

Chapter 1 : Cosmos on Nautilus: How Muslims rewrite the fine-tuning argument.

This book documents the conference on The Science and Religion Dialogue: Past and Future, held at the University of Heidelberg, Germany, October , The conference commemorated the th anniversary of the birth of Sir John Templeton and the 25 th.

Science and Religion in Islam: This blog contains my thoughts on the above, reflecting the tradition of Shia Ismaili Islam: The material universe is part of the structure of truth, the ultimate nature of which it is the goal of religion to reach monoreality. Among other things this blog asks two questions, what is the universe made up of and how does it operate? The sciences, society, art, the oceans, the environment and the cosmos have all contributed to the great moments in the history of Muslim civilisations. In this field, as in others, intellectual leadership is never a static condition, but something which is always shifting and always dynamic Aga Khan IV, Convocation, American University of Cairo, Cairo, Egypt, June 15th "A great risk to the modernization of the Islamic world is identity loss – the blind assumption that we should give up all our essential values and cultural expressions to those of other civilizations. In order to contain this risk, for it cannot be totally eliminated, we must re-invigorate our own value systems and cultural expressions. As Sura al-Baqara proclaims: Is anything taught in secondary education? Does anybody know the names of the great philosophers, the scientists, the great theologians? Do they even know the names of the great civilizations? The great Muslim philosopher al-Kindi wrote eleven hundred years ago, "No one is diminished by the truth, rather does the truth ennoble all". But Science is only the beginning in the new age we are entering. Islam does not perceive the world as two separate domains of mind and spirit, science and belief. By the art of translation, learning was assimilated from other civilizations" Aga Khan IV, AKU, 16 March , Karachi, Pakistan "Indeed, one strength of Islam has always lain in its belief that creation is not static but continuous, that through scientific and other endeavours, God has opened and continues to open new windows for us to see the marvels of His creation" Aga Khan IV, AKU, 16 March , Karachi, Pakistan "Our religious leadership must be acutely aware of secular trends, including those generated by this age of science and technology. Those who have studied mythology and primitive psychology know that magic in various forms started various trains of thought in primitive man by which he achieved what seemed to him to be rational accounts of the natural phenomena he saw around him. It seemed to him rational that these phenomena, these events like the rising and the setting of the sun, the passage of the seasons, the flowering of the bud and the ripening of the fruit, the wind and the rain, were caused and controlled by deities or superior beings. Primitive religious experience and primitive scientific reasoning were linked together in magic, in wizardry. The two remained linked throughout prehistoric and ancient times, and in the life of the early empires of which we have knowledge. It was difficult to separate what I may call proto-religion from proto-science; they made their journey like two streams, sometimes mingling, sometimes separating, but running side by side" Memoirs of Aga Khan III, Over and over, the stars, sun, moon, earthquakes, fruits of the earth and trees are mentioned as the signs of divine power, divine law and divine order. Even in the Ayeh of Noor, divine is referred to as the natural phenomenon of light and even references are made to the fruit of the earth. During the great period of Islam, Muslims did not forget these principles of their religion. Aga Khan IV This notion of the capacity of the human intellect to understand and to admire the creation of Allah will bring you happiness in your everyday lives:

Chapter 2 : Intelligent design/creationism IV: The religion – science conflict | Open Parachute

Previous posts in this series covered the nature of scientific knowledge, the issue of scientific credibility and the religious agenda of intelligent design (ID). This final one deals with the religion/science conflict inherent in ID. Modern science doesn't encompass supernatural phenomena - it.

