SEEING GOD IN SCIENCE

think
CHRISTIAN

INTRODUCTION

People of faith, people of science

In my tenure as editor of Think Christian, one of the perennially compelling topics we've covered has been the perceived conflict between scientific evidence and the Christian faith. From the Pope's encyclical on climate change to arguments over the historical Adam, Christians continue to wrestle with this question: how can we reconcile the special revelation of God's word with the general revelation of His creation, as revealed through science?

I describe this conflict as "perceived" because here at Think Christian, science is valued and respected enough to get its own category page on our website. Indeed, we're heavily influenced by the thinking of Dutch theologian Abraham Kuyper, whose ideas of common grace and sphere sovereignty create plenty of room for scientific inquiry within a Christian worldview. In *Wisdom & Wonder: Common Grace in Science & Art*, Kuyper wrote, "There can be nothing in the universe that fails to express, to incarnate, the revelation of the thought of God."

This perspective is also shared by BioLogos president Deborah Haarsma, who offered an especially liberating blog post last year on the eve of a debate between Young Earth Creationist Ken Ham and Young Earth opponent Bill Nye. The event was characterized as a mano a mano showdown between science and faith, but Haarsma held that "you don't have to choose."

Elaborating on this point, Haarsma explained: "[I]n accepting God as the ruler of the natural world, we do not reject science. In fact, core Christian beliefs give a strong motivation for using our minds to explore the world he created. Applying ourselves with diligence to both God's world and God's word gives the best answers."

The pieces collected here – including one that addresses the pastoral implications of that Ken Ham-Bill Nye debate – set a framework for engaging with science in a faithful manner. Drawn from the Think Christian archive and written by some of the theologians, pastors and biologists we are fortunate to have as TC contributors, these articles help us reconsider the notion of a conflict between faith and science. How can Christians graciously engage in science-related debates? What might it mean to have a "science-friendly" church? How do we react to recent polls that show a growing distrust among Christians regarding scientific evidence on topics such as climate change and vaccinations?

These are the kind of questions we're asking here at TC. We welcome you to grab a lab coat and join the conversation.

— JOSH LARSEN

How science and reason created an age of unbelief – in science and reason

BY *BRANSON PARLER*

Twenty fifteen was a rough year for belief. Many of us are familiar with the Pew research findings that noted drastically diminishing numbers of American Christians. But, oddly enough, religious belief is not the only kind of "faith" on the chopping block. National Geographic's March 2015 cover article bemoaned another sort of unbelief, claiming that "we live in an age when all manner of scientific knowledge – from climate change to vaccinations – faces furious opposition." How do we account for the way that the corrosive unbelief of our age is not just limited to matters of religion, but of science as well?

One factor is the way proponents of modern reason and science have overstated their case. The idea that only things established by science and reason are true is expressed in strong form by philosopher W.K. Clifford's axiom: "It is wrong always, everywhere, for anyone to believe anything upon insufficient evidence." Of course, Clifford doesn't answer the pressing question of what *counts* as sufficient evidence. Taken in a straightforward way, then, his axiom creates a large problem for the scientific community, because unless someone has access to the necessary equipment or data, most of us have to believe the scientific authorities, whom Nietzsche scathingly derided as priests of the modern world. They are gatekeepers who speak from on high with access to special knowledge that most commoners can't have and in terms the average person can't completely follow. Nietzsche rightly saw that science, like Christianity, operates with a metaphysical commitment to truth. Furthermore, for both science and Christianity to function, we have to *believe what experts tell us*.

Our age is characterized by a curious mixture of rationalities. On the one hand, we have the high priests of science, such as Richard Dawkins and Daniel Dennett, who exhibit a kind of old-fashioned, 19th-century naiveté about the ability of science and reason to track down the truth disinterestedly. On the other hand, under the tutelage of Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, we have become masters of suspicion, assuming that any search for so-called "truth" is really a power grab. Although all three of these thinkers attacked Christianity, their suspicion could not be contained; just as it undermined Christianity, it also demythologizes the notion of the purely disinterested scientist or scientific community pursuing truth for its own sake.

