christianity like some sociologists had projected. It helps the believers to become more critical about their faith and the personal relation with God is no longer based on fear but on love and confidence. Christian faith links heaven with God, the Supreme Good, and the hell with Satan, the evil ones. These can be explained rationally, no naïve. We can define the hell as a space where the evil ones make their nest, not just a place of everlasting flaming fire. It is a condition of evil reign; in analogy it is in the space of human heart from where emerge bad things victimizing innocent people and nature. On the contrary, the heaven is defined as a condition analogous to the Kingdom of God, where love exists, justice and peace flourish, people feel a kind of fullness and harmony. We can articulate and describe the death and resurrection of Jesus and his ascension into heaven in a reasonable way. According to Christian faith, the last enemy that we all will face is death, the worst condition where there is no life, lifeless, or simply hell. Jesus descended into this hell to destroy the power of death, giving life to the dead persons. Then He ascended into heaven to prepare places for all humankind.

We may use other term instead of ascension, like *getting away from the Earth*, corresponding to the logic of science that the Earth is round. So, we can explain that Jesus got away from our planet into the infinity analogous to the infinite space that the vast universe unfolds. Then the definition of heaven involves the infinity and unknown, not in the space-time dimension, but beyond. These are new ways of explaining the Christian faith by using new frameworks which sound reasonable. This is in consonance with Taylor's conclusion that secularization goes along with the intensification of religious faith.

There is no opposition between science and religion, rather they are simply different in their approach to the knowledge of truths. These differences push them into a dialogue to find the truths they both are concerned. The difference does not necessarily mean opposition, or adversity, rather a dialectical journey. The claim of incompatibility of science and faith seems to have an ideological motive grounded in the "closed spin" of the immanent frame as a reaction against the clerical hegemony in Christianity. The genuine scientists have seen in the Christian faith, founded on the Biblical Revelation, the consistent scientific evidence. The converts of modern West to Christianity, or the re-converts, that Taylor intentionally mentions, have manifested the condition that there is a closer link between science and Biblical religion. We can say that science and religion only are different in each method to quest for the truths.

Therefore, reason guides us to the knowledge of the truths even the existence of a Creator of the universe who is God. The Christian faith isn’t compatible with the Deism, which is dominant in the Western world. For Deism, God is indeed a Creator, but he is outside of this world or has no intervention with our worldly affairs. For Christian faith, at least the Catholic faith, God is both Omnipotent and Omnipresent, and this means that he is present either outside of the space and time dimension or inside this dimension, history, in order to give us impulse and guidance. The creation narrative contributed to the conversion of Augustine of Hippo, the great thinker in the fifth century who described in his *Confessions* that time also was created by God.