Tim Berners-Lee Hildegard of Bingen –” She is considered to be the founder of scientific natural history in Germany [3] Robert Grosseteste c. Bishop of Lincoln , he was the central character of the English intellectual movement in the first half of the 13th century and is considered the founder of scientific thought in Oxford. He had a great interest in the natural world and wrote texts on the mathematical sciences of optics , astronomy and geometry. He affirmed that experiments should be used in order to verify a theory, testing its consequences and added greatly to the development of the scientific method. French philosopher and priest. One of his most significant contributions to science was the development of the theory of impetus , that explained the movement of projectiles and objects in free-fall. Theologian and bishop of Lisieux , he was one of the early founders and popularizers of modern sciences. One of his many scientific contributions is the discovery of the curvature of light through atmospheric refraction. Catholic cardinal and theologian who made contributions to the field of mathematics by developing the concepts of the infinitesimal and of relative motion. A theologian and botanist from Mainz , Germany. His *Catalogi virorum illustrium* is considered to be the first book on the history of evangelical sects that had broken away from the Catholic Church. In botany his *Herbarum vivae icones* helped earn him acclaim as one of the "fathers of botany". He was arrested for preaching in favor of the Reformation. He later became a Dean of Wells Cathedral , but was expelled for nonconformity. As bishop of Alatri he convoked a diocesan synod to deal with abuses. He was also a mathematician who wrote on Euclid , an astronomer, and a designer of mechanical devices. Considered among the fathers of empiricism and is credited with establishing the inductive method of experimental science via what is called the scientific method today. Italian astronomer, physicist, engineer, philosopher, and mathematician who played a major role in the scientific revolution during the Renaissance. A professor of astronomy and Archbishop of Uppsala. He wrote on astronomy and theology. Catholic priest who tried to reconcile Atomism with Christianity. He also published the first work on the Transit of Mercury and corrected the geographical coordinates of the Mediterranean Sea. He dedicated one of his astronomy books to Jesus Christ , a "theo-astronomy" work was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary , and he wondered if beings on other planets were "cursed by original sin like humans are. Lutheran convert to Catholicism, his beatification in that faith occurred in As a scientist he is considered a pioneer in both anatomy and geology, but largely abandoned science after his religious conversion. English theologian, scientist, and mathematician. Cistercian monk who did work on Combinatorics and published astronomy tables at age He also did works of theology and sermons. He wrote *Ismaelis Bullialdi astro-nomiae philolaicae fundamenta inquisitio brevis* and *Astronomia geometrica*. Prominent scientist and theologian who argued that the study of science could improve glorification of God. Prominent scientist during the Scientific Revolution. Physicist, discoverer of gravity , and an alchemist and an obsessed Christian apologist, was obsessed with trying to discern the date of the Rapture from the Bible. He was a philosopher who developed the philosophical theory of the Pre-established harmony ; he is also most noted for his optimism, e. He also made major contributions to mathematics, physics, and technology. He created the Stepped Reckoner and his *Protogaea* concerns geology and natural history. Copley Medal winning scientist significant to the study of plant physiology. As an inventor designed a type of ventilation system, a means to distill sea-water, ways to preserve meat, etc. In religion he was an Anglican curate who worked with the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and for a group working to convert black slaves in the West Indies. He did a great deal of scientific research with the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences having commissioned work by him. Swiss anatomist, physiologist known as "the father of modern physiology. The son of a pastor, he wrote *Defense of the Divine Revelation against the Objections of the Freethinkers* and is also commemorated by the Lutheran Church on their Calendar of Saints on May Russian Orthodox Christian who discovered the atmosphere of Venus and formulated the law of conservation of mass in chemical

reactions. He was a Catholic and defender of scripture. English clergyman who provided pioneering insights in a wide range of scientific fields, including astronomy, geology, optics, and gravitation. After her father died she devoted her life to religious studies, charity, and ultimately became a nun. Swedish botanist, physician, and zoologist, "father of modern taxonomy". List of parson-naturalists Joseph Priestley – Nontrinitarian clergyman who wrote the controversial work *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. He is credited with discovering oxygen. Italian physicist who invented the first electric battery. The unit Volt was named after him. Cambridge astronomer and clergyman. He won the Copley Medal in , before the period dealt with here ended. Lucasian Professor of Mathematics known for work on an important process to fabricate Nitrous acid. He was also an evangelical Anglican who co-wrote *Ecclesiastical History of the Church of Christ* with his brother and played a role in the religious awakening of William Wilberforce. He also led to William Frend being expelled from Cambridge for a purported attack by Frend on religion. He is best known for introducing the atomic theory into chemistry. He was Quaker Christian. French naturalist and zoologist, sometimes referred to as the "father of paleontology". Andre Marie Ampere – The unit for electric current, Ampere , is named after him. Scottish physician and Christian philosopher [48] who created the a textbook about neuropathology. He was born in , but his scientific life did not begin before the period discussed herein. Anning was devoutly religious, and attended a Congregational , then Anglican church. A devout Christian, his religious thoughts were collected in the biographical book *Memoirs of Marshall Hall*, by his widow [51] He was also an abolitionist who opposed slavery on religious grounds. He believed slavery to be a sin against God and denial of the Christian faith. This movement is among the strictest forms of Lutheranism. As a botanist he has the author citation Laest and discovered four species. He worked on Natural theology and wrote on fossilized tracks. An outspoken Christian, [55] he was an old-earth creationist who openly rejected materialism. Changed to mathematics upon the suggestion of Gauss. Glasite church elder for a time, he discussed the relationship of science to religion in a lecture opposing Spiritualism. James David Forbes – He wrote the *Ninth Bridgewater Treatise* , [61] [62] and the *Passages from the Life of a Philosopher* where he raised arguments to rationally defend the belief in miracles. Anglican priest and geologist whose, *A Discourse on the Studies of the University* discusses the relationship of God and man. In science he won both the Copley Medal and the Wollaston Medal. Robert Main also preached at the British Association of Bristol. Although Clerk as a boy was taken to Presbyterian services by his father and to Anglican services by his aunt, while still a young student at Cambridge he underwent an Evangelical conversion that he described as having given him a new perception of the Love of God. Canadian physician and microscopist who was member of Royal College of Physicians. He was the mentor of William Osler , as well as an Anglican minister and religious author who wrote about natural theology. English naturalist and natural history dealer who made significant improvements to microscopy and wrote the standard work on aquatic micro-organisms. He devoted much energy to the chapel he attended, Newington Green Unitarian Church. Augustinian Abbot who was the "father of modern genetics" for his study of the inheritance of traits in pea plants. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson], English writer, mathematician, and Anglican deacon.