> ***We cannot follow a science that knows nothing of sin and the fallenness of both individuals and structures of our society.***

As Christians observe the conflicted juxtaposition of these two positions in our contemporary life and culture, we can follow neither of them wholeheartedly. We cannot support the naïve scientism that is unaware of how science rests on basic metaphysical assumptions, is often complicit in the exploitation of creation and is blind to any kind of truth that can't be reduced to scientific assertions. In short, we cannot follow a science that knows nothing of sin and the fallenness of both individuals and structures of our society.

But neither can we give way to the absolute suspicion and cynicism that dominate our public discourse. A certain kind of suspicion and testing are part of the scientific method itself, and that is well and good. But Christians can actually be co-belligerents with scientists against a kind of radical suspicion that believes nothing, hopes nothing and endures nothing. Nietzsche was right: Christians and scientists both begin from a stance that believes there is such a thing as truth and both recognize that there are times we need to *believe* what the *authority* on a topic tells us.

We must not embrace naïve scientism to the point that we dismiss the way sin affects our knowing and our science, but there is good reason to think that people of faith might actually lead the way in believing – in science.

Branson Parler *is Associate Professor of Theological Studies at Kuyper College. You can follow him on Twitter or his blog.*

Bringing pathos into the vaccination conversation

BY CLAYTON CARLSON

Do you think meat from genetically modified food is safe for human consumption? Do you think it is ethically acceptable to use animals in research? Do you think it's safe to vaccinate children against measles? According to a 2015 survey by the Pew Research Center, you likely answered in the affirmative to all three questions – only if you are a scientist. The study found a wide gap between the beliefs of scientists and citizens in regards to genetically modified foods, mandatory vaccination, human-caused climate change, animal research and human evolution.

> *Scientists seem to be failing to overcome the public's fear.*

Reading over the list of areas with strong disagreement between the two groups, a pattern becomes clear. Scientists seem to be failing to overcome the public's fear. Scientists are convinced of the safety of genetically modified foods, but much of the public is afraid it could be dangerous. Scientists are certain of the value of vaccination, but some citizens are afraid of possible side effects. As a scientist, I think that part of the problem is our approach to educating the public about our results.

Aristotle's three traditional modes of persuasion are ethos (credibility), logos (proof) and pathos (emotions). Scientists too often consider our ethos or credibility to be self-evident. After all, the studies we cite are performed by researchers at world-class institutions and supported by international organizations. Who could question our ethos? As for logos, the proof we use to persuade the public has a p-value of 0.001 (0.001% chance of being incorrect), is based on the best available models, is peer-reviewed and published in prestigious journals. But, what we seem to forget is that p-values mean very little to a new parent who has read a terrifying article online about a supposed side effect from childhood vaccines.

An early 2015 Science Friday podcast discussing the Pew Research report suggests that what might be missing in the communication of scientific findings is personal contact. Could it be that when trying to change entrenched views, credibility and data may make little difference, while a personal story – dare I say pathos – could be capable of making a lasting change? Might this mean that scientists need to learn to share their stories in ways that identify with and address the fears of the public? I can try to convince someone of the safety of vaccines by quoting peer-reviewed papers from leading experts, but maybe it would mean more to share the story of holding my son's chubby little leg with my own hands while the nurse vaccinated him against measles, mumps and rubella. I could share the mental struggle I had at that moment, reminding myself over and over that I know the vaccine is safe and effective. I could also talk about the comfort I feel now knowing he is vaccinated when I send him off to school during the current measles outbreak.

As believers we are well-equipped to shrink this divide between scientific findings and public perception. With the story of Scripture, we can acknowledge the fear the public feels. We do indeed live in a fallen, broken world that is not what it should be. But in the midst of this, God is making all things new in Christ Jesus. Christians recognize that many scientists are doing the redemptive work of Christ (whether they acknowledge they are doing so or not). Scientists that are developing vaccines to prevent suffering, disease and death are working to protect life, fullness and wholeness. Scientists confirming that genetically modified food is safe for consumption are working to provide nutrition for a hungry world.

