TheForum – Straight answers to straight questions Hasn’t science disproved Christianity? PowerPoint

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 09 May 2010

Preacher: Pete Nicholas

[0:00] Thank you, Bruce. Thanks for the introduction. Yeah, my name's Pete, and thank you very much for having me with you today. Now, I do work for Christians in sport, so some people would be cynical and say that sport and science would be as opposed as the debate would say that sport and Christianity, sorry, science and Christianity would be.

So it may well be that here today there'll be people with significant areas of expertise and areas that I definitely don't have. In fact, I don't know if you've been to a debate about science and Christianity before, but often you do have someone who's got a professional background in science, someone who's studied to a PhD level or something like that.
Now, obviously, I have nothing in the way of that experience, but I wonder if that's not necessarily a bad thing. Firstly, it means that if you ask a question that I can't answer, I can easily say that's because I'm not a particular scientist and hand over to someone with greater expertise.
That lets me off the hook a bit later, doesn't it? But secondly, I think that one of the problems sometimes in this debate is that we do feel a little bit like we've all got to be experts to even engage with it a little bit.
So I'm just coming at it from very much a layman's perspective. I've read quite a lot about it. I'm very interested in it. I definitely don't have all the answers at all. I do believe that the Bible has all the answers that we need to know, but there'll be lots of areas that we may want to discuss which actually I won't be able to speak directly into.
[1:21] So do feel free to discuss on the table. I think that's a big part of what we're here to do. And do feel free to engage and to throw your ideas out as well, particularly if I get stuck along the way.

Now, my own scientific background, I suppose, I gave up science when I was studying GCSE. I have to admit that I used to often stare out the window thinking about playing sports rather than focusing in on the science lessons.
The one particular science lesson I got very interested in was when I was 11 years old and our teacher was telling us about how much weight a helium balloon could support.
And I worked out, being a bit of a mathematician at the time, that if we took 1,327 helium balloons, tied them by string to the smallest girl in our class, who was called Lizzie Allen, that we would have liftoff.
So I suggested to the science teacher, this is what we did. And he was a little bit eccentric, a bit potty, and he wanted to do that. We got halfway through the science lesson and Lizzie started crying, and it was all out.
[2:22] And from that moment on, I slightly disengaged with science, but I'm coming back to it now. First up, question then. This is our question we're discussing. Has science disproved Christianity? You have to have really had your head down a rabbit hole, I suppose, not to think that there is a bit of a war of worldviews going on here.

That if you take the worldview of science on one hand and the worldview of Christianity on the other hand, that they are, if you like, two trains on the same track about to collide, or maybe already colliding.
Let me just give you a couple of quotes of people who would have you believe this. So Peter Atkins is a chemistry professor at Oxford, and he's written this. Humanity should accept that science has eliminated the justification for believing in cosmic purpose.
Cosmic purpose, just to explain, is believing that there is something beyond science, a god or a being behind it all. And he says that humanity needs to accept that science has totally eliminated

that, once and for all.
Richard Dawkins, who is eminently quotable, he's a very, very colorful character, he's written this, which is a great quote. He's written, Darwin chased God out of the old haunts of biology, and God scurried for safety down the rabbit hole of physics.
[3:33] The laws and constants of the universe, we were told, are just too good to be true. A setup that's carefully tuned to allow the eventual evolution of life. But it needed a good physicist to show us this fallacy, and Victor Stenger drives a pack of energetic ferrets down the last major bolt hole, and God is running out of holes in which to hide.

You get what he's saying, don't you? He's basically saying that we believe in God because he explains parts of the world that we can't account for. And the more we're able to explain the world, the less and less need we have for God.
That is what's commonly known as the theory of God of the gaps. God is there to fill in our gaps of knowledge. Now, we're going to look at this a little bit later in Genesis and ask whether that is actually the Bible's view of God.
But certainly it does seem like they're on one train track, two trains, heading in collision course, don't they? I'm just going to briefly, in this first part, look at a few areas and just ask the question, is that a fair assumption?
Is it fair to be saying that Christianity and science are going to collide or are already colliding? First of all, we're going to look at the practice of modern science. This is a very interesting survey because in 1996, two United States sociologists did a survey of scientists, of those who were making a career out of science, and asked them this question, do you believe in a God who answers prayer, and do you believe in personal immortality?
[4:55] Obviously, two fundamental beliefs which are normally taken to be at odds with science. 40%, 40% of those asked, which interestingly is higher, sorry, is higher than in the general population, 40% of scientists said they did.

