

BIBLICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

Philosophy deals with beliefs. A philosophy of science deals with our beliefs about the nature and purposes of scientific activity (**Murray, 2003, p. 123**). The conventional view sees man as somehow coming to truth via science (**Sarton, 1955, p. 19**), but optical illusions show that we cannot depend on our senses to find certainty. Jesus referred to His Word, not science, as truth: "thy word [not science] is truth" (John 17:17). Man also has a heart that is deceitful (Jer. 17:9) and is not truth-seeking, but lie-seeking (Prov. 14:12, 16:25).

Left to his own devices, man follows lies, not truth. This explains why false scientific theories have held sway for so long throughout history. Philosopher of science **Stanley Jaki (1985, pp. 44-45)** lamented, "History, or the history of science, [has] a rather sad lesson. Sad indeed is the history of science insofar as it shows ... the repeated apostasies of the human mind, the repeated yielding to pleasing but obvious fallacies taken for basic frameworks of explanation. Such a fallacy was at work when Newtonian physics was taken for the proposition that everything is machine; another is at work when relativistic physics is taken for the claim that everything is relative; still another is at work when quantum mechanics is taken for a denial of reality."

The biblicalist realizes that science is merely a tool entrusted to man by God, and that this tool is constructive only as we honor the God Who created us. A biblical perspective on the philosophy of science therefore demands that first we recognize that God is governing His creation for the purposes He has stated in His Word. As an example, conventional wisdom sees the earth as a fragile thing that man can easily destroy and render unsustainable. But Isa. 45:18 states that God "formed [the earth] to be inhabited," thereby implying that man can do nothing to make the earth uninhabitable.

I. GOD PRESERVES HIS CREATION.

Man is accountable before God to be a wise steward of His creation, but God Himself is preserving His creation. This is the starting point for a biblical philosophy of science. It prevents scientific effort from being expended to protect the earth in ways that God is already performing. Yet conventional scenarios see looming crises – global warming, exploding population, nuclear catastrophe, and global extinction -- instead of God's hand in creation.

A. There Is No Man-Made Global Warming.

Without an atmosphere, the earth would be exposed to the temperature extremes of outer space. It would be

like the moon which roasts at 250 F during the day and freezes at -250 F at night. Atmospheric gases, especially water vapor, trap the sun's heat like the windows of a greenhouse, keeping the earth's surface comfortably warm. Without this "greenhouse effect," average ground temperature would resemble Siberia. Thus there is a natural greenhouse effect and the earth would be virtually uninhabitable without it.

Since the onset of the Industrial Revolution about 1800, increasing amounts of coal, oil, and natural gas -- "fossil fuels" -- have been burned to power factories, and the level of carbon dioxide, CO₂, in the air has risen steadily. There is about 50% more CO₂ in the air now than in 1800. This fact is generally known, but what most people think it means is wrong.

Conventional wisdom is that because CO₂ – a greenhouse gas -- traps the sun's heat, rising CO₂ levels mean rising surface temperatures, a.k.a. global warming. This warming has been caused by man via the Industrial Revolution, and is bound to be harmful to the earth. The CO₂ level is therefore too high, being the highest in history, and the damage being done to the earth is the fault of human industry. To prevent an ecological disaster, fuels must be regulated by governments. But this entire complex of beliefs is flawed.

CO₂ is only a minor greenhouse gas (**Henry, 2006b, p. 3**). Water vapor, naturally produced in the rain cycle from the oceans, has twenty times the greenhouse effect of CO₂. Though CO₂ levels have risen since about 1800 due to human industry, it has not been shown that this rise has increased average temperature at the earth's surface. The media cite computer model predictions giving the impression that global ecology will collapse soon if something is not done now. These models don't cite temperature data, because there aren't any. There are endless stories of glaciers melting, forests shrinking, and deserts spreading, but the media are virtually silent on glaciers, forests, and deserts elsewhere that are doing the opposite. The earth in fact seems to be in a carefully maintained equilibrium, as if God is indeed preserving it.

Neither are CO₂ levels the highest ever. The pre-Flood era had the highest CO₂ levels. Much of this CO₂ was converted by pre-Flood plants into vegetation and buried by the Flood as coal. From studying the fossil record, even scientists not believing the Bible recognize that CO₂ levels are now too low. "In fact, throughout ... the past ... the CO₂ concentration of the atmosphere has been greater than it is today. ... Only since the beginning of the ice [age] ... have temperatures and CO₂ fallen to current levels. When it was really cold, at the height of the ice [age] ... the concentration of CO₂ fell to values that were a hundred parts per million (ppm) of being able to support life. ... The atmosphere is currently impoverished in CO₂" (**Michaels, 1992, p. 10**).

It is extremely doubtful that CO₂ levels even higher than now exist would cause a temperature increase, for "[G]as bubbles trapped in Antarctic ice tell us that the temperature dropped *before* the CO₂ concentration changed, not after" (Michaels, 1992, p. 10). Changes in CO₂ levels appear simply to be unrelated to changes in earth temperature. CO₂ is too minor a greenhouse gas. On the other hand, since CO₂ is a nutrient required by plants to live, rising CO₂ levels make the earth's forests grow.

"The earth is becoming greener. Plants take in CO₂, and fix it in the form of carbohydrates in their roots, stems, and leaves. CO₂ in current concentrations is what is known as a "limiting nutrient": there is currently so little of it in the atmosphere that plants cannot get enough. Increasing the concentration increases the growth of almost all plant species, and both laboratory and field experiments have demonstrated that plants flourish as CO₂ concentration goes up. Further, there is no doubt that human industrial activity has increased the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere and that most (85 to 95 percent, depending on the estimate) of that increase is a result of burning fossil fuels -- the same carbon that was deposited in the earth's crust when CO₂ was in excess. ... The planet is becoming greener. ... The finding, which indicates that plants are taking in more CO₂ than they did, should not be surprising, because the atmosphere is merely returning to CO₂ levels that were characteristic during ... history" (Michaels, 1992, pp. 11-12).

In other words, the earth at least in a partial way is returning to a luxuriant highly-vegetated pre-Flood state. Even tropical rain forests, so often believed to be rapidly disappearing, are expanding: "Tropical deforestation increased from 78,000 square kilometers in 1978 to 230,000 square kilometers in 1988 while tropical forest habitat, severely affected with respect to biological diversity, increased from 208,000 square kilometers to 588,000 square kilometers" (Skole and Tucker, 1993, p. 1905). Net forest increase exceeded decrease.

Rising CO₂ levels are making the earth not warmer but greener. There is no looming global warming crisis. The earth is returning partially to a luxuriant pre-Flood state. Meanwhile, evil men -- not the earth -- are waxing worse and worse (2 Tim. 3:13), while we expend effort and concern on non-problems rather than the true spiritual crises plaguing mankind.

B. There Is No Population Explosion.

World population in 1850 was about 1 billion. By then the material benefits of the Industrial Revolution were becoming widespread, and human mortality rates plummeted. The plunging death rate coupled with no corresponding decline in fertility rates resulted in rising global population. By the 1960s, the global population was rising about 2% yearly. Even then, people had begun adjusting to the fact that they no longer had to

plan for the premature death of most of their children. Since the 1960s the population growth rate has plummeted.