Sharing a personal story requires a degree of vulnerability that is not needed when presenting a chart or a table. Maybe fear is exacerbating the disconnect between scientists and the public in multiple ways. I pray that we would all have the courage to claim truth when we see it, and also the humility to share it with others with grace.

Dr. Clayton Carlson *is assistant professor of biology at Trinity Christian College in Palos Heights, Ill.*

Who you calling hostile?! Tempering our faith-science debates

BY *ERIK KAMP*

A 2014 study on "Religious Understandings of Science," conducted by Rice University sociologist Elaine Howard Ecklund, was encouraging in its overall revelation that the gap between faith and science may not be as wide as is commonly perceived. Yet there was one statistic I found concerning: of those surveyed, 22 percent of scientists and 20 percent of the general population say religious people are hostile to science.

> ***When it comes to science in particular, it is the church's manner of response that is often remembered far longer than its specific position.***

Yes, Christians should bring skepticism to the wisdom of the world, whether it takes the form of scientific certainty, political promises or economic policy. But the accusation of Christian hostility toward such wisdom should be troubling, for when it comes to science in particular, it is the church's *manner of response* that is often remembered far longer than its specific position.

Consider Galileo and his 17th-century claim that the earth revolves around the sun. The church rejected his work due to their commitment to Aristotelian geocentricism and their interpretation of certain Biblical texts. In fairness, Galileo was in the minority among the scientific community, which largely maintained the Aristotelian model. Yet even to this day, people still perceive the church as a manipulative power looking to restrain science and ignore facts due to their judgment and persecution of Galileo. History has judged the church most harshly, not for getting the science wrong, but for being cruel. Had the church merely disagreed with Galileo and not acted hostilely toward him, it is unlikely their error would be remembered in the same way.

I fear that many Christians today are in danger of repeating history by preferring to appear correct about controversial issues of science at the expense of being kind. Within the church, there seems to be greater emphasis on defeating intellectual opponents by any means rather than loving and serving them. Political power is leveraged, evidence is manipulated and earnest scientists are degraded all in the pursuit of truth. Such actions and methods should not be found amongst disciples of truth, whose defining characteristic should be love. As long as we pursue being right over being righteous, such methods and actions will inevitably be remembered critically by subsequent generations.

I do not know where the future of faith and facts will lead, but my guess is that today's controversies – be it over evolution or climate change – will eventually fade into history, whether they become common knowledge, such as heliocentrism is today, or are ultimately proven false. Either way, it won't be the church's correctness which will be remembered, but rather the church's manner of response. How will subsequent generations remember us? Will we be compared to the 17th-century church, which leveraged all its power and authority to silence dissenters, or will we be remembered as honest, faithful witnesses of Jesus Christ, even amidst a crowd of challengers?

***Erik Kamp** is a pastoral candidate in the Christian Reformed Church. He currently lives in Crestwood, Ill., with his wife Jacque and daughter Kahlan.*

How the *Cosmos* reboot allows for religion

BY *BRANSON PARLER*

The original *Cosmos* television series is widely regarded as one of the most significant science events in TV history. Twenty fourteen's reboot attempted to live up to the hype. With the familiar face of Neil deGrasse Tyson at the helm, 10 networks simultaneously airing the show and President Barack Obama kicking the series off, the premiere episode got underway with great anticipation. The first show struck some promising notes, but it also left something to be desired.