So those practicing science don't seem to have a particular problem with believing things that seem, supposedly, to be diametrically opposed to science, so our culture would say. And interestingly, in 1916, the same question was asked 80 years previously, and that percentage was 42%.
So in a century when we've seen science growing, and therefore supposedly Christianity and a belief in God shrinking, only 2% variation in scientists who actually practice science.
Now, I'm not saying that's a knockdown proof for anything. I'm just saying that that should at least get us begging the question, if those who are actually in science full-time don't have a problem holding these two things together, why are we constantly told that they are in such tension?
Let's look also at the origins of modern science. This is more into my ballpark. It's back to philosophy. But the modern science movement arose out of the Enlightenment, starting in the 17th century and moving on into the early 18th century.
[6:03] These are not just two people who were involved in the emergence of modern science. These are two people who are absolutely critical to it, two pillars of modern science, Blaise Pascal and Sir Isaac Newton.

Blaise Pascal was a mathematician and a physicist, also a significant writer of Christian literature, wrote many books. In fact, only Margie wrote more books about science than he did about Christianity.
Sir Isaac Newton, not always known, but was a very committed Protestant Christian as well, so a believing Christian. And part of the thing is is that the original scientific movement actually came out of a belief in Christianity.
Now, don't take my word for it, but here's a secular physicist and historian called A.N. Whitehead, and he wrote, men became scientific as they looked for laws because they believed in a lawgiver. Do you hear what he's saying? He's saying that science is often about searching for, evaluating, trying to hypothesize laws, but you do that because you believe there is a God behind the universe who is a lawgiver, who makes laws, and therefore you will discover laws.
[7:05] Effectively, science doesn't get off the ground if you don't believe there are regularities, patterns to be discovered. If you believe the universe is purely random, you wouldn't start. You wouldn't endeavor to find laws. But men believed there were laws, so they searched for them, and that was the birth of modern science.

Curious then, wind forward three or four hundred years, that now we take science to be opposed to Christianity. So the practice of modern science, the origins of modern science, and then I just want to talk briefly before I hand over to discussion about the scope of modern science.
In philosophy, there's something called a category error. That is when you put a subject in the wrong category. Let me give you an example. A friend of mine a few years ago, when he'd read the Da Vinci Code, he's not a Christian, got very excited and came bounding up to me and he said, mate, I'm really interested to know what you think of the Da Vinci Code.
Has it rocked your face? And I kind of smiled, and over the course of the next discussion, tried to speak to him about the fact that the Da Vinci Code sits in the category of the bookshelves called fiction.
So I said to him, mate, it's not a problem at all because you can see, I don't believe the Bible is fiction. The Bible doesn't believe itself it is fiction. The Bible makes claims of space, time, and history, of historical fact.
[8:19] Dan Brown, by his own omission, hasn't marketed it as a book about history. It's a work of fiction. That is a category error. He is saying that these two things are going to collide because we've got two works of fact, but we don't.

One fiction, one fact. Now, similarly with science, it doesn't explain everything, but one way of thinking of it is two trains on two different tracks running the same direction together. One, the train, if you like, of Christianity and the Bible, is talking about purpose.
Why are we here? What is the great meaning behind life? Who is behind it all? Is there anyone behind it all? These are the questions of religion, and particularly Christianity. Christianity. But the other train, the science train, if you like, is chugging along, asking questions of mechanism and process.
How do things function? What are the laws that govern the universe? You know, what process brought that about? Mechanism and process. That is a category that is completely set apart to religion in general terms.
And so to say that these are two trains that are going to collide is to fundamentally miss the point that that is a category error. These are two different categories. And I think that's why if we would go back to that first slide with the percentages of scientists who believe various religious beliefs, they have no tension with it at all because they're in different categories and they're running on two tracks parallel together.
[9:37] So I wonder if we've actually been sucked in a little bit. I wonder if that the real debate isn't so much between science and Christianity, but between something a little bit sneaky. I wonder if our culture has tried to convince us about something which we could call scientism.