Now "44 percent of the world's people live in countries where the fertility rate has already fallen below the replacement rate, and fertility is falling fast almost everywhere else" (Singer, 1999, p. 24). Population growth rates are falling so fast that the U.N. predicts global population to peak at some 8 to 9 billion in 2050. After that, a precipitous decline will occur, with the result that, "Unless people's values change greatly, several centuries from now there could be fewer people living in the entire world than live in the United States today" (Singer, 1999, p. 22).

The rapid rise in global population from about 1850-1960 is most accurately seen as an adjustment to the better living brought about by the Industrial Revolution. Since people are not mindlessly reproducing creatures like rabbits or insects, but are made in God's image, they have rationally adjusted fertility rates to factor in the lower post-Industrial Revolution death rate. But unless the public is given reliable information, the adjustment will overshoot. A century from now there may be a genuine underpopulation crisis. Even now, certain parts of Europe most propagandized by the "zero population growth" mentality are facing the prospect of imminent population declines (Lal, 1998, p. 229). This means destruction of the tax base, withering economic activity, a slow decay of social infrastructure, and a general impoverishment of those who remain.

The harm wrought by faulty population policies based on bad science shows that a biblical philosophy of science involves a commitment to actual data rather than to political agendas -- even if the data are politically incorrect.

C. Nuclear Power Is Safe.

Since the 1960s, fears about nuclear radiation, nuclear power, and nuclear waste have brought nuclear development to a standstill. In the 1950s, nuclear power plants were being rapidly constructed, many more were on drawing boards, and confident predictions abounded of low-cost electric power soon being available to all.

None of these optimistic predictions came true. Instead, electric power costs over ten times what it did in the 1950s, and virtually no new nuclear power plants have been licensed for construction in several decades. Instead of national energy independence, we are dependent on foreign oil for transportation and electricity generation -- a dependence becoming more problematic as instability escalates in the Middle East.

None of this had to happen. While nuclear development stagnated in the U.S., France built nuclear power plants sufficient to provide a sizable fraction of that country's electrical energy needs. At the same time nuclear development met with public opposition in the U.S., regulators made it impossible for most power plants to burn coal, the most abundant fossil fuel in America. Fears about nuclear power stem from misconceptions about the alleged hazards of nuclear power and the supposedly immense volumes of radioactive waste that would pile up should nuclear power become common.

Yet contrary to popular belief, the truth is that nuclear waste volume is incredibly small. Physicist and engineer Petr Beckmann noted that, "Nuclear wastes are 3.5 million times smaller in volume than fossil wastes producing the same electric energy; high-level wastes ... which contain 99% of the radioactivity, but only 1% of the volume, are the first type of industrial waste in history that can be completely removed from the biosphere; their volume per person per year equals that of 1-2 aspirin tablets; what is put back into the ground has less radioactive energy than what was taken out; after 100 years, the wastes are less toxic than many ores found in nature; after 500 years they are less toxic than the coal ash produced from the same electricity; the artificial and irrational arguments against disposal in stable geological formations ... help to perpetuate the present way of disposing of fossil-powered electricity wastes -- some of them in people's lungs" (**Beckmann, 1991, p. 1**).

A biblical philosophy of science must involve a commitment to factual assessment of technological risks and benefits. Otherwise, science becomes a harbinger of fear rather than a blessing. Today there is a widespread disenchantment with science. This trend is partly due to the misuse of science to sell fear. The early 1800s were a time in which the public adored science, and even factory workers attended public lectures given by Michael Faraday and other eminent scientists of the day (**Henry, 2006a, pp. 7-8**). But then the tendency was to exalt God through science, not the earth or evolution.

D. How Much Extinction Is There Really?

Another widely feared ecological crisis is the extinction of life. As with the global warming crisis, an acceleration of extinction allegedly is due to human activity. Yet God provided resources for man's use as a wise steward. He commanded man to have dominion over the earth, not to shrink from using it. Since the Enlightenment, biblical dominion has been confused with exploitation (**White, 1967, pp. 1203-1204**), a false equation. Another misunderstanding is that the modern taxonomic "species" is the division according to which

God created life. This is not true; neither is the species the category by which life forms become extinct.

In Genesis God created *kinds*, not species. Genesis *kinds* are not the species of today. Species are often ill defined, and species boundaries are often debatable, but each *kind* included many species and even higher taxonomic groups. The dog *kind* includes wolves and coyotes as well as dogs, though each of these is considered a different species.

Animals belonging to a single *kind* can interbreed. The offspring may be sterile, as with mule offspring from a donkey-horse cross, suggesting that genetic degradation has occurred since the curse on the ground (Gen. 3:17-18). Reliance on the "species" as the basic unit of taxonomy can cause confusion. Several years ago a type of wolf thought to be rare was placed on the endangered species list. Later DNA analysis showed that this supposedly rare wolf was a hybrid of common wolves and coyotes mating in the wild, not a separate species. Amid much governmental wrangling, a controversy developed about whether to retain "endangered status" for the hybrid (**Carpenter, 1991, pp. 55-56**). Other "endangered species" have been the center of similar debates (**Carpenter, 1991, pp. 56-57**).

The death of a species or variety is not the extinction of the *kind* from which it arose. Modern extinction fears focus on species or subspecies which are actually subdivisions of *kinds* that continue to exist, and which therefore continue to preserve the genetic information available to particular species arising from them. The extinction crisis is a mental construct due to reliance on the "evolution of species" concept and lack of awareness of God's creative works in the first week of history. This dilemma illustrates the importance of a biblical philosophy of science to ensure that scientific knowledge is grounded in the biblical account of history, not a secular version.

II. GOD WORKS IN HISTORY.

A common cliché in Christian discussions of history is that, "History is *His* story." But outside of the Bible, most of us might be hard pressed to mention even one meaningful illustration of God's working in history, and our view of God's working in biblical events is often simplistic. A biblical philosophy of science recognizes that God's thoughts are higher than our thoughts, and that God works with whomsoever He will.

God is not limited to working His will according to our parochial ethnic or cultural norms. Though we give lip service to the truth that "Jesus would have died on the cross to redeem even one of us," He has engineered entire geopolitical upheavals apparently to

bring about exactly that result. In the 1946 judgments at Nuremberg, top-ranking Nazis were confronted with the fact that they could not save themselves. Though some such as Goering refused to come to Christ as Savior (**Andrus, 1970, p. 154**), others did. Von Ribbentrop told his chaplain that "he accepted Christ for the redemption of his soul. His one regret was that he had no way of showing by word and deed that he meant it" (**Andrus, 1970, p. 151**). In his last prayer, von Ribbentrop confessed, "I put my trust in Christ," and as he was being hooded for hanging, he whispered to the chaplain, "I'll see you again. ..." (**Andrus, 1970, pp. 158, 159**).

The American Civil War was the deadliest military conflict of the 1800s, with over 600,000 dead. This war brought slavery to an end, but when we are confronted with the lesser known fact that other countries also ended slavery in the 1800s, all without bloodshed (**diLorenzo, 2002, pp. ix-x**), the war seems pointless. Why all the bloodshed? Unfortunately, we seldom hear of the grace God wrought under the extreme hardships of that war. In the Southern army there were "glorious revivals which made nearly the whole army vocal with God's praises" (**Jones, 1904, p. 6**). In the 37th North Carolina Regiment, out of 132 men, 55 were converted in addition to those already saved, and this kind of event was not uncommon. In the winter of 1863-64, over 100 chapels were built in Virginia alone so soldiers could worship in the field (**Jones, 1904, pp. 39, 261**). The Presbyterian General Assembly at Charlotte, N.C., in 1864, reported "the conversion of 12,000 soldiers during the year" (**Jones, 1904, p. 241**), and eventually the revival "reached nearly the whole army, and really did not cease until the surrender at Appomattox" (**Jones, 1904, p. 246**), with the minimum number of soldiers converted of the order of 100,000. No wonder it was said that "out of that terrible war God brought such rich blessings" (**Jones, 1904, p. 464**).

