

## Chapter 1 : Subscribe to read | Financial Times

*Increasingly, it seems to be popular opinion that science and religion—especially Christianity—are adversarial entities. They are presented as mutually exclusive; you simply cannot fully subscribe to the tenets of one without minimizing or dismissing the other.*

Does believing in miraculous healing mean that we cannot seek medical treatment? Believers who are sick should avail themselves of miraculous healing: Affirm and declare by faith that God heals all our diseases Psalm Let the elders of the church pray for them James 5: Seek to be ministered by those endowed with the gift of healing 1 Corinthians Doctors treat but God heals. For example, a diabetic patient may slip into coma and die if drugs or insulin injections are suddenly stopped. Having created the world, God gave man the injunction to multiply, subdue and rule the earth Genesis 1: Our creative potential bears the marks of our Creator, who created each snowflake distinct from the rest. Countless lives have been saved since the advent of antibiotics and vaccination. Logically, they should stop travelling in cars and airplanes, and stop enjoying the benefits of mobile technology. Clearly they have forgotten the account when God told Moses to make a bronze serpent. Those bitten by snakes would not die if they looked at the serpent set on a pole Numbers Is there any merit in such a practice? If the pain persists despite prayer and healing ministry, the humane option is to give the patient a strong pain killer such as morphine. Why prolong their agony by withholding medicine? Let them spend their last days in comfort. No healer, no matter how impressive his or her list of success stories, should be found lacking in a most needful quality—compassion. Some patients have been told they are not healed because they lack faith. Is this the right thing to do? Whether their faith is great or feeble Mark 9: They also respect the healer for his or her successful track record. Why burden them with false guilt in their darkest moments? However, in cases where sin hinders healing, the foregoing does not apply. Jane sincerely believed she could experience miraculous healing. She thought that the kind of faith which pleased God was that which rejected medical intervention. A proper understanding of the relationship between faith and medicine is essential. Seek miraculous healing and medical treatment. These options are not mutually exclusive. Commit the results to God. When miraculous healing does not occur, do not put the blame on the sick. Be open-minded about miraculous healing without medical intervention. His peace and presence will comfort us when all else fails.

**Chapter 2 : Christianity and Yoga: Friends or Foes? : Christianity**

*Recently at a prestigious mid-western University, a group of businessmen, scholars, and ethicists came together to once again discuss the question, "Can a successful businessman be a Christian?" A senior partner of a major national law firm criticized business for its reward system, based on self.*