Chapter 3 : What is Science?

Students in the Religion and Science track should already have an MA and have strong background in (1) religious studies, or philosophy of religion, and (2) natural sciences, the medical sciences, the psychological sciences, or philosophy and history of science.

Posted on July 27, 3 Comments Previous posts in this series covered the nature of scientific knowledge , the issue of scientific credibility and the religious agenda of intelligent design ID. Science is based on observation of, and experiment with, reality. Therefore, explanations based on non-observable supernatural? A scientific theory cannot be built on something that is not observable, not testable and cannot be confirmed. Three centuries ago, Cicero De Divinatione , expressed it this way: Consequently there are no miracles. We therefore draw this conclusion: This takes away any reason to continue normal scientific investigation. And, of course such work is valuable and the normal process in science. There is no way to test such a theory, no way to repeat any finding, no way of independently reaching confirmation. All they can rely on is authority! So religious myths and scriptures, or more specifically interpretation of these made by religious leaders, are the evidence for such theories. The founder of the Institute for Creation Research, Henry Morris, expressed religious authority this way: That is how things worked in the distant past and we know where that leads. Such methods have no role in modern science. However, there are still occasional attempts to replace science with the supernatural approach – see for example Solution to climate change? Attempts to use religious authority instead of empirical evidence are not limited to ID. They are common with many issues in society. Take the attitude towards gender identity. Measures the distribution of different preferences amongst humans and other animals, identifies underlying aspects of brain morphology and chemistry, investigates the influence of gestation chemistry and events, and develops theories which help us understand how gender identity forms. Does there have to be a conflict? Attempts like ID to impose supernatural explanations inevitably produce conflict – humanity has too much to lose to give up on naturalistic science now. I guess we can see more conflicts in areas where the more fundamentalist religions feel threatened. Research into consciousness a relatively new field comes to mind. Adherents of a more modern religious attitude are often happy to enthusiastically accept science. Many religious scientists have no problem accommodating their faith with their science. They can compartmentalise their beliefs, maybe because their religion provides them with an emotional satisfaction rather than a way of understanding the world. Such an attitude removes the need to interfere in science, to impose supernatural assumptions. This avoids the conflict.

77 misunderstandings of the nature of science (Eldredge, ; Matthews, ; Pigliucci,). 78 Beyond direct creationist rhetoric and understandings, religious affiliation and degree of 79 religiosity also have been shown to affect attitudes towards evolution.

Primer Science, Religion, Evolution and Creationism: Connie Bertka and Dr. It is in recognition of these broad factors that public engagement materials, events, and contributions to the Human Origins web site are being developed by the Broader Social Impacts Committee BSIC to support the exhibition in the David H. Koch Hall of Human Origins. The committee recognizes the unique opportunity the subject of human origins offers for the exploration of challenging cultural topics, which in turn can inspire greater public interest in, and understanding of, science. Thus, it is with input from the committee that the co-chairs have prepared this primer. It provides a brief introduction to issues that arise at the crossroads of science and religion, particularly in relation to the scientific accounts of evolution and human origins that are presented in the exhibit. The primer is organized around two broad topics: A question and answer format is used to highlight common concerns for each of these topics. Cultural divides in the United States over the acceptance of evolution and scientific understandings of human origins make this interchange relevant. They also offer an opportunity to inspire a positive relationship between science and religion. Science and Religion Visitors to the David H. Koch Hall of Human Origins bring with them many assumptions about science, about religion, and about their relationship. These assumptions may impact, positively or negatively, their willingness and ability to engage the scientific presentation of human origins. The questions below are offered as a guide to begin thinking about science and religion in the context of the possible interactions of religious worldviews with a scientific account of human evolution and origins. Science is a way to understand nature by developing explanations for the structures, processes and history of nature that can be tested by observations in laboratories or in the field. Sometimes such observations are direct, like measuring the chemical composition of a rock. Other times these observations are indirect, like determining the presence of an exoplanet through the wobble of its host star. An explanation of some aspect of nature that has been well supported by such observations is a theory. Well-substantiated theories are the foundations of human understanding of nature. The pursuit of such understanding is science. Religion, or more appropriately religions, are cultural phenomena comprised of social institutions, traditions of practice, literatures, sacred texts and stories, and sacred places that identify and convey an understanding of ultimate meaning. Religions are very diverse. While it is common for religions to identify the ultimate with a deity like the western monotheisms – Judaism, Christianity, Islam or deities, not all do. There are non-theistic religions, like Buddhism. What is the difference between science and religion? Although science does not provide proofs, it does provide explanations. Science depends on deliberate, explicit and formal testing in the natural world of explanations for the way the world is, for the processes that led to its present state, and for its possible future. When scientists see that a proposed explanation has been well confirmed by repeated observations, it serves the scientific community as a reliable theory. Well-supported theories guide future efforts to solve other questions about the natural world. Religions may draw upon scientific explanations of the world, in part, as a reliable way of knowing what the world is like, about which they seek to discern its ultimate meaning. Religious understanding draws from both subjective insight and traditional authority. However, this is an erroneous judgment. Virtually all of the historic religions include traditions of rational reflection. How are science and religion similar? Science and religion both have historical traditions that exhibit development over time. Each has places for individual insight and communal discernment. Analytic and synthetic reasoning can be found exhibited in both. Science and religion have been and continue to be formative elements shaping an increasingly global human society. Both science and religion have served to jeopardize and contribute to the common human good. How can science and religion be related? Typical assumptions about this relationship fall into one of three forms: A conflict approach assumes that science and religion are competitors for cultural authority. Either science sets the standard for truth to which religion must adhere or be dismissed, or religion sets the standard to which science must