Now, an ism is a worldview. That is, an ism could be described as something you would believe to explain everything there is about the world. In fact, I managed to get a little quote of one of the new atheists about what he thought scientism was.
He said this, he believes that this is his view, that natural science as a worldview is superior to all other interpretations of life. Now, that is very different to what science is.
To engage in science does not require you to believe that. That is a question of belief. That is not something that if you are, you know, practicing physicist or a PhD level biologist, you have to believe.
You may believe that or you may not. But that is a belief that is not a scientifically held viewpoint.
And so the real debate, I would like to say, is between scientism and theism. Theism being a belief that God, an explanation of God as a foundation, is superior to all other interpretations of life.
[10:50] Those are the two trains that are going to collide. But science and Christianity need not collide at all. Now, you've got some questions on your table. I'd love you to throw it around for a little bit.

We'll try and give you about 10 minutes to debate. So maybe the table leaders, you'll chair those discussions, and then we'll come back together in about 10 minutes. Over to you. Good. Can I just recommend that as we're going through this, if there's anything that I say that I'm not clear about, I mean, I'm definitely prone, definitely prone, as my wife would tell you, if she were here to not being clear on things.
So don't think that it's you or you're being stupid. It's probably me and probably me not being sufficiently clear. So do write down your question, and perhaps we'll have time at the end to answer it. If not, then I'll be sticking around for a little bit as well.

So I'd love to chat to you one-on-one. So just make a note, and if you haven't been able to discuss with your table leader, do ask the question, and we'll see where we go with it. The second part that I want to look at is to do with the so-called sacred cows of scientism.
I know I'm being a little bit naughty calling it a sacred cow, but what I mean by sacred cows, not of science, but of scientism, and remember the definition that we had in the first part, is a sacred cow is something that's deemed untouchable, something that is so rock-solid and certain as a belief that it disproves something.
[12:04] So there are certain things which you'll hear often in our culture, touted in the press, or maybe just chatted about amongst friends, that are instantly, the moment they're mentioned, they're knocked-down proofs for Christianity. You know, the two things can't even be mentioned on the same page if you're a credible, intellectual, intelligent person.

And I just want to consider some of those and just to see whether that is really that reasonable or not. So the first one I want to look at is some of the principles of scientism.
Now, underpinning some of these principles is that the only true knowledge we can ever really have is knowledge that is attained from scientific methods. Often people will talk that way, and often people will say that as a big problem they have with Christians.
When after all, we, you know, Christians believe the Bible, the Bible isn't testable by scientific methods, is it? Therefore, you're probably believing something akin to fairy tales. That's roughly how the argument, in a slightly uncharitable form, can go.
Bertrand Russell, who is a philosopher and also an atheist, wrote this, whatever knowledge is attainable must be obtainable by scientific methods. Now, it sounds pretty good.
[13:06] I've got to admit, it does sound pretty compelling, doesn't it? Science is certain. It deals with facts. We can examine things. We can test them. We can put them under a microscope. So that's very reasonable. I have the problem with it, which is it's totally circular and self-defeating.

That's a big claim, I know, but let me just show you what I mean. Apply the test that Bertrand Russell has there to his own statement. Whatever knowledge is attainable must be obtainable by scientific methods. Is that principle obtained by scientific methods?
Did Bertrand Russell manage to observe that principle under a microscope? Did he manage to deduce it from number or logic? Not at all. This is a principle which sounds quite compelling, but where is the evidence for it?
Where is the foundation for that principle? It's just something which Bertrand Russell has come up with. I mean, I presume he would say being a philosopher is an a priori assumption, but I would definitely beg the question whether or not it's actually valid.
Let's go a little bit further. So going back, Bertrand Russell actually was in a long line of secular atheists, and David Hume, again, on the cusp of the Enlightenment, was a writer, and he wrote this.
[14:08] If we take in our hand any volume, any book, of divinity that's talking about God, or school of metaphysics, that's talking about what there is out there in the world, let us ask, does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number?