Let me begin with disappointment. The middle section of the show was devoted to the story of Giordano Bruno, an Italian monk. *Cosmos* depicted Bruno as a martyr for science, someone who was executed by the church for his support of the idea that the sun was but one among many stars and the earth but one of many planets. This was misleading on two counts. First, Bruno was killed primarily because of his heretical views on God (which the show did mention), not his scientific views. Second, as *Cosmos* noted, Bruno's ideas were a lucky guess; he had absolutely no scientific evidence for any of his claims. This was noted almost as an aside, probably because it's hard to make Bruno a hero for science if this is really true. Whatever it was, Bruno versus the Roman Catholic Church was not a case of science versus religion. As Richard Rubenstein has noted, the standard modern narrative about science versus religion in the 12th to 16th centuries is simplistic and wrong, so it was disappointing (but not unexpected) to find it enshrined in the opening episode of this series.

Despite this, the first episode gave an intriguing visual explanation of our particular place in space and time. The opening portion of the show was devoted to explaining our cosmic address. This segment was fascinating and visually captivating, as viewers moved first through the solar system, then the Milky Way, the Local Group, the Virgo Supercluster and, ultimately, the universe. This progression underscored that the universe is insanely, almost unbelievably, huge and that we are staggeringly small on the scale of things.

The sequence regarding our place in time also underscored the extreme contingency of our existence. In the enormous cosmos, our existence depends on a "game of inches" played in the distant past by dancing asteroids. If innumerable factors hadn't happened in a very precise sequence, there would be no earth and no life as we know it. In fact, deGrasse Tyson went so far as to talk about the "chance nature of existence," which was interesting, given that "chance" is not a scientific term. Rather, as Loren Haarsma points out, it is a statement about "our lack of knowledge about causation." Our extreme contingency does not rule out God's existence or God as ultimate cause of all things.

I imagine that viewers of *Cosmos* break down into two basic groups of people: those who see the minute movements of ancient asteroids as simple dumb luck and those who see signs and orchestration in the celestial dance. My guess is that neither group will alter their view because of the show, and that both will benefit from watching it.

> ***Science is about imagination and having a vision for things unseen and unproven.***

Finally, the show underscored that science is not simply about "the facts." Science is about imagination and having a vision for things unseen and unproven. It has a tradition and communion of saints, so to speak, and it moves forward through storytelling and personal interaction. The episode concluded with deGrasse Tyson's moving personal testimony about Carl Sagan's hospitality and influence on his own life,

which was a good reminder that what really moves us as human beings is not mere matter and gravity, but the ineluctable pull of goodness, truth and beauty.

The more the producers of *Cosmos* recognize this, the broader their audience will be.

***Branson Parler** is Associate Professor of Theological Studies at Kuyper College and author of Things Hold Together: John Howard Yoder's Trinitarian Theology of Culture. You can visit his website at www.bransonparler.com.*

Children of atom, children of Eve

BY *ROBERT JOUSTRA*

Are you smarter than the average American, at least when it comes to science and religion?

Following separate surveys in recent years on those two topics, the Pew Research Center has made quiz versions available online for the public. Now you can weigh your own knowledge on science and religion against those who were first polled.

Looking back at the results of the original surveys, the findings were grim. The report on the U.S. Religious Knowledge Survey showed atheists, agnostics, Jews and Mormons outperforming evangelical Protestants, mainline Protestants and Catholics on questions about core teachings, history and leading figures of major world religions. To be clear, it's not that they run so fast. It was a slow race. On average, Americans correctly answered only 16 out of 32 religious knowledge questions. The report on the Public's Knowledge of Science and Technology also shows some tough results. Only 58% surveyed knew global warming was related to carbon dioxide.

What went wrong?

Apathy this widespread, this basic, is more than education failure. It's about broken trust. Epistemology, they say, is how you go about knowing something such that you trust the results of the knowing process. We have a crisis of epistemology, which is really a crisis of trust.

> *The shift from science-fiction utopianism to dystopia has been subtle but sure.*

The decline of religion in North America is a well-worn story by now, even if the secularization thesis hasn't entirely delivered on itself. But disenchantment with the religious is certainly not in question, a reactionary secularism having taken its toll in a country (pointedly not a globe) where religious knowledge is increasingly characterized by curiosity and confusion. Science, on the other hand, overawed the human psyche for much of the 20th century, but gradually, incrementally, its abuses and powers provoked more fear than awe: atom bombs, killer drones, corporate pillaging. The shift from science-fiction utopianism to dystopia has been subtle but sure: gone are predictive feats of psychohistory or federations of solidarity. Here, instead, are the sins of our parents, a ledger to be balanced, a trek into darkness.