In a nutshell, she divides the world in two antagonistic groups. While the Schmittian approach to politics might be appealing, particularly given its parsimonious model for explaining a rather messy sphere of social life, it is certainly a dangerous one, especially if taken as a normative stand. However, not even Schmitt goes as far as Pait does. And this is what we are witnessing in Brazil right now: Particularly in Latin America, examples abound of how unwilling conservative social elites are to accept democratic procedures as the only valid mechanism for acquiring political power. This is true of the remote as well as the recent political history of the continent, as one can learn from the cases of Paraguay , Honduras and Venezuela Brazil also has in common with many of its neighbors the fact that it is and remains, since colonial times, among the most unequal countries in the world. Its constitutional history can be described as a process whereby affluent social elites have tolerated institutionalized mechanisms of political decision-making as long as these did not contradict their interests. Before that, there were at least four moments of complete or partial breakdown of constitutional political institutions in , , , and There is a telling regularity in almost all of these moments: Actually, it was only thirteen years ago that, for the first time in half a century, an elected president handed power to another elected president of a different party. Telling Brazilian political history as if it had begun with the constitution is deceptive. Constitutions are not only contingent political decisions made by a sovereign "be it the people or those who claim to be authorized to speak in their name. Looking back at Brazilian history should warn us of the risks of not accepting electoral results. Moreover it should provoke our consciousness of how recent events relate to a long historical path of political decision-making based on the casuistic methods of interested groups. Crisis in the New Republic; fear of democracy? By the second electoral round, Brazilian voters were well aware of the many corruption scandals involving her party. And while most popular media in Brazil have been keen on informing the public about the possible connections between the president and the facts related to the oil company, no evidence has been presented thus far against her in particular, though a lot has been already proved against her party comrades. Corruption must certainly be condemned. Nonetheless, as a social phenomenon, it is a constant feature of Brazilian political history: And getting rid of corruption has been a frequent pretext deployed by those who have attempted to break with constitutional democracy in the past. The current political crisis has other reasons. To make things even worse, some of the social programs which garnered support for the government among the lower classes, will soon be downsized. This brings us to the present state of affairs. Rouseff is herself partially responsible for the current economic and political crisis. Or at least she has not taken the measures that could have prevented its worst effects. But the central question becomes whether her plummeting popularity can be a legitimate reason for interrupting a presidential mandate. The juridical requirements for the impeachment: Institutional mechanisms securing an agonistic politics Turning back to the Schmittian understanding of politics, even those who embrace it do so in a rather critical way. This is done through the invention of legitimate political channels that allow dissenting voices to express themselves. Such channels are founded on a minimal consensus around two elements that enable democracy: As described earlier, contestation within democratic mechanisms abounds in our history, but it also proliferates dissatisfaction with these same mechanisms on the part of those who lose in the democratic game, particularly conservative elites. And this is the case of the opponents who now call for impeachment. According to the Constitution, it is certainly not forbidden to talk about impeachment; however, meeting its requirements is an entirely different issue. While the impeachment is a political process, this does not mean that it lacks the requisite of a juridical argument. That is to say, for that political process to move forward, it is necessary not only to make but also prove a strong legal case against the president. Along these lines, it is not sufficient to simply claim that Ms. Rouseff was silent in the face of some illegal activity; there has to be proof of her involvement in these actions and the definitive intention to

carry them out. None of this has been demonstrated thus far. Quite to the contrary, the current government has had a notoriously, and historically exceptionally, positive attitude towards investigations carried out by the Federal Police and the Judiciary, demonstrating no attempt to interrupt or stop them. It is not our aim, however, to support the current government in a substantive way; as stated before, it is heavily responsible for the current situation in which the country is drowning. In fact, democracy can only exist if its procedures are stable enough to endure political tensions and social conflicts, even if these tensions encompass falling popularity and economic instability. Pait envisions impeachment as a mere mechanism of recall of a rather unpopular president. But unpopularity, as bad as it might sound, does not constitute legitimate reason to impeach an elected representative according to the Brazilian Constitution see Articles 85 and Such a move would not only suggest that Brazilian democratic procedures are incapable of processing dissensus but, even more importantly, would demonstrate that not all players are capable of abiding by the rules of the democratic game. Moreover, this would certainly establish a dangerous precedent according to which any president facing poor rates of popular support could be subject to an impeachment procedure.

**Chapter 3 : School Choice and Democracy: Friends or Foes? Â· Giving Compass**

*Social media and democracy: friends or foes? Social media affects how people think and behave without them being aware, such as in the case of elections integrity, billionaire George Soros says.*