He's saying, does it contain any maths or logic, really? And then he says, does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter-of-fact and existence? Can you poke it and prod it and examine it under a microscope?
No. What do you do with it, then, according to David Hume? Commit it, then, to the flames. Burn it, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion. That is, it's nothing but smoke and mirrors. Well, again, let's apply his test to his statement, shall we?
Does his statement contain in it any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does his test contain in it any experimental reasoning concerning matter-of-fact?
No. So what should we do with this great book? And by the way, it is a brilliant book. What should we do with it, according to his own principle? Burn it, because it's nothing but smoke and mirrors. Now, I'm not trying to be too provocative here.
[15:07] I'm just saying that it is circular. I don't think we should burn the book. I think it's a brilliant book and well worth reading and engaging with. But it does fail its own test. And so often, we feel that actually science is so certain, but science requires certain foundations.

And the big question is, where do those foundations come from? Let's move on and consider two other sacred cows, Big Bang and the Evolution of Life. Now, often when I have friends and I talk to them, they've even said things like, I can't believe in God because I believe in evolution, or I can't

believe in God because I know the Big Bang is how it all started.
So they're often used as these ways of sacred cows that kind of keep Christians or those who believe in God at arm's length. Now, I just want to consider them, in turn, the Big Bang. What was interesting with the Big Bang as I started reading up about this was the term was first coined by a guy called Hoyle in 1952 when he was undergoing a radio interview, Fred Hoyle.
And in his radio interview, he was advocating that the universe didn't have a start and won't have an end. It's so-called steady state theory. He was arguing that the universe is in a constant state and has always been.
And that when you look at the constants in the universe, then, he was arguing, that would force you to believe that the universe had no beginning. Now, subsequently, a lot of the evidence, and I know it's all up for grabs, but subsequently, a lot of the evidence has pointed to the fact that the universe actually had a beginning, which then brought about the so-called Big Bang theory.
[16:27] But notice, when the Big Bang theory was first touted, it was supposedly to knock down the idea of creationists who would believe in creation, therefore believe in this kind of miraculous Big Bang to the universe.

Now, people who believe in Big Bang are saying that creationists have got it wrong because we know the Big Bang. That is what's known in my world as having your cake and eating it. Now, I know that sounds a little bit provocative, but listen to what Stephen Hawking, who knows much more about these things than me, wrote.
He wrote in A Brief History of Time. So long as the universe had a beginning, such as a Big Bang, that was my brackets, not his. So long as the universe had a beginning, we could suppose it had a creator. But if the universe is really completely self-contained, having no boundary or edge, it would have neither beginning nor end.
It would simply be what place then for a creator? Do you hear what he's saying? He's saying that the moment you suppose the universe has a beginning, you open the door to a hypothesis of a creator.
What you would expect if there is no creator is you would expect the universe would not have a beginning. It would have always been here. Steady state theory. But nowadays, most astrophysicists, as far as I understand, are positing that the Big Bang is the best theory we're working with because the constants and the laws and things like red light, and you can ask me about that later, not too much detail, seem to point out the fact that the universe definitely did have a beginning, the Big Bang.
[17:50] So I don't think the Big Bang's a knockdown theory for believing in secularism or scientism over God at all. In fact, I think the other way, it opens the door to a belief in God, to a belief in the creator. Maybe you want to come back to me on that.

Let's look at the other one before you have some time of discussion, and we're going to go into a little bit more detail on this. The origins of life. I was showing my wife this earlier, and she said, what is that? I said, love, that's the primordial soup.
She points out a few flaws in my theory, namely that apparently this one on the right has got eight eyes, and eyes wouldn't have evolved in the primordial soup, things like that. But it's supposed to be a picture of the primordial soup, so go with me on this one.
That's supposed to be the primordial soup. The big question is, how do you go from this loop of amino acids, of the building blocks of life, because all life we know is made up of protein, how do you go from this loop to the very ordered organisms of DNA?
Every living organism has in it DNA. And a scientist that I know explained it to me like this. He said that even the DNA in the most simple organism, bacteria or a single-cell amoeba, is more sophisticated than the most complex computer programs we have yet written.
[18:57] He said it's as sophisticated as the assembled works of the Encyclopedia Britannica. I don't know how you work that out, but that's what he said, so it's obviously very complex. But I just want to show you a little bit of the complexity, and bear with me on this one.