conform. For example, some atheists adopt this approach and argue that science reduces religion to a merely natural phenomenon. Conversely, some religious adherents, while claiming to accept science, will identify specific points at which mainstream scientific findings must be distorted or abandoned for the sake of religious convictions. Such an adversarial approach tends to rule out any constructive engagement between science and religion. Individuals who prefer a separation approach hold that science and religion use different languages, ask different questions and have different objects of interest. By highlighting the differences between science and religion, conflict is avoided. While this approach allows a person to explore what science has learned about human origins without fear of conflict with religious beliefs, it also encourages that the science be left, so to speak, at the museum threshold so that it has no impact on other non-scientific explorations of what it means to be human. A consequence of separation is that the science of human origins can be viewed as irrelevant to what might be the deepest of human concerns. It should be noted that it is true that science is practiced without reference to religion. God may be an ultimate explanation, but God is not a scientific explanation. This approach to science is called methodological naturalism. However, this method of isolating religious interests from scientific research is not an example of the separation approach. Historically, this bracketing out of religious questions in the practice of scientific inquiry was promoted by religious thinkers in the 18th and 19th centuries as the most fruitful way to discover penultimate rather than ultimate explanations of the structures and processes of nature. A third possibility for the relationship between science and religion, one of interaction, at minimum holds that dialogue between science and religion can be valuable, more that science and religion can constructively benefit from engagement, and at maximum envisions a convergence of scientific and religious perspectives. Generally, this view encourages an effort to explore the significance of scientific understanding for religious understanding and vice versa. With this approach science remains relevant beyond the museum for many people who might otherwise ignore scientific findings. Evolution and Creationism The National Museum of Natural History of the Smithsonian Institution has a responsibility due to its charter to provide the public with an opportunity to explore for themselves the most recent scientific understandings of the natural world, including human origins. People are well aware that insights from the humanities, including the arts, literature and religious traditions, have much to say on this topic as well. For some people an evolutionary account of human origins may be greeted with skepticism because it challenges their particular religious commitments. In contrast, other people find their religious perspectives are deepened and enriched by an evolutionary understanding of human origins. Although the questions below recognize this range of perspectives, many of the questions reflect expectations that are especially characteristic of people from those religious communities that are skeptical about the science of evolution. Ironically, people in these latter communities often value science and seek scientific support for their particular religious commitments. In this sense of the word, many creationists accept an evolutionary understanding of natural history. However, at least four types of creationism can be identified, and each has a distinctive view of the evolutionary sciences and human origins. Human beings were created through a direct act of divine intervention in the order of nature. While many aspects of nature may be the consequence of direct acts of divine creation, at very least they hold that the very beginning of the universe, the origin of life and the origin of humankind are the consequence of distinct acts of divine intervention in the order of nature. Theistic evolutionists also hold that the sacred text provides an infallible account of why the universe, all life and humankind came into existence. However, they also hold that for the most part, the diversity of nature from stars to planets to living organisms, including the human body, is a consequence of the divine using processes of evolution to create indirectly. Still, for many who hold this position, the very beginning of the universe, the origin of life, and the origin of what is distinctive about humankind are the consequence of direct acts of divine intervention in the order of nature. Evolutionary theists hold that the sacred text, while giving witness to the ultimate divine source of all of nature, in no way specifies the means of creation. Further, they hold that the witness of creation itself is that the divine creates only indirectly through evolutionary processes without any intervention in the order of nature. It is intended that those Americans who do not accept evolution will experience in this exhibition an open invitation to engage the science presented, explore the supporting materials, and participate in conversation with staff and volunteers without fear of ridicule or antagonism. Though the viewpoints of those