Science and religion have created us, and for better or worse, like bickering parents, their tensions and their infections are manifest in us. Religion promised solidarity and peace, but it divided and polarized. Science promised progress and enlightenment, but it built systems of mass destruction, of terrible powers that bruised our imaginations and scorched our planet.

But justified or not, betrayal and its reactionary criticisms cannot gain a truer understanding of the world. Totalized criticism, says Oliver O'Donovan, is the modern form of intellectual innocence, the apex of adolescence, but not a happy apex sadly, because by elevating suspicion to the dignity of a philosophical principle it destroys trust and makes learning impossible.

It is said that maturity in relation to our parents consists in going beyond a belief in their omniscience and a disdain for their weakness. Increasingly, it seems, Americans are choosing – or having chosen for them – the ironic detachment of disgruntled children, trading off a limited inheritance, casually acknowledged, if that. Some of what science and religion taught us was important, but we try not to act

too impressed. We'll just be disappointed again, so we no longer trust. And like parents who rehearse their mistakes, I'll bet those deeply engaged in both science and religion fret. Because failing a quiz here and there on whether helium causes global warming may not kill you – but then again, it just might.

***Robert Joustra** is assistant professor of international studies at Redeemer University College and editor, with Jonathan Chaplin, of God and Global Order: The Power of Religion and American Foreign Policy. You can also find him on Twitter.*

Having “the talk” with college biology students

BY CLAYTON CARLSON

In September of 2014, The New York Times published an opinion piece by University of Washington professor David Barash, in which Barash reflected on his need each September to discuss science and religion with his first-year biology students. He does this to address the discomfort his students display when he teaches evolutionary science. Each September I have the same conversation with my students for the same reason, yet I have a substantially different message.

Barash begins his talk by explaining and disagreeing with Steven Jay Gould’s concept of “nonoverlapping magisteria,” which claims science is concerned with facts while religion deals with morals. Therefore, the two do not overlap. Barash and I agree that this concept deeply misrepresents both science and religion. We also agree that science has theological implications and that theology should inform how a believer sees the world. For me, science and religion are two fields dedicated to reading the two books of revelation: creation and Scripture. Certainly they overlap if they both teach us about our God.

But for Barash, the theology he sees in evolution teaches there is no good, powerful God. He says that the process of mutation and selection fully predicts that with a certain statistical likelihood complex creatures will be found on Earth. For him, this means that life is an “entirely mechanical phenomenon.” In other words, we have no maker. What I see, instead, is a good Creator who has made a world full of life that can do as it was commanded, and be fruitful. By the grace of God and according to His good plan, life on our planet has come to be beautifully diverse through the biological rules He set up.

Barash claims that the genetic and physiological makeup of humans shows we are just animals, with no special, central role in the world. I believe that the staggering, shocking thing about the image of God is that it was given to creatures at all. As full-fledged members of this biosphere we are made up of the stuff of this world. Dust to dust. And despite our dusty nature God, in His grace, felt fit to allow us to be His stewards, reflecting His grace to His world while doing His work in it.

Barash sees death, predation and parasitism as a "powerful critique of theodicy." He claims that the huge amount of death required for evolution is evidence that no good, all-powerful God can exist. I see them as tragic examples of the fall. The historical event of the fall not only changed the world then, but continues to corrupt God's powerfully creative world today. Barash’s view both underestimates the effect of sin on the world and the gift of God’s grace in holding it in check.

Barash and I agree with the responsibility we have as biology professors: to call our students to consider the claims of science in light of their overall worldview. But whereas he thinks – and teaches – that believing science and religion requires “challenging mental gymnastics routines,” I see them as complementary ways to learn about our Lord and Maker.