If it glazes over you a little bit, let it wash over you, but just try and stick with the fact of how incredibly complex and sophisticated DNA really is, as we're just going to dive into a bit of the detail. Okay.
Proteins are made up of amino acids, and they're polymers. Now, DNA is a particular type of polymer, a long-chain polymer. Now, you don't necessarily need to remember much of that, but crucially, they're made up of nucleotides.

And nucleotides are chemical clusters that have a very interesting quality to them. They have bases, if you like, an arm that sticks out, and that arm has one of four chemical qualities to it, which often, those who deal with these things, categorize as C, G, A, or T.
Now, it is worth thinking of this like these are the four fundamental letters that make up the alphabet of life. That is not so much a metaphor, that's almost a very, very tight way of explaining it.
[20:03] And you can see on the picture that here we have, these are the nucleotides with their arms sticking out, with the various different bases. And they match up on DNA with bases on the other side to make base pairs.

And they match up very tightly. So, for example, you see the yellow one, cytosine, has to match up with the purple one, guanine. So C and G always match up together. And you can see that as well with the top one, that T and A always match up together.
So they have to be matching perfectly. Now, as you roll it on, it gets even more complex. Not only are these supposedly four letters, but those four letters are then split into triplets, and those triplets are codons, much the same way that we would have words.
In fact, if you're in any type of computer programming, this is how programming works. You take your compound unit, and then you assemble it into words. And there are 64 DNA words, if you like. Not only that, but they are punctuated. Again, if you're in computer programming, in the same way that you would punctuate code to know when you have the end of a line, or in the speaking, the same way that you would punctuate with a comma or with a colon or with a full stop.
[21:05] So they have stops along the DNA, and the groups them into kind of sentences. So you've got letters, words, sentences.

And then eventually, to have DNA, you combine. They combine two strands of RNA together. And as they combine, again, as I've said before, you have to have special combinations. So G's can only go with C's, A's can only go with T's.
So they can't just randomly match up. They actually have to be properly matched. Almost, and often it is called, translation. Now do you see how sophisticated this is at the very foundational level of life?
And here's my big question. When you've got something that is that sophisticated, that much information, where does it come from? It's a huge question. And Sir Francis Crick, who was the co-discoverer of the double helix, had such a big question with this that this is genuinely what he hypothesized.
He hypothesized that this life, this DNA, was planted on Earth by extraterrestrial beings. Now I'm not mocking him at all. What I'm actually showing is that because he didn't believe in God, he needed a prior intelligence that put the very information that's right at the root of life there.
[22:17] How do you get that? If you have a random universe, how do you get such a sophisticated coding of information on the very fabric of life from completely random forces? It's very hard to account for.

Now, of course, you would expect that those who don't believe in God do have a way of accounting for this. And the way they account for it is variations on this theory, that if you put enough monkeys in a room and enough typewriters and get them banging away on the keys, eventually, given enough time and enough variations, those monkeys would come up with the combined works of Shakespeare.
What they're saying is, to break it down, they're saying that a random process can, given enough connotations, produce an orderly solution. And so they say that the incredible sophistication of DNA came about from random process given enough period of time, right?
Well, this is an interesting one here because actually, since 2003, there's been a computer programming running that's been doing exactly this. And since 2003, the computer program has been running like this. It had 100 monkeys at 100 typewriters, and every other day, the number of monkeys, the number of typewriters doubles, and the monkeys are banging away on the keys.
And then they ran it because, you know, computers go a lot quicker than real time. So they ran it over and over and over and over again to effectively factor in how long it would take. They ran it for 10 to the power 40 years.
[23:34] To put it in perspective, the universe has been existing for 10 to the power 11 years. So this is a lot, a lot, a lot longer than the length of the universe. In that period of time, this is how much they came up with of the assembled works of Shakespeare.