The global situation has changed somewhat since then, but I think that this column is still relevant. Is he genuinely devout, or was this pure political maneuvering? The truth is both, but this is all a part of a broader strategy. Putin is no fool. He understands the importance of social morals, and he knows that Russia is plagued by many problems: Putin is positioning himself as a modern-day religious crusader. This will kill three birds with one stone. First, it will put his country on the path to fixing many of its underlying problems. Second, it will allow him to refashion Christianity to accommodate the dictatorial system he favors. And most importantly, it will divide America and Europe between religious supporters and secular opponents, thus limiting the likelihood of unified condemnation of any of his future actions. China is more than happy to accept this arrangement. China has its own interests in this high-stakes game. The recent lobbying of the Russian Orthodox Church to reestablish itself within China went largely unnoticed, but it is key. Orthodoxy is favorable to state control, a major positive in the eyes of the Chinese government. If China agrees, which it is likely to do, it will accomplish its goal of further limiting the influence of the Catholic Church, which has always been a thorn in its side. And by cozying up with the leaders of the most influential church in Russia, it will create an even-stronger relationship with that country, further weakening the influence of America, its primary economic and military adversary, in the East. In light of all of this, the world will no longer be principally divided by geography, ethnicity, or wealth, but by the two prominent systems of government: Both worldviews will fight to the death and make the existence of the other untenable. The rest of the world serves as the backdrop for this massive conflict. The turmoil in the Middle East is not an isolated set of circumstances that we should stay out of, but part of the great proxy war between the world powers. Iran has a particularly important role in this. As for Syria, it is less important in the grand scheme of things, but because it is a major ally of Iran, the West is keen to negate its importance. Africa has not yet been thoroughly polluted by these events, but it is actively courted by America and China in everything from healthcare to economic development. Under these conditions, China is set to be the economic powerhouse, and Russia is set to be the dominant moral authority. To defeat this unholy alliance of autocracy, an impediment to liberty and civilization, the West must unite its three most powerful entities: America, Europe, and the Catholic Church. This trinity vanquished Communism once, and it can do it again. But for such a partnership to work effectively, the elitist, anti-religious attitude of some of our leaders must be abandoned. The globe can shift from a civilization characterized by nationalism and a lack of cooperation, to a more peaceful and multicultural civilization, if Russia and China are reformed or beaten. If they win, however, the future is less clear. Humanity must soon choose: Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping kremlin.

**Chapter 4 : Christianity and Science: Friends or Foes?**

*Definitions. Our discussion calls for clarity and consistency in the use of terminology. One of the main obstacles in using the term pluralism is that though the concept is a familiar one the term can be used in many different ways.*

With few exceptions, most of the Arab countries are ruled by corrupt and secular elite that is benefiting from the status-quo. They are afraid of what democracy might bring, so they are doing everything in their power to scare the U. The secular elite are becoming increasingly marginalized, isolated, authoritarian, and corrupt. They are neither genuine secularists nor democrats, but they raise such flags in order to solicit support from the West. Being elitist, they have no grassroots or popular support, and they discourage popular participation in the political system because they do not trust the people to keep them in power. These regimes are not interested in real democracy or democratization, therefore, external pressure from the US, European Union the UN, and the international community is absolutely necessary. Real democratization requires pressure from inside and out. Pressure from within right now is coming mostly from the Islamic movements that have the popular support needed to push for reforms in their respective countries, but pressure from the outside is also very important to prevent violent reactions, radicalization, and give hope to millions of people who want real change, a decent representative government, and accountability. This means that the US must learn to accept and support democracy even if moderate Islamic or Islamist movements, and not secularists, receive the majority of votes. In reality, change is inevitable, but the only question is what kind of change: Will it be slow, peaceful, and progressively move us towards real democracy, or will it be violent, revolutionary, and lead us towards another form of dictatorship. To guard against more violence, anarchy, and the possibility of a theocratic state, we need a working coalition of moderate Islamists and secularists who trust each other and work together for the public interest. They need to develop a consensus on what democracy means, how it can work within the context of their Muslim societies, and how to encourage progressive, modern, and moderate interpretations of Islam. Among the most moderate Islamic movements today are the Justice and Development Parties in Turkey and Morocco, and great examples of the most prominent moderate Muslim leaders are Anwar Ibrahim in Malaysia and Abdulwaheed in Indonesia. For the past 40 to 50 years, various United States administrations have supported secular dictators in the Arab and Muslim world, and that has resulted in very dysfunctional political systems, in which both corruption and oppression are prevalent. As a result, the idea of secularism has been completely discredited in popular eyes as it is now associated with dishonesty and tyranny. The real question therefore is: It will also convince younger people, who are fed up with the current injustices happening in their countries, that peaceful and democratic change is not possible and they will in turn join more radical, violent, and extremist groups to create the changes they want to see happen. History has shown that when and where Islamic parties have been allowed to participate in the political process, they have tended to become more moderate, pragmatic, and have moved away from simplistic or what may be considered hard-line rhetoric. Democracy is indeed possible and desirable in the Arab world, even with a religious and Islamic flavor. We must come to accept and understand that it will indeed take time for people to discern the proper relationship between religion and politics, and between religious scholars and elected political leaders. We must trust that in the end, people are not incompetent, and that they do not want to continue to live under any form of tyranny, whether secular or religious. It is increasingly tough to be a democrat or an advocate of democracy in the Muslim world today. Thus, anything coming from the West is regarded with great suspicion and mistrust. Regardless, there is no other option besides working as hard as we can to bring democracy to their governments and hope to the Arab and Muslim people. This is why I consider that what Daniel Pipes, and others like him, recommend to consider all Islamists as enemies is not only wrong, but will lead to disastrous results. It will swell the ranks of the Islamists and even of the extremists, and it will turn the entire Muslim world against us. Many people judge democracy by what they see on TV – "promiscuity, pornography, homosexuality, destruction of family values and marriage as an institution, drugs, crime, greed, etc; in short, the image they have is not pretty. The concern is that democracy will destroy the culture, religion, values, and traditions they have held for centuries. Secularism is even more problematic,