God works through those not considered great. Pioneer missionary to India William Carey is not lauded in most reference works. But Carey had immense influence in India winning converts. He also "published the first books on science and natural history in India ... was the first to make an indigenous paper ... introduced the idea of savings banks to India ... [was] first to campaign for humane treatment for India's leprosy patients ... established the first newspaper ever printed in any oriental language ... began dozens of schools for Indian children ... wanted to introduce India to the scientific culture of astronomy ... pioneered the idea of lending libraries ... [was first to stand] against both the ruthless murders and the widespread oppression of women ... [and] transformed the ethos of the British administration from indifferent imperial exploitation to 'civil' service" (**Mangalwadi and Mangalwadi, 1999, pp. 17-23**).

God has also gifted the recognized great, saved and lost. The belief that all great scientists were Christians might be appealing, but God's work in history is more complex than that, that we might glory in Him, not the men.

A. God Has Worked in History Through Unbelievers.

Isaac Newton (1642-1727) is best known for developing the three laws of motion and the law of gravitation. For the six millennia from the creation to Newton's life, there is no record of anyone's having solved the problems that Newton addressed. In Newton's time the philosophy of Aristotle still held sway. Aristotle had flourished around 300 BC and "thought of the heavenly bodies as obeying laws quite different from those that held on earth" (**Andrade, 1964, p. 10**). In contrast, Newton explained "the motion of the heavenly bodies on the basis ... that the same laws governed the movement of [both] earthly and heavenly bodies ..." (**Andrade, 1964, p. 10**). In formulating these laws, Newton broke with 2000 years of tradition. Amazingly, the entire conception and plan for confirming these laws arose in his mind soon after he graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge – around 1666 when he was 24 (**Anthony, 1961, pp. 49-50**).

Newton rightly believed that the mathematical proofs of his laws would need to be flawless. More than twenty years passed before he was convinced that his mathematics could withstand all possible scrutiny. By then he had invented the calculus as a tool for developing his mathematical proofs. In 1687 he published these proofs under the title *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica (Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy)*. The title is often shortened to *Principia*, and it is considered the greatest scientific work of the last millennium. The *Principia* remains in print in English translation (**Newton, 1687**).

How could one young man working alone in the privacy of his apartment begin to conceive of new laws overthrowing what authorities had taught for two millennia? Clearly Newton had nearly unique mental powers, possibly below only those of Solomon, noted in the Bible as having had wisdom above all others (1 Kings 3:11-12, 4:29). Newton's biographers have struggled to understand the workings of Newton's mind:

"It is little use discussing Newton in terms of ordinary experience, because he was a quite extraordinary man. Other great men of science ... have devoted all their best labours to their scientific researches. Newton had long periods when he seemed to have been indifferent to science ..." (**Andrade, 1964, pp. 128-129**).

"Of how he arrived at his great discoveries we understand very little ... William Whiston [famously the translator of Josephus], who knew him well ... was convinced that he had the power of perceiving scientific truths before he had proved them. ... Newton, perhaps, possessed this power of scientific foresight, correct scientific surmise, to a greater extent than any other man" (**Andrade, 1964, pp. 127-128**).

Newton himself, "when he was asked how he made his discoveries ... said, 'By always thinking unto them' ..." (**Andrade, 1964, p. 35**). **Andrade (1964, p. 35)** concludes: "Even for great men of science it is hard to keep the mind concentrated on a problem ... for

more than an hour or two: I believe that Newton, however, could sit for hours with the whole power of his mind fixed on whatever difficulty he was concerned with."

One might think that the young Newton was motivated by rebellion against authority to overthrow long-established scientific tradition. This conclusion would be wrong. In fact, "Newton's scrutiny of nature was directed almost exclusively to the knowledge of God and not to the increase of sensate pleasure or comfort. Science was pursued for what it could teach men about God, not for easement or commodiousness" (**Manuel, 1974, p. 48**). **Barzun (2000, p. 190)** likewise says, "Newton thought that studying the ways of Nature was trivial compared with interpreting Revelation." Some authors have concluded from this type of statement that Newton must have been a God-fearing Christian. **Barnes (1993, p. 44)** says forthrightly that, "He believed in Christ as his Savior." **Morris (1982, p. 46)** claims Newton was "a genuine believer in Christ as his Savior." These writers emphasize that Newton was a staunch creationist.

Certainly "Newton was not a materialist, as may be inferred from his biblical research and explicit statements" (**Barzun, 2000, p. 366**). However, Newton's expressions of theism and supernatural creation, though admirable, reflected the "cultural Christianity" respectable in his time. One must not confuse professions of theism and creation with professions of genuine saving faith. Strongly theistic and God-fearing, Newton was nevertheless apparently not a Christian, because he did not truly grasp who Christ was and is. One of the most extensive studies of Newton's religious beliefs summarized the situation:

"Newton's copy-books ... are pervaded by a sense of guilt and by doubt and by self-denigration. ... From the beginning to the end of his life, Newton's was a religion of obedience to commandments, in which the mercies of Christ the Redeemer played a recessive role" (**Manuel, 1974, pp. 15-16**).

Newton further maintained that there was only one God, God the Father, and "diminished the other two persons of the Trinity" (**Manuel, 1974, p. 61**). Accordingly he was called an "anti-trinitarian," a belief now called unitarianism, which descended from Arian and gnostic teaching endemic to central Europe beginning with the heretic Arius about 400 AD. In other words, Newton could not bring himself to accept Christ as God: "Newton yielded to a full embrace of the Arian credo. ... Newton could not have been more explicit. He declared the Father to be supreme. The Son is a separate being, different from the Father both in substance and in nature. Christ is not truly God. ..." (**Christianson, 1984, p. 253**). Newton maintained that Christ was the "Lamb of God," but only in the sense of being a good man who

was sacrificed as an example of God's stern view of the effects of sin (**Manuel, 1974, p. 61**).

Newton never saw God as loving. Neither was Newton at all loving: "The real Newton was anything but affable ... Newton's later years, when he had become the idol of 'Philosophic' London, could be chronicled in his acrimonious quarrels with subordinates and his vindictive plots against anyone who threatened to become his equal" (**Boorstin, 1983, pp. 410, 412**). The most famous quarrel was with Leibniz, Newton's rival as inventor of calculus. Newton formed a committee of the Royal Society of London to denounce Leibniz, and took pleasure that, "He broke Leibniz's heart with his Reply to him" (**Boorstin, 1983, p. 416**).

Though there seems to have been a complete lack of the Spirit's fruit in Newton's life, nevertheless Newton's struggle to pierce through the veil of God's judgment was so consuming that his theological output was double his scientific output. One of his theological works, *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel* (**Newton, 1733**), is still in print and traces the fate of the ethnic groups leaving Babel down to Newton's day. The example of Newton shows that God works even through those who have not come to His Son for salvation.