My hope is that when my students, as well as his, open their biology textbooks, they find cause for study, reflection and prayer as they contemplate God and His creation.

***Dr. Clayton Carlson** is assistant professor of biology at Trinity Christian College in Palos Heights, Ill.*

How the Ken Ham-Bill Nye creation debate hindered pastors

BY *SCOTT HOEZEE*

Nobody seriously thought the Ken Ham versus Bill Nye debate would settle anything. The real question is whether or not the spectacle helped the church and its pastors.

This question came to mind when a former student and current pastor sent me a note in response to something I posted on Facebook right after the debated ended. His comments centered on the plight of pastors who have to deal with congregations that very often contain both Young Earth Creationists, who seek to debunk the science that supports an ancient universe in favor of a literal reading of Genesis, *and* Theistic Evolution types, who accept the scientific view of the universe's age/development even as they approach Genesis with a non-literal hermeneutic.

Both sides want their pastor to understand them. Both sides exert subtle and not-so-subtle pressure to woo the pastor to their point of view (probably hoping to hear something from the pulpit that will confirm them in their stance and put others in their place).

Bill Nye, known to schoolchildren as "the Science Guy," is at least aware of a variety of Christian viewpoints. In the debate, he referred explicitly to Francis Collins as an example of a Bible-believing Christian who embraces an ancient universe and evolutionary development. But most of the church-going folks who tuned into this debate were focused not on Nye, but on Ken Ham, CEO of Answers in Genesis. Near as I could tell, Ham refused to acknowledge the existence of Bible-believing Christians who do not share his literal reading of Genesis.

At the end of the evening, those in agreement with Ham were confirmed in the belief that the Bible exists to teach the age of the earth, that the Biblical flood narrative wipes out every scientific piece of evidence for an ancient earth/universe and that to think otherwise – to think about the physical world in any way that approaches Nye's views – is to spurn the revelation of God. "Well, there's this book…" Ham said multiple times in answering Nye's questions. The tittering of the audience indicated delight in the trump card that is Scripture.

Pastors who want to embrace and love people from all viewpoints on these matters – and who want to encourage mutual respect for all – probably now have a harder row to hoe. If pastors cannot imitate the stalwartness of Ham's "The Bible says it's so" stance, then not only will they likely find their own commitment to Scripture impugned (or at least doubted), they will quite possibly find the hostility of the YEC crowd to be heightened toward any members of the congregation who doubt that just waving the Bible around can resolve all these tensions.

> ***The idea that we can have mutual love for one another across our differences did not make an appearance at the debate.***

So was the Ham-versus-Nye debate good for the church and for its pastors? I think not. The idea that we can have mutual love for one another across our differences did not make an appearance at the debate. Pastors hoping to foster such love may now be seen by some as selling out.

***Scott Hoezee** is co-host of Groundwork, a sister ministry of Think Christian, and the director of the Center for Excellence in Preaching at Calvin Theological Seminary.*

Do you have a science-friendly church?

BY PHIL REINDERS

The perceived conflict between faith and science is so commonplace that it's a given in popular culture. Caught up in this false choice, churches are sometimes inhospitable places for people trained in the sciences.

So how can congregations create a welcoming space where people celebrate God's scientific truth, and where all those involved in the sciences (including engineers, teachers, lab technicians, researchers, health care professionals and others) can grow as disciples and embrace their work as a holy vocation?

Although some might think of a hospitable attitude toward science and faith as an option package, it is an essential facet of the church's witness. It is vital to the spiritual formation of those who are engaged in the sciences. It is critical for a compelling Christian witness in a culture where the dogma of the scientific worldview mostly goes unchallenged. And it is integral to developing a robust faith centered on the God who reveals His glory within the created world.

Becoming a science-friendly church is not so far out of reach – it doesn't require a conference or a shiny new program. Most congregations and pastors can draw on Christ-centered practices and postures cultivated over centuries, mindfully extending them toward the sciences. Following are a few of those practices and postures that might be helpful.