because it is linked in the minds of most Arabs and Muslims with hostility towards religion, atheism, and oppression. There is currently a serious crisis in the Muslim world, one which has manifested in many ways: Terrorism is of course the most violent form of this rage and anger, which finds its roots in the terrible conditions that millions of people, especially young people, find themselves in today. Most of all, this crisis is the result of bad governance, poor strategic thinking and planning, and lack of freedoms, dignity, and respect for all inalienable human rights. First and foremost, it is the twin curse of corruption and oppression, which is at the core of all these problems. Of course, there is no short-term quick fix to all these problems, but the most important and urgent ingredient in this strategy must be good and participatory governance. The political crisis and deadlock in the Muslim world needs and deserves our immediate attention, even though it will of course take time to be fully addressed and corrected. Real change and significant reforms are absolutely necessary and needed, but governments are resisting it for fear of the unknown or of losing their privileges and opposition political movements are weak, divided, lack maturity, and are grossly under experienced. It goes without saying that democracy and good governance cannot and should not be imposed or imported, but they certainly can be supported. Reformers in the Arab and Muslim world have been working and pushing for real democracy and reforms for decades, but in the past have received very little support or encouragement from the outside world. It is time for this to change and it is our duty and obligation to provide them with as much support and encouragement as needed. Our support begins by providing the intellectual and philosophical support for the simple and basic truth that Islam and democracy are perfectly compatible. Without doing so, democracy will never become accepted by the masses in the Muslim world because the government-controlled media will continue to portray democracy as un-Islamic or even as being part of a Western conspiracy in the Muslim world. There is nothing that could be further from the truth, and the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy CSID is in the best position to demonstrate this. Secondly, we need to convince the US and European governments and policymakers that they must stop their support for oppressive and authoritarian rulers in the Arab and Muslim world. Even though these dictators claim that they are providing stability for the region, the reality is that they are creating the perfect conditions for despair and hopelessness which will only lead to further violence, extremism, and turmoil. Thirdly, we need to engage and support moderate Muslims and Islamists who are trying to be both true to their religion while adopting and accepting democracy, modernity, and development. Building strong coalitions between moderate Islamists i. As citizens of America and Europe, we must realize that we are directly responsible for what our governments do, and that their ongoing support for oppressive regimes in the Arab and Muslim world is one of the main causes for the current crisis in the Muslim world. Since , CSID has developed and implemented a strategy for achieving these objectives, by: Organizing conferences and seminars to bring democrats together both moderate Islamists, secularists, and others 2. Educating the masses about democracy, how it works, and its compatibility with Islam 3. Lobbying the US govt. There is not a single other organization American or otherwise that has done so or is even capable of doing so. The reason we have been able to organize such activities simply has to do with the huge credibility and connections that CSID has established throughout the Muslim world during the past 8 years. Our credibility and strong network of friends and colleagues among Arab and Muslim reformers is simply unmatched. This growing network “ which again includes both secularists and moderate Islamists ” is also capable of pushing for significant dialogue and reforms in their respective countries. As a result, we are making a difference. The demand for both, however, is much greater, and our objective is to train between 5, and 10, people per country, per year, for the next 10 years. For the first time in history, secular leaders and moderate Islamist leaders are starting to work together in many countries, learning to build trust and strong coalitions for positive and meaningful reforms. The Network of Democrats in the Arab World is growing, and has provided training on leadership skills, communication skills, consensus-building, and conflict resolution skills to hundreds of members and NGO leaders. Our long term goal is that both the US and European governments, with the help of the international community as a whole, will work with and support governments that are serious about democracy and are achieving real progress toward it, while isolating any government that rejects democracy and continues to oppress its people while paying false lip service to any real reforms. Finally, CSID has just opened two regional offices “ one in Morocco and one in Jordan ” to