B. God Has Worked in History Through Believers.

Michael Faraday (1791-1867) invented the motor, generator, and transformer. To make these inventions Faraday experimented with electricity and magnetism. In an indirect way Newton inspired Faraday. Newton had shown that gravity extends through empty space. Faraday was motivated partly by the idea that maybe man could utilize the electrical and magnetic fields which must also permeate space.

Faraday was born into poverty. By his early teens he was experimenting with chemistry in the back of a drug store -- a "chemist's shop" as English pharmacies were known -- where he worked. He read voraciously and was self-taught.

A devout Christian from youth, he belonged to the Sandemanian Church, a fellowship of local churches independent of the state Presbyterian Church of Scotland (**MacDonald, 1964, p. 10**). Faraday was a serious Bible student, a well-prepared lay preacher, spoke frequently in his church, and was known worldwide in scientific circles for his Christian humility. Unbelievers associated his humility with his Sandemanian faith, one of them, fellow British scientist Tyndall, commenting:

"I think that a good deal of Faraday's week-day strength and persistency might be referred to his Sunday Exercises. He drinks from a fount on Sunday which refreshes his soul for the week" (**Williams, 1971, p. 6**).

Faraday's biographer **L. Pierce Williams (1971, p. 103)** concluded that, "No man in the history of science has been referred to as humble more often than Faraday. But it was a very definite kind of humility that shone from his eyes. ... His true humility lay in a profound consciousness of his debt to his Creator. That Michael Faraday, poor, uneducated son of a journeyman blacksmith and a country maid was permitted to glimpse the beauty of the eternal laws of nature was a never-ending source of wonder to him."

When Queen Victoria invited him to an audience at Buckingham Palace, he went, though the appointment was on a Sunday. His church stripped him of his membership for violating the Lord's Day, but without rancor or bitterness, Faraday continued faithfully attending his church thereafter and was eventually reinstated as an elder (**Kendall, 1939, p. 79**).

He was kind to all. Having no wealth, he and his wife were housed in apartments in facilities of the Royal Institution of Science in London at government expense. He and his wife were deeply in love:

"Mrs. Faraday proved to be exactly the true helpmeet for his need; and he loved her to the end of his life with a chivalrous devotion which has become almost a proverb. ... Tyndall, in after years, made the intensity of Faraday's attachment to his wife the subject of a striking simile: 'Never, I believe, existed a manlier, purer, steadier love. Like a burning diamond, it continued to shed, for six and forty years, its white and smokeless glow' " (**Kendall, 1939, p. 57**).

The Faradays never had children, but even in the midst of work at the Royal Institution, he would patiently and kindly receive his cousins, nieces and nephews whom he regarded as his own. He "took great delight" in lecturing to children (**Kendall, 1939, p. 82**), and "was to be seen at his best as a lecturer in the famous Christmas Lectures for children" (**Williams, 1971, p. 344**).

The Christmas Lectures are delivered annually in London to this day and are open to the public. Modern topics as likely as not are those promoting evolution, a complete contrast with Faraday's time. Then the battle lines between creationists and evolutionists had not been drawn so sharply as now, and though Faraday certainly saw the hand of God in his study of science, he did not try to harmonize his science with the Bible (**Williams, 1971, pp. 103-104**). His Christmas Lectures were entertaining expositions and demonstrations of chemical principles. His most famous Christmas Lecture was "The Chemical History of a Candle" (**Faraday, 1910, pp. 86-170**), a topic appropriate to the Christmas season and originally delivered over several sessions in 1860-61.

Without Faraday, modern electrical technology would not exist. All labor saving devices depend on motorized power, and all electrical generation is ultimately based on Faraday's innovations. Without the transformer, electricity could be sent only a few miles at most, and the modern power distribution grid could not exist. Faraday is an excellent example of a great scientist who also exhibited the Christian graces of humility and charity, as well as faithfulness to his local church.

C. A Biblical Philosophy of Science Recognizes God's Hand in All Events.

The Reformation, by freeing men of traditionalist dogma, opened a window for human opportunity eventually culminating in the scientific wonders of today. What was the cause of this incalculably significant event?

Conventional wisdom says that the new technology of printing caused the Reformation. Gutenberg printed his first Bible in about 1453. The Reformation rose to full influence in 1517 with Luther's pronouncement -- and printing -- of his Ninety-five Theses. Yet Jesuits also used printing to rebuild Catholic power, and Communists since then have used the press probably more aggressively than the Church. Ultimately, the Holy Spirit caused the Reformation. Historian of science **Cecil Dampier (1961, p. 102)** observed:

"[W]e cannot but feel that the attempt to explain by obvious causes the amazing change of mental attitude produced in so short a time is not wholly successful. As Bishop Creighton said, 'After marshalling all the forces and ideas which were at work to produce this change, the observer „still feels that there are behind all these an animating spirit [the Holy Spirit] which he can but most imperfectly catch, whose power blended all else together and gave a sudden cohesion to the whole'."

The Reformation was far from a perfect biblical movement, as is any endeavor involving fallen men (**Verduin, 1991, pp. 17-18; Verduin, 1990, pp. 188-194**). Yet God guided the Reformation to set the stage for unprecedented political freedom and scientific achievement throughout the world.

III. CHRISTIANITY MADE MODERN SCIENCE POSSIBLE.

Christianity made modern science possible (**Henry, 2006a, p. 10**). **Peter Hodgson (1988, p. 198)**, Professor of Nuclear Physics at Oxford University, wrote: "Christian beliefs played an important part in the development of modern science. ... The ideas necessary for the birth and growth of science are that the world is orderly and rational and open to the human mind. These are Christian beliefs about the world."

By contrast, indigenous science simply has not developed in pagan cultures such as China and India because of the influence of paganism. That the old civilizations of India and China did not develop an indigenous science has long been a point of keen interest to historians. British scholar Joseph Needham spent a

lifetime studying Chinese civilization, concluding that in China, the absence of Christianity meant the absence of science: "[In Europe] the scientific revolution took place along with the rise of capitalism and the Reformation ... but none of them took place in China" (Fisher, 1982, p. 13).

A. Not All Great Scientists Were Christian; the Origin of Science Is.

Murray (2003) asserts that (1) excellence in any field requires a sense of vocation, (2) Christianity has been a major factor in the success of the West in the arts and sciences, and (3) excellence suffers and even declines as the classic sense of vocation declines. Yet Murray is not a Christian, but an agnostic (Murray, 2003, p. 619):

"The willingness to engage in [excellence] in the sciences and creative arts is related to a sense of vocation. By vocation, I have in mind the dictionary definition of "a function or station in life to which one is called by God." I hedge on the necessity of God as the source. ... [A] person with a strong sense of *this is what I have been put on earth to do* is more likely to accomplish great things than someone who doesn't" (Murray, 2003, p. 393).

"People who see a purpose in their lives have a better chance of creating enduring work than people who don't, because the kind of project they work on *does* make a difference to them. ... [To] believe life has a purpose carries with it a predisposition to put one's talents in the service of whatever is the best -- not the most lucrative, not the most glamorous, but that which represents the highest expression of the object of one's vocation" (Murray, 2003, pp. 393-394).

"Creative elites in a culture with a strong sense of duty [as in Asian cultures] are more likely to work hard, and be better able to carry on an existing stream of accomplishment, than in a culture where the creative elite see life as a matter of amusement [as is increasingly true in Western culture]. But for the ignition of creativity, an additional sense of *vocation* is required" (Murray, 2003, p. 407).