who do not accept the scientific explanation of human origins are not affirmed in the exhibition, the personal importance of their perspectives is appreciated. What the exhibition intends to create is an environment for an enriching and respectful dialogue on human origins that currently can be found in no other venue. Scientific theories change in the light of new discoveries. Why should we believe what science has to say today about human origins when it may change tomorrow? The perception that scientists completely change their mind with each new discovery is mistaken. Although this has occurred occasionally in the history of science, it is relatively rare. What is frequently missed is the broad consensus among scientists in a field, like that of human origins research, which provides the basis for seeking new discoveries. For example, it is broadly agreed that the various characteristics that distinguish our species did not emerge all at once. Walking on two legs emerged before making stone tools, and both of these occurred well before the biggest increase in human brain size. All of these came before the origin of art and symbolic communication. Farming and the rise of civilizations occurred much later still. There is broad scientific agreement even in the light of the most recent fossil discoveries that these changes that define our species took place over a period of about 6 million years. Each visitor to the exhibition has the opportunity to explore both the latest findings of laboratory and field research as well as consider how the scientific community is using these to give a more complete account of human origins. Each visitor is also invited to consider how this account might inform their deepest religious understanding of what it means to be human. What is Intelligent Design and does the exhibit address it? Advocates of Intelligent Design ID hold that there are features of the natural world for which there are no natural explanations and that these features can be shown analytically to be the result of a designing agent. Although ID advocates seldom specify who the designer is, the logic of their argument requires that the designer be beyond nature, or supernatural. However, advocates for ID have not been able to show that their claims are genuinely scientific. While the scientific community welcomes new theoretical proposals, these must lead to active research programs that deepen our understanding of nature and that can find confirmation in either laboratory or field observations. Thus far, ID advocates have been unable to do either. As an institution of informal public education, the exhibit cannot advocate a religious position. Dover Area School District, For all of these reasons it is inappropriate for ID to be included in a scientific presentation on human origins. Still, some people believe that there is a scientific debate about evolution, and that advocates of ID represent one side of this debate.

Chapter 5 : Paddle8: Science Philosophy Religion (IV) - Sajjad Ahmed

Science 11 Oct Vol. 92, Issue , pp. DOI: /science

Extent to which future changes in knowledge are expected by user None. Can be expected, to the degree that the user expects personal development Considerable. How knowledge changes through time Unchangeable except by reinterpretation by authorities, or by new inspired revelations, or by divergence of mavericks. Certainty of the user High, given sufficient faith; can be complete. High Dependent on quality and extent of evidence; should never be complete. Assumptions That ancient texts or inspired revelation have meaning to modern or future conditions. That personal feelings and insights reflect nature. That nature has discernible, predictable, and explainable patterns of behavior. Usual Objectives To understand the human soul, the nature of a deity or deity, and the conditions of human afterlife. To understand the origin, nature, and processes of the physically observable universe. Where users put their faith In the supernatural beings that they worship or in the authorities who interpret texts and events. In their own perceptions. In the honesty of the people reporting scientific data the incomes of whom depend on generation of that data , and in the human ability to understand nature. Between users, who each draw on their own personal insights Across time, as understanding changes; between fields, which use different approaches and materials; and between individuals, who use different approaches and materials. Note that each of these ways of thinking can have its advantages, depending on how one views the world: On the other hand, for someone who can adapt to changing understandings of the world and even enjoys newly discovered ideas, science can be quite attractive. However, it can be of great value for someone who questions past authority and instead is more trusting of the peer-reviewed published reports of some contemporary humans who make their livings as scientists. As one college student put it, "I do not want to be the only kid in the playground who knows the truth about Santa Claus. Summary Science is the concerted effort by very real human beings to understand the history of the natural world and how the natural world works. Observable physical evidence, either from observations of nature or from experiments that try to simulate nature, is the basis of that understanding. The results of, and inferences from, those observations and experiments become scientific knowledge only after publication, and the point of publication is to change previous ideas. Thus theories, the large-scale concepts that are based on huge amounts of data and try to explain and predict large bodies of phenomena, may be powerful ideas, but they are constantly subject to revision or even rejection as new knowledge emerges. The result is that scientific knowledge is constantly changing but hopefully proceeding toward a more correct view of the world.

Chapter 6 : Track IV: Religion & Science | Graduate Division of Religious Studies

A third view, articulated by Ian Barbour, the founder of Science and Religion studies, is the dialogue model. Dialogue theorists see science and theology as involved in distinct, yet complimentary, investigations.