help support the network and all of our activities, conferences, and training workshops in the Arab world. One of the most disappointing developments occurred after the Dec. It is shameful for the West, and truly catastrophic for the region, to continue to support the current regimes under the belief that they provide stability and the promise of reforms and development. The real lesson of the last years in the Arab world and much of the Islamic world is that neither long term development nor stability are possible without real democracy, transparency, and accountability. It is time for the US and Europe to support voices for genuine reforms, freedoms, and democracy in the region. The concern that some people and policymakers have, especially those who are interested in prolonging the status quo, is whether the Islamist movements will respect democracy and abide by its rules, if and when they come to power. In fact, it is important to remember that the support that Islamist parties enjoy today did not exist a mere 20 or 30 years ago, and is clearly the result of the despair and hopelessness to which these failed states have led their populations. Out of despair, people, and especially young people, are turning to Islam as their last hope to unite, mobilize, and fix the ills of their societies. There are also indications that when Islamic parties come to power or parliament through the ballot box, they become more practical and pragmatic, and much less ideological and intransigent. Politics, after all, is the art of compromise, and Islamists must learn this art if they want to succeed in politics. Certainly the experience of the Justice and Development party, which is now ruling in Turkey, is a good model for other Islamist parties to follow. There are three truths that can prevent and protect against the danger of the monopolization Islam by Islamic movements and turning their countries into theocracies: First, There is no clergy at least in Sunni Islam and therefore no one individual or group can claim to be divine representatives on earth. Second, we need multiple Islamic parties in each country, so that none of them can claim to solely represent or speak on behalf of Islam. These Islamic movements represent various interpretations conservative or otherwise of Islam and competition among themselves would only provide for healthy debate and interaction. Finally, secular forces and groups need to develop a better understanding for the importance of religion in their countries, and must understand that being portrayed as anti-Islam or anti-religion will severely hurt their prospects to gain sufficient political representation. They must develop a new paradigm that makes it clear that it is possible to be secular and religious at the same time. Islamist parties have evolved so tremendously within the past years that we can no longer continue to judge their intentions. There are ambiguities in the platform of every group, Islamist or otherwise, and there is no longer a guarantee that secular parties will be democratic. In democracy, the only safeguard is to build strong institutions and educate the public about their rights and their duties as active citizens; constitutional guarantees are worthless without an educated and mobilized citizenry. We also need to establish clear mechanisms to guard against abuses. Normative consensus on issues such as definitions of democracy, and rules of the game, final guarantor king military international community, and the idea of pacts need also to be articulated. Their main priority is good governance, transparency, fighting corruption, poverty, illiteracy, among many other progressive ideas. Recent developments in Iran, Sudan, and Afghanistan have been both negative and destructive, and we now find ourselves searching for different and more positive democratic models in the Arab and Muslim world. Turkey, Indonesia, and Malaysia are now becoming the models for both Islamists and secularists. Modern Islamists today look at Turkey as a model, much more than they look at Iran, which has unfortunately become a theocracy and has limited the freedoms and the choices of its citizens. Turkey, on the other hand, is a model of a very progressive and democratic Muslim state, where the state itself is secular but the society is deeply religious. The state is not and should not be in the business of imposing religion or forcing people to practice any particular religion; imposing religion is, in Islam, not only strongly discouraged, but also looked down upon as it generally turns people against religion instead of bringing them closer. Political parties become popular when they reflect the values and principles of the majority of the people and religion and religious standards represent a big part of those values. Islamic parties should not be excluded from the political system, so as to allow them to participate actively and peacefully in the democratization process of their societies and countries. This process will take time several years and perhaps even decades but it is the only way to bring real tangible peace, stability, and development to the Muslim world. Ijithad and the Reinterpretation of Islam: The effort to reinterpret Islam and modernize Islamic thought is not a