24 letters. Stopping, incidentally, halfway through a word. So it's gobbledygook. So you see, the length of the universe hasn't been running even close to long enough to account for how a random process can produce something as sophisticated as DNA.
Now, the other thing about it, and chemists might correct me on this, is that as I understand it, chemical theory of rate processes says that for any process to advance, it has to have a greater likelihood of it progressing than it regressing.
Take the monkeys of the typewriters. They've got a 1 in 25, sorry, 1 in 26 chance of hitting the right key, 25 out of 26 chance of hitting the wrong key. In chemistry, that is a process that would remain stagnant.
It would never advance. And so it is with DNA. You've got all the probabilities of it regressing and a very, very slim and very precise probability of it progressing. In chemistry, that is a process that if you stuck in a test tube would not take off.
[24:40] It wouldn't go anywhere. So theoretically, chemically, it doesn't work. Chemically, as I understand it, it doesn't work. So it's a massive question. How do we get life, this incredible sophistication of information at the center of life from a random process?

Now, I'm not saying this is a knockdown proof of belief in God. Please don't hear me saying that. What I am saying is is that it just says that a belief in God is not quite so improbable after all and certainly, I would suggest, is not at odds with engaging with science.
In fact, it seems like a reasonable hypothesis after all. You may well disagree and that would be great if you did because you've got an opportunity to discuss it on your tables now. So over to you for 10 minutes to discuss it on your tables. Again, can I break into your discussions and draw us back together?
So, so far, hopefully, what I've been trying to show you is that I don't think science and Christianity are on opposite directions on the same track going to collide. I think they can run in parallel. And secondarily, I just wanted to look at some of the so-called sacred cows and maybe suggest that actually believing in God isn't quite so scientifically lacking credibility as you might think.
Last thing that I would just want to ask a question that will probably be slightly briefer is to ask the question is science alone really enough? Is science alone really enough when you're engaging with the science world? Because one of the key doctrines of Christianity is that Jesus Christ is Lord of all.
[26:00] And therefore, one of the implications of that is there is not one area of life, not one academic discipline, not one activity that you can engage in that he has not got something to say about, something to speak into, wanting you to engage with that and engage with him as you are engaged in that activity.

And science is no different. So let's just consider a little bit. And this will be inevitably quite brief. With the Big Bang, someone has said, a guy called Arno Penzias, who's a Nobel laureate, that the best data we have concerning the Big Bang are exactly what I would have predicted had I nothing to go on but the five books of Moses, the Psalms, the Bible as a whole.
Now that is a very compelling quote. A very compelling quote indeed. The very first sentence in the Bible is so simple but it's so profound. Genesis 1, verse 1, In the beginning, God created.
Do you notice it assigns agency? That is, it says who it is that's behind the whole show. God. God created the heavens and the earth. Notice that the order is significant. The heavens means everything in the universe.
So there's a catch-all term that was used in Hebrew literature, the heavens. So the heavens are created before the earth is created. Now you might not find that particularly remarkable but what's really interesting is when you compare it to most other so-called creation myths.
[27:23] And by the way, myth is a technical term I'm using, not because we shouldn't believe it but because it's an account of how creation came into being. If you compare it, for example, with Babylonian, Mesopotamian or Egyptian creation myths, they start inward and work out.

But the Bible goes the other way. The Bible starts with the heavens and comes in. Hugely significant because it's validated by science. Because creation started with the universe and then the earth was created later from what we know of modern science.
But other creation myths go completely the other way around. It might not be that big but it's quite a significant point. It stacks up completely. Genesis 1 verse 1. In the beginning, God. God is behind the whole show and hopefully we already saw in that second point that that is compatible with the Big Bang.

Secondly, the origin of life. It's in the DNA. Also, when you compare the Bible and the creation account with other ancient accounts of creation, there is something very significant as well. God is unique.
The Hebrew God, the God of the Bible, is unique in speaking things into existence. There is no other creation account in which this has been found. So generally, you have, for example, female gods giving birth to creation.
[28:30] You have male gods like potters at a wheel. For example, the Mesopotamians had their gods, the gods of a potter wheel, creating things out of clay. But the God of the Bible does something very odd.