There is plenty of evidence for that, both from the conspiracy mongers themselves and from more level-headed observers. More on that from time to time, but now back to Dr. This case series has been singled out by proponents as one of the most convincing in support of an unconventional cancer treatment. No surprise, then, what happened next. Gonzalez , In July of , the National Cancer Institute NCI invited me to present case reports from my practice, detailing patients with appropriately diagnosed poor-prognosis cancer who had enjoyed tumor regression or unusual survival while following my therapy. Dr Isaacs and I put together 25 cases for the session, which was attended by a large group of NCI scientists and lasted 3 hours. After the meeting, I was asked to pursue as a next step a pilot study evaluating my approach in 10 patients diagnosed with advanced adenocarcinoma of the pancreas. Curiously, although the OAM report was dated September , , it also has this: Gonzalez recently submitted to NCI a meticulously documented best case series Friedman Gonzalez had become a minor celebrity. According to Victor Herbert, it happened just in time: Gonzalez, is not for the faint of heart. The Findings of Fact reveal a practitioner who is beyond incompetent. Gonzalez himself learned nothing, as evidenced by his words at the White House Commission on Complementary and Alternative Medicine Policy in All the time while I was trying to present my work and getting funding and doing clinical trials, the medical board relentlessly tried to basically close my office down. We eventually prevailedâ€ According to Victor Herbert, Columbia University opened its arms to Gonzalez at about the same time: Gonzalez and other advocates of pseudoscience-based medicine were hired by Dr. Kronenberg to give one-hour lectures promoting their practices as legitimate. Kronenberg and Medical School dean Herbert Pardes refused requests to withdraw the invitation or to allow alumni Stephen Barrett or me to be present when Gonzalez spoke, for rebuttal. Other objections have to do with the cases themselves. Case H was almost certainly a bile duct cancer, which has a far better prognosis than cancer of the pancreas. This case should not have been included, as the fact that the cancer was deemed operable indicates a more favourable prognosisâ€ Case K is not certainly pancreatic cancer. Patient 27 also lacked a biopsy to prove cancer of the pancreas; the diagnosis was based on even flimsier radiologic evidence than in the previous case. Prior to pursuing Dr. In he wrote a glowing eulogy for rabid Laetrile promoter Michael Culbert, who had been a vice-president of the Committee for Freedom of Choice in Medicine, the major Laetrile advocacy organization. After stormy hearings of Rep. In his campaign to win federal support, Gonzalez got a boost from Rep. The Continuing Case of Nicholas Gonzalez. Scientific Review of Alternative Medicine ;2 2:

Chapter 7 : The Ethics of "CAM" Trials: Gonzo (Part IV) " Science-Based Medicine

1 Religion and Science: The Emerging Relationship Part IV On Christmas Eve on , the first astronauts to orbit around the moon appeared live on T.V. in millions of homes.

In others, he claims that the priest considered him a reincarnation of Jesus , the Buddha , Muhammad and other religious prophets. According to the biography, the high priest trained Ali in mysticism and gave him a "lost section" of the Quran. It is also known as the "Circle Seven Koran" because of its cover, which features a red "7" surrounded by a blue circle. Chapters 20 through 45 are borrowed from the Rosicrucian work, *Unto Thee I Grant* with minor changes in style and wording. They are instructions on how to live, and the education and duties of adherents. In these he wrote: The fallen sons and daughters of the Asiatic Nation of North America need to learn to love instead of hate; and to know of their higher self and lower self. This is the uniting of the Holy Koran of Mecca for teaching and instructing all Moorish Americans, etc. The key of civilization was and is in the hands of the Asiatic nations. Drew Ali and his followers used this material to claim, "Jesus and his followers were Asiatic. He suggested that all Asiatics should be allied. His approach appealed to thousands of African Americans who had left severely oppressive conditions in the South through the Great Migration and faced struggles in new urban environments. In the traditions he founded, male members of the Temple wear a fez or turban as head covering; women wear a turban. It was also a way to claim and proclaim a new identity over that lost to the slavery of their ancestors. As Drew Ali began his version of teaching the Moorish-Americans to become better citizens, he made speeches like, "A Divine Warning By the Prophet for the Nations", in which he urged them to reject derogatory labels, such as "Black", "colored", and "Negro". He urged Americans of all races to reject hate and embrace love. He believed that Chicago would become a second Mecca. The ushers of the Temple wore black fezzes. The leader of a particular temple was known as a Grand Sheik , or Governor. Noble Drew Ali had several wives. There he instructed followers not to be confrontational but to build up their people to be respected. Emmerson , as 27th Governor of Illinois in the state capital of Springfield. The Chicago Defender stated that his trip included "interviews with many distinguished citizens from Chicago, who greeted him on every hand. Internal split and murder[edit] In early , following a conflict over funds, Claude Green-Bey, the business manager of Chicago Temple No. He declared himself Grand Sheik and took a number of members with him. No indictment was sworn for Drew Ali at that time. The death of Drew Ali[edit] Shortly after his release by the police, Drew Ali died at age 43 at his home in Chicago on July 20, One Moor told the Chicago Defender, "The Prophet was not ill; his work was done and he laid his head upon the lap of one of his followers and passed out. Mealy El in an undated photo, ca. The death of Drew Ali brought out a number of candidates to succeed him. Accompanied by two Moorish Science members, the police visited the home of Johnson, when they were met by gunfire. The attack escalated into a shoot-out that spilled into the surrounding neighborhood. In the end, a policeman as well as a member were killed in the gun battle, and a second policeman later died of his wounds. Nation of Islam[edit] The community was further split when Wallace Fard Muhammad , known within the temple as David Ford El , [33] also claimed or was taken by some to be the reincarnation of Drew Ali. He moved to Detroit, where he formed his own group, an organization that would become the Nation of Islam. It is estimated that membership in the s reached 30, There were major congregations in Philadelphia, Detroit, and Chicago. There were congregations in numerous other cities where African Americans had migrated in the early 20th century. The group published several magazines: During the s and s, continued surveillance by police and later the FBI caused the Moors to become more withdrawn and critical of the government. The investigation failed to find any substantial evidence, and the investigations were dropped. The federal agency later investigated the organization in for violation of the Selective Service Act of and sedition. In September , the Department of Justice determined that prosecution was not warranted for the alleged violations. The file that the FBI created on the temple grew to 3, pages during its lifetime. It is unclear whether he officially joined or was instead rejected by its members. Demographic and cultural changes have decreased the attraction of young people to the Moorish Science Temple. Only about members attended a convention in , rather than the