new phenomenon. It started at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century with famous reformers, such as Jamaluddin Al-Afghani, Mohammed Abduh, al-Kawakibi, and many other prominent religious scholars. It was delayed or slowed down by the struggle for independence for about 50 years, and then by oppressive and corrupt regimes for another 50 years. However, now it is back on track and is moving at a much quicker pace, and is on the agenda everywhere, in the United States, in Europe, and in every Muslim country. I believe that American and European Muslims are called upon to lead in this effort as we enjoy the freedom, the means, and the opportunity to create the atmosphere necessary to harbor democratization. The relationship between religion and the state needs further investigation and clarification.

**Chapter 5 : RUSSIA: FRIEND OR FOE? | Fuel for Faith**

*Democracy is defined as a system that “holds free elections on a regular basis and” – determines “who governs on the basis of these results.” – 5 The respect for “political and civil rights” – of the.*

Increasingly, it seems to be popular opinion that science and religion “especially Christianity” are adversarial entities. They are presented as mutually exclusive; you simply cannot fully subscribe to the tenets of one without minimizing or dismissing the other. However, a review of history, a deeper look at Christianity, and a closer inspection of the worldview of metaphysical naturalism will present a different picture. The History and Philosophy of Science It is an unavoidable fact of history that science arose and flourished within the worldview of Christian monotheism. And not every culture subscribes to a worldview conducive to science. Though their emphasis on the rules of logic and the exercise of reason contributed mightily to human wisdom, Greek polytheism stated that many events unfolded simply due to the whims of numerous competing and emotional gods. One could not reliably predict the motives or actions of a group of impetuous, jealous gods. From this perspective, the concept of science would be illogical. Indeed, there are certain philosophical presuppositions that must be assumed in order for science to be considered an effective, worthy endeavor: The external world is real and knowable. Nature itself is not divine. It is an object worthy of study, not worship. The universe is orderly. There is uniformity in nature that allows us to observe past phenomena and to understand and predict future occurrences. Our minds and senses are capable of accurately observing and understanding the world. Language and mathematics can accurately describe the external world that we observe. Science within Christian Theism These premises flow logically and naturally from the monotheistic belief that we are beings made in the image of God “with the ability to think, act, and reason freely” in a universe that was created and designed by God for a specific purpose. Without belief in a single omnipotent rational lawgiver, it is unlikely that anyone would have assumed that nature is intelligible in a systematic quantitative way, mirrored by eternal mathematical forms. The idea that the world was created by an intelligent designer allowed humans to begin to think that this design could be deciphered. The Worldview of Naturalism However, some people claim that religious belief undermines science because, in their minds, the practice of science requires a commitment to the worldview of naturalism. Some “although they are in the minority” will even assert that it is irrational for a person of faith to be a scientist because any commitment to science is contradictory to a belief in the supernatural. Methodological naturalism is the self-imposed convention of science that assumes naturalistic causation or explanations during the investigation of any issue. Metaphysical naturalism assumes that reality itself is purely natural and composed solely of material objects. For example, my doctor is a Christian. As a Christian, he believes in the supernatural e. However, as a practicing physician, he employs methodological naturalism as a matter of procedure. Whenever he treats a patient, he assumes there is a naturalistic cause for whatever is ailing the person. He then generally prescribes a naturalistic cure based upon the best research medical science has to offer. In her book *Science vs. What Scientists Really Think*, she detailed the findings of the study. Much of what we believe about the faith lives of scientists is wrong. As many recognize, belief in metaphysical naturalism leads to the doctrine of determinism. What happens in the future could not have been different, given what has happened in the past. Determinism means we have no free will. To think that would be to hold a supernatural view of ourselves, the opposite of naturalism. In practicing science, one weighs the facts in order to draw just conclusions. We reflect upon the evidence and formulate theories based upon competing hypotheses, alternative options, and counter-arguments. For knowledge or expertise to count for anything at all we must be free to say that certain options are invalid. Therefore, metaphysical naturalism actually undermines the practice of science. Conversely, Christian theism “which views humans as beings made in the image of God with the ability to think, act, and reason freely” provides a basis for the notion of libertarian freedom free will, which seems necessary for science to be a valid enterprise. Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they reveal knowledge. Science and faith need not be set up as opposing entities. The two are complimentary forces. Quercus Publishing, , , Belief in God is, ultimately, a matter not of reason, but of faith. In the end,