Repent. Humble repentance is a good place to start. For many, fear and suspicion lurk beneath the faith-science conversation. This posture never allows us to extend love to others, to experience candor in our conversations, or to express gratitude for the wisdom in God's two books of revelation. Those in the sciences can repent of the idolatry of the scientific worldview; others can repent of a suspicious attitude toward the sciences. All of us can ask God for a heart ready to celebrate the goodness of the scientific endeavor and to affirm the priestly work done by those in the sciences as they give voice to the Word of God inherent in creation.

Cultivate wonder, delight and play. Christians worship God. Our worship emerges from a deep sense of wonder in God and delight in God's creating and saving work. All week long, science-friendly congregations bring that posture of wonder to the created world and to the discoveries of the sciences.

This practice is pivotal because conversations on faith and science often turn to the issue of origins. No doubt this is an important issue – but there is so much more to delight in! Before discussing the question of origins, perhaps we should first spend time leisurely gawking at photos from the Hubble space telescope, closely observing an ant colony at work, enjoying a visit to the zoo or finding out what goes on inside our digestive systems. Let a deep sense of worshipful wonder properly set the table for important theological conversations.

> *Healthy churches are learning communities.*

Encourage curiosity. Part of the goodness of human life is our immense hunger to know God and the universe God created. Curiosity is a homing device implanted in the human soul, calling us back to our Creator. Every time we encourage curiosity, questions and learning (whether pursued through God's book of creation or Scripture), we practice humility and steer people toward a larger understanding of God.

Healthy churches are learning communities. We ask questions about God; we teach the story of God in Scripture; we expand our knowledge through Bible

studies and adult education; we discourage ignorance. It's no stretch to extend that learning posture toward God's created world, humbly learning all we can from sound science, even embracing the common grace of a learned scientist who doesn't believe what we believe.

Practice hospitality. Churches are supposed to be welcoming places of grace for all people. The practice of hospitality creates a place for others to know the embrace of Christ and it opens wide our world to the views of others. Simply taking an interest in the world and work of scientists by asking them questions about what they do is a generous act of hospitality.

Admittedly, science can be intimidating; for many, scientific knowledge can seem overly complex and out of reach. Yet scientists are not that scary – likely they would love the chance to tell you about their work. Ask where they see God in their research or how their work encourages or hinders their spiritual formation.

In fact, why not include a scientist on the worship team or as part of the sermon planning process? Every day, Christian scientists note the grandeur of God in molecular genetics, chemical reactions or particle physics. They are perfect allies for giving voice to God's Word within creation through the church's ministry.

Pray. Churches are communities of prayer. Together we lift prayers to God for our world and its hot spots, for government leaders, natural disasters, personal needs and for people as they pursue their vocations. Why not pray specifically for those serving in the sciences in our congregations and beyond – praising God for recent scientific discoveries in the news and praying for the faithful witness of Christians in the world of science?

Community. Churches are communities where we encourage, care for and support each other, where we bear one another's burdens. Christians who are active in the sciences regularly wade through complex ethical issues and many are involved in high-level discussions that impact public policy. These followers of Jesus feel the weight of demanding careers and of where their work and research may lead. The burden can be heavy. Can we compassionately come alongside these fellow disciples, providing supportive Christian community and a safe place to explore how the Gospel shapes these important issues?

The way beyond the perceived conflict of science versus faith is the way of Jesus, the way of living Jesus' generosity, patience, humility and love. Why not make an experiment of it in your church and see what surprising new discoveries emerge?

***Phil Reinders** is a member of the Regent College Pastoral Science Cohort. He blogs at Squinch and recently accepted a call as senior minister at Knox Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Ontario. A longer version of this piece originally appeared in The Banner.*

EDITED BY JOSH LARSEN

DESIGNED & ILLUSTRATED BY SCHUYLER ROOZEBOOM

think
CHRISTIAN

www.thinkchristian.net

Think Christian is one of a family of programs from

ReFrame Ministries