thousands of the past. The documents include fake liens , deeds, and property claims.

Chapter 8 : Moorish Science Temple of America - Wikipedia

Science and fundamentalist religion cannot, they are polar opposites, but more moderate religious views that don't feel the need to take their particular holy works literally can do so. But they have the problem of having to compromise towards science more and more as science continues to explain the previously unexplained things that they.

Edit Religion can be spread with a Missionary or Apostle of that religion, both of which can spread their Religion three times per unit without any special effects or promotions. A city of a given religion will only purchase religious units of that religion. The strength of the spread is equal to the current Religious Strength of the unit times 2. Note that this strength diminishes if the unit is injured. Therefore, it is usually more sensible to heal an injured religious unit before using it to spread your religion. Religious Pressure Edit After converting to a particular religion, each city starts exerting religious pressure for this religion, and may use its Belief benefits. The individual city pressure extends for 10 tiles in all directions, and is compounded by other cities with the same Majority religion within range. Thanks to this pressure, left on their own nearby cities will eventually also convert to this religion. The amount of Religious Pressure your cities exert decides how fast or how far your Religion will spread. If there is, however, another religion which also exerts pressure over these cities, the two will start competing, converting Citizens at the same time. Eventually, the religion with the stronger pressure will win and convert the other city. Note that the Holy city of each religion exerts much more Religious pressure than other converted cities. This all but ensures that all nearby cities will eventually convert to this religion, unless something is done via Religious units. Call it from the Lenses menu option, or by pressing 1. Additionally, every time you select a Religious unit this Lens will turn on automatically. Here you will see each city with its territory colored in the color of its Majority religion the territory of those without a Majority religion remains blank. This is especially useful for Theological combat, as is described elsewhere. Additionally, you will see colored circles emanating from each city, representing its Religious pressure; and colored arrows pointing towards it from all nearby sources of Religious pressure. Thus you can grasp at a glance what pressure is exercised where, and what you need to do to convert a particular city. Clicking on the tab expands it and you can see the particular division - how many citizens each Religion has. Of course, you can also see additional information about Religion from the City Details tab.

Chapter 9 : "Mind and science against religion" Soviet poster : PropagandaPosters

)Quotes of Aga Khans IV and III with the word 'Science', 'Scientist' or 'Scientific' in them "The second great historical lesson to be learnt is that the Muslim world has always been wide open to every aspect of human existence.