"... Devotion to a human cause, whether social justice, the environment, the search for truth, or an abstract humanism, is by its nature less compelling than devotion to God. Here, Christianity has its most potent advantage. The incentives of forgiveness of sin and eternal life are just about as powerful as incentives get. The nonbeliever has to make do with comparatively tepid alternatives. ... Christianity is an important variable, one of the most important in the story of modern accomplishment" (Murray, 2003, pp. 407-408).

B. The 1600s Century of Science

A misconception is that the greatest strides in science have been modern. Not so. The greatest strides were in

the century immediately following the Christian Reformation, a fact demonstrating the close relation between Christianity and the origin of modern science. Historians of science claim that the 1600s were the greatest century in science in the last 2000 years:

"Here and there, in the history of human thought and action, we find periods to which the epithet 'great' may properly be applied ... in the domain of science the seventeenth century, the 'century of genius' ..." (Jeans, 1951, p. 160). "[S]ince the rise of Christianity, there is no landmark in history that is worthy to be compared with [the 1600s]" (Anthony, 1961, p. 9).

C. Pagan Cultures Haven't Produced Modern Science.

It has become fashionable to assert that the Christian West, far from producing useful science, has been a curse upon the earth. "Primitive" native peoples were allegedly good environmentalists according to the fashionable multicultural ethos. Yet, "Many Americans, both before and after Columbus, were anything but protective of the environment. In many parts of the United States, they destroyed millions of forested acres by using fires to hunt and to fight enemy tribes. Often these fires went out of control, devastating thousands of acres of forests. In addition to uncontrolled fires, Indians also engaged in broadcast burning of forests [to make] hunting easier ...

"These burnings took their toll ... The prairies were kept treeless as a result of manmade fires ... If the Europeans had arrived 500 years after Columbus the entire eastern part of the United States would have been treeless and prairie-like" (Schmidt, 1997, p. 54).

Common wisdom also sees Western cultures as the worst environmentalists. But "[p]rimal' economies have rarely been as harmonized with nature as they are depicted; many have actually been highly destructive ... Capitalism [characteristic of the West] presents the only economic system resilient and efficient enough to see the development of a more benign human presence on the earth" (Lewis, 1992, p. 9).

IV. SCIENCE IS NOT VALUE FREE.

Science is not an objective activity. The biases brought into the scientific process by the human mind insure that data will be used to further particular agendas. If the underlying biases and resulting agendas are biblically wrong, the practical consequences will manifest a range of scientific stagnation, geopolitical disasters and scientifically sanctioned death. Throughout history damaging philosophies have been many (Jaki, 1985, pp.

44-45). In the last couple of centuries evolution has been one of the most damaging philosophies posing as "science." The effects of evolution on science itself, on geopolitics, and on the growth of the modern "death" culture illustrate the baneful influence of unbiblical philosophy on science and the world.

A. Evolution Has Brought About Scientific Fraud.

There are concerns about an impending decline in scientific work (Lemonick, 2006, pp. 22-25). W.R. Thompson (1963, p. xxi), FRS and Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, wrote: "The success of Darwinism was accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity. This is already evident in the reckless statements of Haeckel and in the shifting, devious, and histrionic argumentation of T.H. Huxley."

Technological advances have masked this scientific decline for a time, since the sources of technological ideas are the scientific discoveries of an earlier, more productive era.

Scientific fraud is a symptom of decline. Fraud is an intentional or unintentional deception (Webster, 1828, "fraud"). Many frauds are unintentional, occurring because the perpetrators are motivated by fallacious premises and are themselves deceived. Fraud may not be an act of deliberate deception.

The false premises of evolution have led to scientific frauds. The false premise that there must be primitive races evolving conditioned scientists to accept the Tasaday hoax engineered by the Filipino government: "Most glaring is the case of the Tasaday [people, a supposedly primitive tribe], famed for both their gentle ways and their total freedom from corrupting exterior contact. The discovery of this stone-age remnant now appears to have been an outright fraud" (Lewis, 1992, p. 67).

"The evidence leaves no doubt in my mind that the entire Tasaday episode has been a deliberate deception, a hoax ... Vulnerable villagers ... were induced to cavort, clad in leaves, as cave-dwellers before outsiders during brief, preannounced visits" (Berreman, 1991, p. 34).

Before exposure of the Tasaday hoax, *National Geographic* had published articles on the Tasaday as if they were real (MacLeish, 1971b, pp. 220-255; MacLeish, 1971a, pp. 881-882). In fact, *National Geographic* was victim to a more recent fraud involving claims of a feathered dinosaur that never existed (Sloan, 1999, p. 98). This fraud was made possible by the fallacious premise that feathered dinosaurs evolved into birds. A retraction of the feathered dinosaur claim was published eventually (Simons, 2001, p. 128).

B. Evolution Has Led to Totalitarianism and War.

Evolution provided a foundation for the rise of Communism: "Marx and Engels accepted evolution

almost immediately after Darwin published *The Origin of Species*. ... Evolution, of course, was just what the founders of communism needed to explain how mankind could have come into being without the intervention of any supernatural force, and consequently it could be used to bolster the foundations of their materialistic philosophy" (Zirkle, 1959, p. 85).

"It is a commonplace that Marx felt his own work to be the exact parallel of Darwin's. He even wished to dedicate a portion of *Das Kapital* to the author of *The Origin of Species*. ... Like Darwin, Marx ... saw history in stages, as the Darwinists saw geological strata and successive forms of life. ... Both Marx and Darwin made struggle the means of development" (Barzun, 1981, pp. 8, 170).

"There was truth in Engel's eulogy on Marx: 'Just as Darwin discovered the law of organic evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history'" (Himmelfarb, 1968, pp. 422-423).

Evolutionists early on were discussing the violent overthrow of governments. Geographer Elisee Reclus recounted a conversation in 1861 with Alfred Russell Wallace, the "co-founder" of evolution: "We did not talk of geography during the afternoon we spent together, but of Anarchism ... On asking him if he thought force was needed to bring about such a great reform, and if he approved of the killing by bombs or otherwise of bad rulers, he replied, very quietly, that in extreme cases, like that of Russia, he thought there was no other way to force upon the rulers' notice the determination of the people to be free from their tyrants ..." (Wallace, 1905, p. 208).

Evolution provided an impetus for global war. With evolution fomenting an upsurge in modern racism and communistic revolution, war parties grew stronger: "In every European country between 1870 and 1914 there was a war party demanding armaments, an individualist party demanding ruthless competition, an imperialist party demanding a free hand over backward peoples, a socialist party demanding the conquest of power, and a racialist party demanding internal purges against aliens - all of them, when appeals to greed and glory failed, or even before, invoked Spencer and Darwin ... Race was biological, it was sociological; it was Darwinian" (Barzun, 1981, pp. 94, 95).

Evolution was a major factor generating a warlike spirit leading to World War I. "This great European war has nearly wiped out human civilization; although its causes were very many, it must be said that the Darwinian theory [of struggle for survival] had a very great influence" (Teng and Fairbank, 1961, p. 267).

World War II was an outgrowth of evolution. "To see evolutionary measures and tribal morality being applied rigorously to the affairs of a great modern nation we must turn again to Germany of 1942. We see Hitler devoutly convinced that evolution produces the only real basis for a national policy. ...

