

## Message: Faith & Science - Part 3

Welcome back to JesusFamilies.org's audio messages!

This message is entitled, 'Faith and Science: Part 3'

In part one of the faith and science series, we briefly looked at the belief that physicalists – many of whom also take the label 'scientist' – hold that there is no metaphysical realm or metaphysical aspect to human nature or the human experience. A metaphysical reality – if it existed and by definition – would not be detectable by physical means, and thus other means must be used. We used observation and reason to deduce that the best explanation for some aspects of human nature and the human experience were metaphysical – meaning physical explanations were unreasonable while metaphysical explanations were reasonable.

After posing certain questions and using reason to explore answers to those questions, we came to the following conclusion.

A reasonable and plausible conclusion is that matter and energy do not provide an adequate explanation of some aspects of the human being. Matter and energy cannot reasonably account for sentience, a moral conscience, the ability to reason using metaphysical concepts like logic, or perhaps most importantly love. The best observation of reality and the best use of deduction based upon the analysis of human beings leads one to conclude that humans do indeed have a metaphysical component. Just because the metaphysical realm cannot be detected by human senses does not mean it does not exist, nor does it mean it does not provide the most reasonable and plausible explanation for human nature and the human experience.

In part two of this three part series, we looked briefly at the belief that physicalists – many of whom take the label 'scientist' – hold, that an intelligent designer is not required to account for the existence of complex physical systems or machines which machines are made up of inter-dependent parts or sub-systems. We defined inter-dependent parts or subsystems as those parts which depend on other parts in order for the entire machine (or subsystem) to function properly. We reasoned that without an intelligent designer, it would be impossible for inter-dependent parts to integrate with each other properly in order make the whole machine work. In other words, mathematics of probability would not support two or more inter-dependent systems randomly integrating themselves in order for the whole machine to work. We used simple machines created by men as an example of this principle. For example, it is not probable that a bicycle's chain and gear system (which system had to randomly create itself) would randomly integrate with the bicycle's brake system (which system had to randomly create itself) or its wheel and tire system. To believe that those inter-dependent system created themselves and them randomly integrated themselves to form the entire machine is un-reasonable.

We then reasoned that organic entities – namely creatures bodies - were machines just like their inorganic cousins that men create...that the building blocks of the machine – whether proteins or plastic – did not alter the fact that both were machines with inter-dependent parts or subsystems. We concluded that just like the machines men create out of inorganic materials – which machines have inter-dependent parts or subsystems – the much more complex machines that are creature's bodies require an intelligent designer to account for their existence. Finally, we suggested that it is a reasonable deduction that the more complex organic machines that populate the earth would require a more intelligent designer than the simpler inorganic machines that men are able to

create. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that a Designer is necessary to account for machines – whether formed of inorganic or organic materials – that are composed of inter-dependent parts or sub-systems. Furthermore, it is reasonable to conclude that the Designer necessary to have created the immensely complex systems of inter-dependent parts that are organic beings would be far more intelligent than humans.

Let us move on to the last leg of this three part series.

Let us start with the core belief of the physicalist that we will examine.

Physicalist belief 3 is as follows – science is the best tool or discipline to determine all important matters pertaining to human kind.

The opposing belief is that while science is an excellent tool or disciple to determine how the physical world works, it is not the tool or discipline that can answer the “why” questions of the human experience. Science cannot determine the causes of human events in the past, nor can it answer if a person’s claim in the present regarding human events is true or false. Science cannot illuminate the most important aspects of the human experience like the purpose of my existence or an individual’s destiny. Science cannot define what is meaningful in the human experience; nor can it help human’s improve themselves regarding human to human interaction – it will not solve the cause of human conflict, for example, for the solutions for that are in the realm of the soul or the metaphysical.

Let us look at some examples to prove these claims out...to prove that science is the wrong tool or discipline to address some very important aspects of the human experience.

Dramatic or drastic examples often demonstrate the point the clearest. Let us use one to make the point that science does not address all the important matters of the human experience.

Let’s say you are a parent and one of your children was murdered in school by their teacher, the murderer escaped and no one saw it happen except one other student. Would it be important to you, dear listener, if your loved one was murdered by someone you trusted? Would it matter to you if the murderer went free because the eye witness lied because they were scared? Would it matter to you if the murderer enjoyed the rest of his life in material luxury? Would it make a difference to you if the murderer was caught and received a just punishment because the witness testified that he was in fact the murderer? Would those things impact your life experience? Or stated another way, would you judge those events and potential outcomes as important to your life experience – perhaps even as the most important events affecting the quality of your life?