Both take the view that science and theology need to be sharply distinguished, either such that they make incompatible claims about the same dimensions of life, or compatible claims about different ones. A third view, articulated by Ian Barbour, the founder of Science and Religion studies, is the dialogue model. Dialogue theorists see science and theology as involved in distinct, yet complimentary, investigations. Each has something of value to say to the other. Instead of taking particular theories in science or theology as the starting point, however, dialogue theorists look at the general approach of each and try to see what they have in common, and what keeps them distinct. The success of science strongly suggests that nature is indeed intelligible, at least in the respects relevant to physics. When Stephen Hawking writes about black holes or time dilation, for instance, he takes it for granted that these phenomena both can be, and are, well understood by people with the right knowledge and training. He might be right to do so, but this does not answer the limit question, which is about the contingent nature of that intelligibility. Why should nature be comprehensible to us at all? A scientist who really thought that the phenomena they were studying could never be understood would face something of a morale problem. In their view, nature preserves its secrets. We never speak simply about the world, but about our being in the world, on this view. Anti-realism has a real attraction for some atheist philosophers, because if nature is not intelligible then its intelligibility does not require explanation. It is one thing, however, to take the success of science for granted, and another thing to become motivated to do scientific research in the first place. The quest for discovery is premised on the possibility of a well discovered, of finding out the truth about something. Indeed, it encourages a certain attitude toward science which is very pervasive in our time. Scientific inquiry began as a quest for truth, to really understand nature, but today is largely understood as a quest for technological control. Even the most zealous advocates of science typically appeal to the technological benefits, not to the desire to understand for its own sake, when justifying the scientific enterprise. Under conditions of modernity, the quest for knowledge was primarily a quest for truth. Why did Europeans believe that they could understand nature? If you looked at the world in the fifteenth century, and had to guess where groundbreaking discoveries would occur, you might have guessed in the Islamic World, or in India or China, which all have ancient and profound traditions of thought, and were much more wealthy and stable than Europe. So, why in that one, particular place? The answer, according to philosopher Alfred North Whitehead, and to the scholar, physicist, and priest Stanley Jaki, is that European intellectuals assumed the intelligibility of nature. They believed, not that it was self-existent and eternal, as the Greeks had, or that it was intrinsically sacred, as the pantheistic philosophies of India held, but that it was a finite product of infinite intelligence, that of God; an intelligence reflected, in some small capacity, in human reason. God wanted people to be able to understand the world they lived in, and so created them such that they could understand it, according to Aquinas. A person who thinks that the use of their intellect is in some sense an expression of what is best in them has a powerful motivation for doing so. Just sitting back and thinking for the pleasure of it is really a very odd activity, and not many people do it, even today, when the culture we live in praises thoughtfulness and creativity. Another sense in which human beings have been thought, by Christian theology, to have a likeness to God is in the exercise of dominion, or mastery, over nature. Again there are certain passages in Genesis and the Psalms that represent God as conferring this mastery on human beings. The omnipotence of God is thought to be reflected in the more limited potency of human beings. In that case, it is not only good to think, but good to think about how to control nature. There have been occasional eccentrics and inventors in practically all societies, of course, but science is really not about individual people pursuing their own projects. It is an institutionalized, collaborative, long-term effort, and it has to be based on the conviction that it is both possible and good to understand the world around us. The ancient Greeks devoted a great deal of attention to intellectual questions, but their thought tended toward understanding abstract concepts, such as mathematics and ethics, rather than on understanding the natural

world. In Confucian philosophy, the central question has been how to order family relations, and by extension the rest of society, so that justice and virtue can prevail. According to one theory of our current ecological crisis, it is a consequence of this particular inheritance from Christian theology—“an obsession with mechanism and with mastery, rather than integration and reverence. If, then, human beings could understand nature, and should understand it, and should use that understanding to exercise mastery over it, as seems to have been implied by certain strands of premodern Christian theology, the origins of science in Europe rather than in other parts of the world, where people were in some respects better situated to pursue it, becomes more readily comprehensible. Today, the justification for the intelligibility of nature is not usually given in these terms. The success of science itself is thought to sufficiently underwrite this claim. It still calls out for explanation, though—at least for people who think that science really does discover the truth—“why nature should be intelligible in the respects relevant to the truth-finding character of science. There may be one destination, but many possible paths by which it can be reached. Then again, there may also simply be different destinations. At any rate, from the observation that modern science was reached in a particular way in the past, it does not follow that it cannot have been reached in any other way. Nor do I want to imply that it was Christian theology, and that alone, or necessarily even primarily, that was responsible. The issue is very complex and has been the subject of extended scholarly investigation over the last century. What has become reasonably clear, however, is that Christian theology did inform the early development of science, in the distinctively modern, Western sense of the word, in important ways. Finally, it has to be pointed out that other societies had practices, and systems of belief, that were scientific in the sense of understanding and controlling nature. It is not the case that people lived in complete ignorance of the world around them before the development of modern, European science. The Polynesian Islanders, for instance, undertook amazing feats of navigation. They developed astronomical and oceanographic records that allowed them to accurately locate islands hundreds of miles away, and to settle in locations as far apart as Madagascar, Eastern Island, and possibly even South America. Certainly other societies have made impressive discoveries as well, before modern times or any meaningful contact with Europeans. The idea, rather, has been to explore one possible means of dialogue between science and theology. And, according to some strands of premodern and current! As we have seen, this point of view is not without relevance to scientific inquiry. It encouraged the pioneers of science to make it successful, at a time when that success could not be taken for granted, because it had not yet been established. And it continues to offer encouragement to theistic scientists and philosophers looking for resources with which to combat postmodern skepticism, and who are not content to take the intelligibility of nature for granted, and yet leave it unexplained. But this is only one instance of a limiting question—one that emerges as a result of scientific inquiry, but which that inquiry does not resolve. These and other limiting questions provide the dialogue model with its typical point of departure, according to Ian Barbour. The idea is not so much for science to change theology, or for theology to change science, but rather to see what each, considered on its own terms, might have to say about questions which arise because of the other. Perhaps in future articles, there will be additional opportunities to explore examples of constructive and mutually enriching dialogue. This essay is part of a series; the previous essay can be found [here](#). Daniel Halverson is a graduate student studying the History of Science and Technology. He is also a regular contributor to the PEL Facebook page.