"The German Fuhrer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution" (**Keith, 1947, pp. 28, 230**).

Evolution was a factor in China's eventual fall to Communism: "Even in China in recent years, where throughout [the] whole country men struggle for power, grasp for gain, and seem to have gone crazy, although they understand nothing of scholarship, yet the things they say to shield themselves from condemnation are regularly drawn from Yen Fu's translation of T.H. Huxley's *Principles of Evolution*. One can see that the influence of theory on men's minds is enormous" (**Teng and Fairbank, 1961, p. 267**).

Evolution's destabilizing influence on China extended back to the early years of the 20th century: "But it was Darwinism, speaking through Huxley, and made to appear organically related to ancient Chinese thought on evolution, that furnished the intellectual basis for China's great upheaval beginning with 1911" (**Veith, 1960, p. 16**).

Evolution made the 20th century the deadliest in history. Without evolution's influence, it is conceivable that the Communist Revolution and World Wars I and II might not have been. As events worked out, the 20th century was the deadliest ever for political and war deaths. For Communism alone, "With a grand total of victims variously estimated ... between 85 million and 100 million ... the Communist record offers the most colossal case of political carnage in history" (**Kramer, 1999, p. x**). An additional 25 million died due to Nazism (**Kramer, 1999, p. xi**).

These deaths were due to evolution:

"Communism's recourse to 'permanent civil war' rested on the `scientific' Marxist belief in class struggle ... Nazi violence was founded on a scientific social Darwinism promising national regeneration through racial struggle" (**Kramer, 1999, p. xix**).

Evolutionists have sought to turn the blame for evolution's deadly legacy from evolution to "male dominance." According to psychiatrist Arnold Ludwig, author of *King of the Mountain: The Nature of Political Leadership*, published in 2002 by the University of Kentucky, of all rulers in the 20th century, "98.6% were male. [Ludwig] also found it `simply horrifying' that in the 20th century rulers contributed to over 200 million deaths from wars and oppressive social policies. `And I happen to believe that these two things are connected ...' Ludwig believes one way to reverse the numbers of deaths from wars might be to adopt more of an `estrogenic approach' to ruling. `There not only should be far higher percentages of women in power, but they should be well represented at every level: cabinet posts, ambassadorships, and the highest military ranks'" (**Worley, 2002, p. 28**).

However, this does not explain why in the 1800s, when rulers were nearly all male, the number of deaths from wars and social causes was so much less than 200 million. For comparison, in the

years 1917-1953, there were some 20 million political deaths in Russia under Communism, but a total of only 6,321 political deaths under the Czars in the century from 1825-1917 (**Kramer, 1999, p. xviii**). Further, the deadliest war of the nineteenth century, the American civil war with a death toll of 600,000, was only 1% as deadly as the deadliest war of the 20th century (World War II) with its death toll of 60 million.

The historians already quoted do not put the blame for 20th century death on the development of more murderous weaponry. They put the blame on evolution. Evolution was the new factor that made the 20th century so deadly.

C. Evolution Has Produced Modern Death Culture.

Abortion and infanticide are justified by appeals to evolutionary thinking: "Among some animal species, then, infant killing appears to be a natural practice. Could it be natural for humans, too -- a trait inherited from our primate ancestors? ... Charles Darwin noted in *The Descent of Man* that infanticide has been „probably the most important of all checks' on population growth throughout most of human history" (**Burke, 1984, p. 29**).

Abortion was legalized in the U.S. in 1973; now it is becoming required that physicians learn how to do abortions (**Villarosa, 2002, p. 1**). Will infanticide/ euthanasia training eventually be required? This is not so far fetched; scholarly works are now appearing that compare our culture to pre-Nazi Germany and even to the Nazi regime itself. **Proctor (1999, pp. 249-252, 276-278)** documents that the modern "war" on cigarettes was also carried out by the perverted Nazi regime. Most chilling is the fact that this author approves of certain similarities between our culture and that of the Nazis.

Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood, was a fervent evolutionist and based her coercive contraceptive policies on evolutionary teaching. One of Sanger's early writings was a pamphlet, *Family Limitation*, and Planned Parenthood was originally named the Birth Control League which published the magazine *The Birth Control Review* strongly advocating birth control (**Grant, 1995, pp. 49, 64**).

Sanger was wanted to impose birth control on the world for two reasons: (1) that it would undermine Christianity, and (2) that it would eliminate "inferior races" from reproducing. She wrote, "Birth control appeals to the advanced radical because it is calculated to undermine the authority of the Christian churches. I look forward to seeing humanity free someday of the tyranny of Christianity ..." (**Grant, 1995, p. 104**).

She also wrote of black people, whom she viewed as inferior, that the way to convince the "Negro" to accept birth control "is through

religious appeal. We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population ..." (Grant, 1995, p. 74). Sanger Biographer George Grant concludes: "The bottom line is that [Sanger] self-consciously organized the Birth Control League -- and its progeny, Planned Parenthood -- in part, to promote and enforce the scientifically elitist notions of White Supremacy" (Grant, 1995, p. 72).

Lest it be doubted that Sanger's radical views were not those of Planned Parenthood, it should be noted that she remained in control of the organization even after it had global influence because "the organization found that it simply could not survive without her" (Grant, 1995, p. 96). Alan Guttmacher, who took the helm after her death in 1966, stated, "We are merely walking down the path that Mrs. Sanger carved out for us" (Grant, 1995, p. 102).

Planned Parenthood has been virtually alone responsible for the global abortion holocaust. In 1938 Sweden was the first "Christian" nation to legalize abortion and to initiate Planned Parenthood birth control programs; from 1949-1956, eleven other nations in Europe legalized abortion because of Planned Parenthood activism; in 1958, Planned Parenthood became the global sponsor of free sex and abortion under U.N. financial support. The U.N. presently supports Planned Parenthood abortion programs in virtually every nation, including China, India, the African states, and the nations of central Europe. The U.S. is also a major sponsor, since the U.S. is the single largest donor to the U.N.

There have long been calls among the elite for draconian controls on population. Aldous Huxley (1932, pp. xii-xiii) opined that the future is likely to be totalitarian: "A really efficient totalitarian state would be one in which the all-powerful executive of political bosses and their army of managers control a population of slaves who do not have to be coerced, because they love their servitude. ... The most important [projects] of the future will be vast government-sponsored enquiries into ... 'the problem of happiness' -- in other words, the problem of making people love their servitude. ... The love of servitude cannot be established except as the result of a deep, personal revolution in human minds and bodies. To bring about that revolution we require, among others, the following discoveries and inventions. First, a greatly improved technique of suggestion -- through infant conditioning and, later, with the aid of drugs ... [And finally] a foolproof system of eugenics, designed to standardize the human product and so to facilitate the task of the managers. In *Brave New World* this standardization of the human product has been pushed to fantastic, though perhaps not impossible, extremes."

There continue to be modern calls for Nazi-like population control: "We must have population control at home ... by compulsion if voluntary methods fail. ... And while this is being done we must take action to reverse the deterioration of our environment before population pressure permanently ruins our planet. [But the environment is not collapsing, nor is population exploding. We can no longer afford merely to treat the symptoms of the cancer of population growth; the cancer itself must be cut out. Population control is the only answer.