The pertinent question is, therefore, can science address this situation? Can the scientific method determine what is meaningful in that scenario? Can science provide answers to your questions, your concerns, your grief in that situation? Can science, as it claims, determine what is true and what is false regarding the important matters pertaining to the human experience in that scenarios? The answer is clearly no. Science cannot judge what is right or wrong for it has no standard to do so – that is in the realm of human thought or the realm of the metaphysical. The scientific endeavor only observes physical interactions in the present and draws conclusions from those interactions. Therefore, it can shed no light to your perception or understanding of your loved one being murdered.

Nor can science could prove who was guilty or innocent – it could provide tools to assist in that endeavor – but only eyewitness testimony could determine truth and falsehood in that scenario. Science can provide no comfort to the grieving parents or siblings. The only answer science can provide as to what happened to the child’s soul in that situation is that your child is utterly gone, destroyed, never to exist again since science denies the existence of a human soul that survives

death. Science cannot assist in understanding that important event nor can it determine truth about various aspects of it. To deny this is irrational. Thus, we have proved by a simple example that the claim of physicalists - that science is the best tool or discipline to determine all important matters pertaining to human kind – is a false claim.

Furthermore, and as we determined in part 1 of this series, it is a reasonable deduction that a metaphysical reality exists. As such, science, by definition cannot address aspects of a realm that it denies exists. Therefore, science cannot address matters pertaining to the metaphysical realm as it does not have the tools to do so. Science relies on observations in the present to draw conclusions in the realm it can observe, the physical realm.

In our example, we saw the importance of human eye witness testimony. If you answered that it would be important for you to see the murderer of your child brought to justice, that was accomplished by eye witness testimony, not science. Human eyewitness testimony is the foundation of any system of justice that mankind has ever developed or used. Why? Because only eyewitness testimony has the potential to be infallible regarding determining what is true or what is false in human interactions. Science cannot prove who shopped at Walmart today – only humans using metaphysical means can determine that. Again, science can provide useful tools to assist in that endeavor, but only human's using metaphysical means – thought, reason, moral judgments, etc. – can determine what happened regarding human behavior and events.

Let us make these point's clear:

Science cannot determine the facts regarding human interaction and events in the past or present.

Science cannot determine the reasons why humans did certain things in the past or present.

Science cannot prove or disprove events that happened in the past – it can merely state is principles and say if an event obeys those physical principles. For example, if someone in the past wrote that a giant chicken layed and egg that was so large while it was flying over the west Pacific, that it caused a tsunami to destroy Japan, a person relying upon scientific based beliefs would claim that was a false claim.

This brings us to an important bridge that I would like the listener to consider crossing. No, I don't want you to believe in giant chickens!

Science says a metaphysical realm does not exist. As we saw in part 1 of this series, deductive reasoning based on observation points to a metaphysical reality as the best explanation for some aspects of human nature.

Science cannot prove or disprove eyewitness testimony of human events in the past or present. Sometimes science can provide physical evidence that supports or refutes certain claims regarding past human events, but only in an infinitesimal number of cases and not infallibly. In other words, of all the human events that happened yesterday, for example, only a very small fraction of those interactions could be verified using scientific tools. And of course, human's using the metaphysical tool of reason are necessary to draw conclusions from that evidence.

About 2,000 years ago, a certain human appeared on the earth's scene, and that person said and did some things that make significant claims regarding human nature and the human experience. That person's words and deeds were recorded using eyewitness testimony, the only valid means of recording human events and behavior accurately. That person taught the following things:

1. A metaphysical or spiritual realm does exist;
2. People have a soul and/or spirit which will persist after physical death;

3. There is a governor of that realm who will hold people accountable for what they did with the life they were given or stated another way, for how they lived their lives.

Please answer this question, dear listener, can scientists disprove those claims? Please note that those claims are not of the nature of giant chickens or dragons.

In truth, scientists cannot disprove those claims – they can merely say they don't believe them. By contemporary definition – which definitions are controlled by contemporary scientific philosophies or beliefs - science only deals with the physical realm which can be seen, heard, touched, felt or smelled. Therefore, they will say all matters outside of that realm are not real, are irrelevant, or are not worthy of human efforts to understand.

So, how can physicalists prove a metaphysical realm does not exist? They cannot, they can only choose to believe in the physical realm which their senses can validate and reject any other realm.

How can physicalists prove that human's don't have a metaphysical element oftentimes referred to as a soul or spirit? They cannot - they can merely choose to believe in the physical realm which their senses can validate and reject any other realm.

How can scientists prove that God – the governor of the metaphysical realm – does not exist? They cannot - they can only choose to believe in the physical realm which their senses can validate. They would also have to be all knowing to be able to prove that God does not exist.