He speaks things into existence. And more than that, the Bible goes on to explain that God leaves his imprint on every aspect of creation because he is intimately involved in his creation.
Now, God of the Bible is a speaking God who leaves his imprint on all aspects of life. Therefore, what would you expect to find in all aspects of life? You would expect to find words, information, coursing through the very veins of life.
And that's exactly what DNA is. It is information coursing through the veins of life. Again, it just stacks up with the Bible. So it is interesting to me that our modern science, as we progress further and further, does seem to have a high degree of compatibility with the Bible.
But I want to move further on a little bit and just look and ask the question, really, is science as a worldview on its own really enough? Erwin Schrödinger was the guy who came up with the thought experiment of Schrödinger's cat.
[29:36] And he was arguably the forefather of modern quantum physics. Not actually a Christian, but it's an astonishing quote, he wrote this, I am astonished that the scientific picture of the real world around me is very deficient.

It gives us a lot of factual information, puts lots of our experience in a magnificently consistent order, but it's gaspy silent about all and sundry that is really near our heart that really matters to us.
Now look at what it can't explain according to him. It cannot tell us about a world about red and blue, bitter and sweet, physical pain, physical delight. It knows nothing of beautiful and ugly, good or bad, gods and eternity.
Science sometimes pretends to answer such questions in these domains, but the answers are very often so silly that we're not inclined to take them seriously. He's saying that if you have a purely scientism worldview, it is a very limited worldview.
Very limited worldview. I remember watching Jeremy Paxman interview Richard Dawkins, the secular atheist, and at the end of it, after Richard Dawkins had been going through, explaining how love was just completely a chemical reaction that gave rise to our feelings of love, but there was really nothing real in the word love at all, the part of his debate.
[30:45] At the end of it, Jeremy Paxman asked him a brilliant question. You must find it on the internet, you can find it on YouTube. He said to him, he said, Richard, what gets you through the night? Dawkins paused, smiled, and then said, same thing that gets everyone through the night.

Love of my family, love of my kids, love of my friends. And that was the end of the interview. Now that is fascinating. What gets a secular atheist, arguably the father of a kind of modern scientist, and through the night?
Love. Love, which is just a random kind of chemical reaction that gives rise to certain feelings, but it's not something real and true after all. I mean, you can't have your cake and eat it. And I think that the worldview of purely science on its own is deficient, whereas the worldview of the Bible at the heart of it is very rich because it enables you to engage with science, but also to go beyond science.
It asks questions of purpose, and the Bible explains that we are far more than just a random collection of atoms or just even orderly DNA. We have a purpose, and our purpose, the Bible says, and when you read the Genesis narrative, it goes to great pains to exaggerate this and to make it really clear.
Our purpose is to be in relationship with God. We are far more than just other animals and just very developed apes. We are made in God's image, like Him, to be in relationship with Him.
[32:05] That's so significant. Why are you here? To know God, to be loved by Him, to love Him back, to experience that for eternity, to be part of that for eternity. That's why you're here according to the Bible. And then the second thing that the Bible explains is in Genesis chapter 2, which is it actually explains why it is that so much of human endeavor in thinking has this side agenda to try

and disprove God.

Genesis 2 explains it because there is something deep in the heart of humanity which wants to push God out of the picture, which doesn't want anything to do with God. And that is why we twist something almost like Frankenstein's monster to turn it against its very maker.
Science should be something conducted in a relationship with God, giving thanks to God and glory to God for His creation. And yet we turn it back on God to try and make it consume God. That is what the Bible calls sin, trying to push God out of the picture.
And lastly, the Bible explains that God has gone to enormous lengths to bring us back into relationship with Him, though we all want to push Him out of our lives, and to enjoy life now and life forever in eternity in a relationship with Him through the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
It is an incredibly compelling and rich worldview when you have God at the center. You can still engage with science, but you can know so much more.