"Some sort of compulsory birth regulation would be necessary to achieve birth control. One plan often mentioned

involves the addition of temporary sterilants to water supplies or staple food. Doses of the antidote would be carefully rationed by the government to produce the desired population size. ..." (Ehrlich, 1968, pp. 11, 135). Such drastic calls for coercive population control have become increasingly common among the elite. Ehrlich (1968, p. 79) called for a global population of only 2 billion by 2050 and 1.5 billion by 2100.

Ehrlich was involved in establishing the Wildlands Project, a plan now being gradually and quietly implemented by the government to depopulate the U.S. in a couple of centuries and confine people to "reservations" occupying a fraction of the land -- an "archipelago of human-inhabited islands surrounded by natural areas" (Mann and Plummer, 1993, p. 1860).

Though now it is politically correct to decry the violence and death due to Communism and the World Wars, the evolutionary death toll continues to mount. An estimated 50 million babies are aborted worldwide each year due ultimately to evolutionary influence. This began after World War II. Since then, on the order of 2 billion babies have been aborted (Grant, 1995, p. 3). As a consequence, the global population growth rate is plummeting, with a population decline predicted to set in within 50 years. There is no population explosion, but there is a "death explosion" due to more than 150 years of evolutionary dominance.

V. A SCIENTIFIC "PRIESTHOOD" IS EMERGING.

In his Nobel lecture, William Fowler (1984, p. 934) cautioned that we know much less about how stars work than most people realize: "In spite of the past and current research in experimental and theoretical nuclear astrophysics ... Hoyle's grand concept of element synthesis in the stars [is not] truly established. ... It is not just a matter of filling in the details. There are puzzles and problems in each part of the cycle which challenge the basic ideas underlying nucleosynthesis in stars."

The words of Seneca appended by Alexander Humboldt (1852, p. 560) near the end of the astronomical section of his epochal five-volume *Cosmos* series remain applicable: "We believe we are initiated; whereas we halt at the very threshold." Despite these caveats, there has been since the rise of evolution in the 1800s a slow shift away from scientific observations to a reliance on the human Mind as the route to truth (Henry, 2006c, pp. 1-4).

A. The Renaissance Revived "Greek" Thought.

The Renaissance is simplistically defined as a rebirth of learning. But it is important to ask, What kind of learning was re-born? It was a rebirth of Graeco-Roman

paganism in opposition to the Reformation: "The [Renaissance] humanists discovered the literary works of antiquity. In them they became absorbed to the exclusion of all else. ... They still remain a curse to our educational system" (**Singer, 1959, p. 192**).

With the eclipse of biblical thought in our culture, there is a resurgence in "Greek" thought that is the Renaissance revived. This Renaissance revival is no more biblical in philosophy than the original Greek philosophy. It believes that the human mind can unlock all knowledge. Astronomer **Donald Goldsmith (1985, p. 253)**, for instance, believes that, "The power of the human mind, seen both in its analytic ability and in its development of superfast calculating machines, has enabled us to penetrate the interiors of stars and to discover the liberation of kinetic energy within them. We have achieved this success despite the fact that we can see only the *surfaces* of stars." To Goldsmith, the Greek belief that human logic can tell us what the universe must be like has replaced scientific observation.

Renaissance sympathizers seek achievements in Greek thought that were never there. It is conventionally said that the concept of atoms -- the atomic theory -- is due to Democritus (**Brescia et al., 1980, p. 17; Hein and Arena, 2004, p. 84**). But he only guessed: "The atoms of Democritus were in no sense the product of experimental investigation" (**Singer, 1959, p. 21**), and "were based neither on knowledge nor observation" (**Jeans, 1951, p. 45**). **DeWitt (2004, p. 177)** concludes that, "Atomism is much more of a metaphysical, philosophical/conceptual belief than an empirical belief." Such considerations show that Greek thought did not originate modern science (**Henry, 2006a, p. 1**).

B. Modern "Greek" Thought Places Human Reasoning Above Observation.

Greek thought and logic in science is being revived through the primacy of mathematics. Mathematics is the basis of computer models, and this primacy explains, for example, why computer model predictions are taken as evidence of human-caused global warming despite the absence of supporting temperature data.

Some scientists have expressed alarm about the reversal of status between observation and mathematics. Through the late 1800s, the predictions of mathematical models were considered reliable only if supporting data existed. In the early 1900s, a shift began toward the position that mathematical predictions are reliable in themselves even without data.

The required acceptance of any mathematical proposition as physically true has led to a strange state of affairs in which scientific observation is no longer supposed to tell us what the universe is like. Due to certain mathematical constructs viewed as part of

quantum theory, for example, the fashionable claim is now that, "Common sense has already been tested as a guide to quantum theory and been found wanting. The one sure thing we know about the quantum world is not to trust our common sense" (**Gribbin, 1984, p. 205**).

It is a dangerous position to say that common sense -- the human ability to make sense out of data -- must be discarded. The consequence is to accept any idea, no matter how contrary to observation. Yet in the context of discussing relativity theory and quantum mechanics, **Gribbin (1984, p. 194)** says we must do exactly this: "[A]nything that is acceptable to both those theories, no matter how paradoxical that something may seem, has to be taken seriously." There is a linkage between the growth of this mentality and the acceptance of evolution despite the evidence against it.

The reason for accepting paradoxes as dogma is clearer when one realizes that most of the founders of modern quantum mechanical theory held various Eastern beliefs and shaped their science around these. This was true of **Niels Bohr (1958, p. 20; Capra, 1984, pp. 145-146)**, **Werner Heisenberg (1958, p. 202)**, and **J. Robert Oppenheimer (1954, p. 40)**.

Physicist **Herbert Dingle (1972, p. 183)** asked, "If this state of mind exists among the *elite* of science, what will be the state of mind of a public taught to measure the value of an idea in terms of its incomprehensibility and to scorn the old science because it could not be understood? The times are not so auspicious that we can rest comfortably in a mental atmosphere in which the ideas fittest to survive are not those which stand in the most rational relation to experience, but those which can don the most impressive garb of pseudo-profundity."

Inexorably Western science is shifting away from objective empiricism fostered by the Reformation, toward reliance on elite pronouncements of the supposed truth of incomprehensible dogma. Yet God is at work. We live in a society where free inquiry remains possible. Let us rise up and prayerfully use our opportunities to proclaim biblical truth -- really the only truth there is.

CONCLUSIONS

Though God works through believers and unbelievers alike, science has prospered when Christian virtues are in the ascendancy as in the years right after the Reformation. It suffers when Christianity is in eclipse. With our shift away from biblical principles, Western science is slowly shifting toward the ancient Greek mentality which was a scientific dead end. We live in an excellent time to call people back to the truths of the Bible and to Christ Himself.