So, where does that leave you, dear listener? Here are a few other things that person who visited us 2000 years ago said. Please don't forget that eyewitness testimony captured that this Man did do things that validated his claims – that he performed miracles in order to show that he and his Father were Masters over the physical realm. He said the following:

1. The Governor of the spiritual realm truly loves the creatures that call themselves human beings;
2. The Governor sent a messenger who said that all who believe in – or trust in – him will not lose their existence due to their faults and failures – will not experience justice for their faults and failures - but will instead enter into an eternal existence not only free from pain, suffering and hopelessness...but an existence so far better than our current one, that we cannot adequately understand it other than to know it was described as paradise.

OK, let us summarize the content of this message thus far.

Physicalists claim that the empirical scientific method can provide all the important answers that humanity seeks – that it alone defines what is real and not real – what is true and what is false – what should be meaningful and what should not be.

We have seen that while the scientific method is a useful tool for helping human's understand the physical realm, it has significant limitations in addressing certain important aspects of human nature and the human experience.

Science fails to provide any meaningful answers to a situation where a human endures the loss of a loved one close to them. It provides no answers to the why questions of human existence, human purpose, right versus wrong, and a person's destiny.

Science cannot provide answers to human interactions in the past. Science cannot prove whether certain human events occurred in the past. Furthermore, scientists insists that human events be

understood through the prism of its own beliefs and philosophies, typically an evolutionary philosophy and one of its sub beliefs of survival of the fittest. Certainly physicalists insist that all historical and contemporary human events be understood without any metaphysical elements, explanations or causes. This is the bias and arrogance of the contemporary intellectuals who rule the so called higher places of human learning and education in western culture.

In contrast, dear listener there is a voice, recorded in the past, but still calling out in the present to all who will listen. And that voice says that we have a spiritual Father who deeply cares about us and our experience while on the earth. That voice says that the physicalist way or material way is a empty, bankrupt, ugly approach to the life we have been given. That there is this metaphysical thing called love that make's life worth living and which, if lived out and combined with faith, will bring us into a superior existence after our present body dies. Why is rejecting that testimony so noble, while accepting a belief that life's meaning can only be found in the physical realm, and all is lost after death? All the good things you did and experienced will be snuffed out when you die – forever lost to you. All the love and beauty you experienced in this life will be destroyed as the chemicals that make up your body decay back to dust. The people you love will be forever lost to you, never to be known, experienced or communicated with again. Gone. The empy cold blackness of your ceasing to exist.

Each of us makes choices regarding who we will listen to. The current western establishment wants people to believe what they say about reality, and what they say is that reality is physical only...there is no metaphysical realm and there is no God governing that realm...that they have the answers for humanity and we need to listen to them regarding what is real, what is important, and what we ought to live for.

I ask the listener to answer the question, how is this growing universal belief working? Is humanity improving? For example, it is a fact that more and more people in the USA are dying from suicide and drugs each year. In fact, suicide and drug use are two of the leading causes of injury related death in the USA in 2012. Is science going to solve the cause of that problem? Is it possible that the beliefs of the physicalists are actually the cause of that problem? Or, for example, there is more human conflict on the planet in terms of the number of groups in conflict with one another at this time in history, than at any other time in human history. Is science going to provide the answers to solve that problem?

Some will say that religion plays a big part in human conflict, and I would agree. But religion is not faith, and religion is not the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The cause of human conflict is lack of compassion or love for other humans, and religion does not solve that. What fills the human heart to cause the lack of compassion? Pride and fear govern the human race. Pride says, 'I am better than you and deserve betting things than you and that is why I am going to take from you'; Fear says, 'I am afraid of you because you are different than me, so I will not trust you and am ready to harm you to prevent you from harming me'. Dear listener, this is the state of the human race and science is doing nothing to change that.

Physicalist philosophies cannot solve that problem. The tools of empirical science cannot solve that problem.

Faith in, and love for, the one who says, "love your enemies" and "lose your life in the world in order to find life everlasting" can solve that problem.

I ask you, dear listener to put your faith in the person who says, "love your enemies" and his Father, and thus become part of the solution to mankind's problems – problems that so desperately need fixing, and that science cannot fix. You can show the way to the truth that changes mankind, one person at a time, but only if you have faith.

I hope you have enjoyed this three part series, and that it will make a difference in your life. If you have found these messages helpful, please do share them with others.

Thank you for listening, and I hope you will return to listen to the other audio messages on [www.JesusFamilies.org](http://www.JesusFamilies.org)

May our Father's blessing be recognized by each of us this day, and may we seek to love all we are with, and all we encounter.