faith is irrational or non-rational; it proudly and defiantly sets itself in opposition to reason and, in a sense, that is precisely its point. Since we astronomers are priests of the highest God in regard to the book of nature, it benefits us to be thoughtful, not of the glory of our minds, but rather, above all else, of the glory of God. Baker Books, , This article is not intended to minimize the contributions of any other culture or religion that has increased overall human wisdom and understanding and helped provide a foundation of knowledge vital to the scientific enterprise. The point of this article is to acknowledge the historical fact that science did rise and prosper within the worldview of Christian monotheism and to further confirm that science and Christianity are not in conflict. Paul Davies, *The Eerie Silence*: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing, , 73â€” Oxford University Press, , 19â€” Stenger, *God the Failed Hypothesis*: Prometheus Books, , See also page 14 for a further discussion on methodological naturalism versus metaphysical naturalism. Sam Harris is a neuroscientist, author, and world-renowned atheist. Harris embraces the deterministic implications of his belief in metaphysical naturalism. Our wills are simply not of our own making. Thoughts and intentions emerge from background causes of which we are unaware and over which we exert no conscious control. We do not have the freedom we think we have. No one has ever described a way in which mental and physical processes could arise that would attest to the existence of such freedom. Kowalski, *Classic Questions and Contemporary Film*: McGraw Hill, , There are not two different worlds, the supernatural and natural. Naturalism says we are completely physical, material creatures, a complex, highly organized collection of atoms, molecules, cells, neurons, muscles, bone, etc. We are products of our social and family environment and the genetics given us at birth. People take it for granted that the physical world is both ordered and intelligible. The underlying order in natureâ€”the laws of physicsâ€”are simply accepted as a given, as brute facts. Nobody asks where they came from; at least they do not do so in polite company. However, even the most atheistic scientist accepts as an act of faith that the universe is not absurd, that there is a rational basis to physical existence manifested as lawlike order in nature that is at least part comprehensible to us. So science can proceed only if the scientist adopts an essentially theological worldview.

### Chapter 6 : Russia and China: Friends, or Foes? | Catholic Analysis

*"Shall Capitalism and Christianity be Friends or Foes?" Harding University Macro Economics Learn with flashcards, games, and more â€” for free.*

### Chapter 7 : Christianity, Government, and Public Policy

*Christian Humborg is the Managing Director for an NGO in Berlin and a visiting lecturer at the University of Potsdam. Friends or foes? democracies. Measuring.*

### Chapter 8 : The View from This Seat: Religion and Irreligion: Friends or Foes?

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Disciples and Democracy: Religious Conservatives and the Future of American Politics*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, Eberly, Don E. *Restoring the Good Society: A New Vision for Politics and Culture*.

### Chapter 9 : Christianity & Science : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

*Democracy excludes the possibility of any party claiming to acquire power for being "the nation's real friends." There is a normative structure in place, which establishes clear requirements for the politically costly process of impeachment to take place.*