References

- Andrade, E. 1964. *Sir Isaac Newton: His Life and Work*. Anchor, Garden City, N.Y.
- Andrus, B. 1970. *I Was the Nuremberg Jailer*. Tower Publications, NYC.
- Anthony, H. 1961. *Sir Isaac Newton*. Collier, NYC.
- Bererman, G. 1991. The incredible 'Tasaday': deconstructing the myth of a stone age people. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 15(1):3-44.
- Barnes, T. 1993. *Science and Biblical Faith*. Creation Research Society, Norcross, Ga.
- Barzun, J. 1981. *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*. University of Chicago.
- Barzun, J. 2000. *From Dawn to Decadence*, HarperCollins, NYC.
- Beckmann, P. 1991. Nuclear hospital waste. *Access to Energy*. 18(11):1-2.
- Bohr, N. 1958. *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*. Wiley, New York.
- Boorstin, J. 1983. *The Discoverers*. Random House, NYC.
- Brescia, F., J. Arents, H. Meislich, and A. Turk. 1980. *Fundamentals of Chemistry*. Academic, NYC.
- Burke, B. 1984. Infanticide. *Science* 84. 5(5):26-31.
- Capra, F. 1984. *The Tao of Physics*. Bantam, NYC.
- Carpenter, B. 1991. A panther by another name. *U.S. News & World Report*. 110(23):55-57.
- Christianson, G. 1984. *In the Presence of the Creator*. Free Press, NYC.
- Dampier, W. 1961. *A History of Science and Its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*. Cambridge University, Cambridge, England.
- DeWitt, R. 2004. *Worldviews: An Introduction to the History and Philosophy of Science*. Blackwell, Malden, Mass.
- DiLorenzo, T. 2002. *The Real Lincoln*. Prima/Random House, Roseville, Calif.
- Dingle, H. 1972. *Science at the Crossroads*. Martin Brian & O'Keefe, London.
- Ehrlich, P. 1968. *The Population Bomb*. Ballantine, NYC.
- Faraday, M. 1910. The chemical history of a candle. *The Harvard Classics*, Collier, NYC. 30:86-170.
- Fisher, A. 1982. The Roots of Science in Ancient China. *Mosaic*. 13(2):9-15.
- Fowler, W. 1984. The quest for the origin of the elements. *Science*. 226:922-935.
- Goldsmith, D. 1985. *The Evolving Universe*. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA.
- Grant, G. 1995. *Killer Angel: A Biography of Planned Parenthood's Founder Margaret Sanger*. Ars Vitae Press, Franklin, Tenn.
- Gribbin, J. 1984. *In Search of Schrodinger's Cat*. Bantam, NYC.
- Hein, M., and H. Arena. 2004. *Foundations of College Chemistry*. Wiley, NYC.
- Heisenberg, W. 1958. *Physics and Philosophy*. Harper and Row, NYC.
- Henry, J. 2006a. Christianity and the rise of modern science. CCC, Clearwater, Fla.
- Henry, J. 2006b. Environmental collapse is not happening. CCC, Clearwater, Fla.
- Henry, J. 2006c. The rise of the new scientific priesthood. CCC, Clearwater, Fla.
- Himmelfarb, G. 1968. *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*. Norton, NYC.
- Hodgson, P. 1988. The Christian origin of modern science. *The World and I*. 3(7):198-203.
- Humboldt, A. 1852. *Cosmos*. 4:291-601. Henry G. Bohn, London.
- Huxley, A. 1932. *Brave New World*. Harper and Row, New York. Reprinted 1969.
- Jaki, S. 1985. On whose side is history. *National Review*. 37(15):41-47.
- Jears, J. 1951. *The Growth of Physical Science*. Cambridge University, Cambridge, England.
- Jones, J. 1904. *Christ in the Camp*. Martin and Hoyt. Reprinted 1986. Sprinkle, Harrisonburg, Va.
- Kendall, J. 1939. *Young Chemists and Great Discoveries*. Books for Libraries, Freeport, N.Y. Reprinted 1969.
- Keith, A. 1947. *Evolution and Ethics*. Putnam, NYC.
- Kramer, M., editor. 1999. *The Black Book of Communism*. Harvard, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lal, D. 1998. *Unintended Consequences*. MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lemonick, M. 2006. Are we losing our edge? *Time*. 167(7):22-30, 33.
- Lewis, M. 1992. *Green Delusions*. Duke University, Durham, N.C.
- MacDonald, D. 1964. *Faraday, Maxwell, and Kelvin*. Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, N.Y.
- MacLeish, K. 1971a. First glimpse of a stone age tribe. *National Geographic*. 140:880-882.
- MacLeish, K. 1971b. Help for Philippine tribes in trouble. *National Geographic*. 140:220-255.
- Mangalwadi, V., and R. Mangalwadi. 1999. *The Legacy of William Carey*. Crossway, Wheaton, Ill.
- Mann, C., and Plummer, M. 1993. The high cost of biodiversity. *Science*. 260:1868-1871.
- Manuel, F. 1974. *The Religion of Isaac Newton*. Oxford University, London.
- Michaels, P. 1992. *Sound and Fury: The Science and Politics of Global Warming*, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Morris, H. 1982. *Men of Science, Men of God*. Creation-Life Publishers, San Diego.
- Murray, C. 2003. *Human Accomplishment*. HarperCollins, NYC.
- Newton, I. 1687. *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. Royal Society, London. Translator, A. Motte, 1729. Translation revised, F. Cajori, 1930. Reprinted 1934, UC Berkeley.
- Newton, I. 1733. *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel*. J. Darby and T. Browne, London. Reprinted 1991, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, Cave Junction, Ore.
- Oppenheimer, J. 1954. *Science and the Common Understanding*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Proctor, R. 1999. *The Nazi War on Cancer*. Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Sarton, G. 1955. Introductory essay. In J. Needham, editor. *Science, Religion and Reality*. George Braziller, NYC.
- Schmidt, A. 1997. *The Menace of Multiculturalism*. Preager, NYC.
- Simons, L. 2001. Archeoraptor fossil trail. *National Geographic*. 198(4):128-132.
- Singer, C. 1959. *A Short History of Scientific Ideas to 1900*. Oxford University, London.
- Singer, M. 1999. Demographics: the population surprise. *Atlantic Monthly*. 284(2):22-25.
- Skole, D., and C. Tucker. 1993. Tropical deforestation and habitat fragmentation in the Amazon: satellite data from 1978 to 1988. *Science*. 260:1905-1910.
- Sloan, C. 1999. Feathers for T. rex: new birdlike fossils are missing links in dinosaur evolution. *National Geographic*. 196(5):98-107.
- Teng, S., and J. Fairbank. 1961. *China's Response to the West*. Harvard, Cambridge, Mass.
- Thompson, W. 1963. Introduction to *Origin of Species*. J.M. Dent, London, pp. vii-vvix.
- Veith, I. 1960. Creation and evolution in the Far East. In S. Tax, editor. *Issues in Evolution*. University of Chicago, pp. 1-17.
- Verduin, L. 1964. *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids. Reprinted 1991. Christian Hymnary, Sarasota, Fla.
- Verduin, L. 1976. *The Anatomy of a Hybrid: A Study in Church-State Relationships*. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids. Reprinted 1990. Christian Hymnary, Sarasota, Fla.
- Villarosa, L. 2002. Newest skill for future ob-gyns: abortion training. *New York Times*. June 11, 2002, Health and Fitness p. 1.
- Wallace, A. 1905. *My Life*. Chapman and Hall, London. Vol. 2.
- Webster, N. 1828. *American Dictionary of the English Language*. S. Converse, Philadelphia. Reprinted 1993, Foundation for American Christian Education, San Francisco.
- White, L. 1967. The historical roots of our ecological crisis. *Science*. 155:1203-1207.
- Williams, L. 1971. *Michael Faraday*. Simon and Schuster, NYC.
- Worley, J. 2002. It's good to be king. *UK Odyssey*. Fall, p. 28.
- Zirkle, C. 1959. *Evolution, Marxian Biology and the Social Scene*. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.