

Brief Notes on Origin of Science and Religion Conflict

Sylvester Donkoh

Tutor

Science department

Foso College of Education, Assin Foso, Ghana

Abstract: Even though both science and religion seek to generate knowledge about the universe, they are in conflict. The conflict dates back to the sixteenth century when Galileo Galilei published a paper in support of a religiously suppressed heliocentric universe proposed by Copernicus. Theologians feared Galileo's pronouncements will throw abase the sacred text the church derived its authority from. This was the first major contribution to the science and religion conflict. Darwin's 'Origin of Species' was also considered a counter theory to the origin of life expressed in sacred texts. Darwin's theory of evolution was a sharp contradiction to the theologian's version of the origin of life. The theologians in the United State of America opposed the inclusion of Darwin's theory of evolution in the school curriculum. Like Galileo's, Darwin's theory of evolution challenged God-inspired-knowledge and so was not tolerated in religious circles. In the early twentieth century, Lamitre's controversial big-bang theory that appeared to describe events that took place when God said in the Bible 'let there be light', came to add to the science and religion conflict. At the forefront of the science and religion conflict are the constantly opposing philosophies Biblical literalism and scientific materialism. Scientific materialism and Biblical literalism are the major relative forces that have fueled and sustained the science-religion conflict.

IndexTerms - Galileo Galilei, science and religion conflict, Scientific materialism and Biblical literalism, Darwin's theory of evolution, big-bang theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

The incompatibility of scientific knowledge and religious belief in supernatural causations is the primary cause of the science and religion (mostly Christianity) conflict. Science as seen by Townes (2003) is man's attempt to study and understand the structure and functioning of the universe. Science seeks to understand the universe through application of rationalism and empiricism. Religion on the other hand is man's attempt to understand the meaning and purpose of the universe. Religion attributes and explains the universe through belief in a supernatural being who constantly intervenes and guide the functioning of the universe. According to Paz-y-Miño-C & Espinosa (2015), the belief in natural causations disrupts, distorts, delays or stops the comprehension and acceptance of scientific evidence" (p. 1). Science does not consider religious beliefs as true knowledge principally because of its non-verifiability and reproducibility. These belief-empiricism stance has polarized science and religion.

Prior to the end of the scientific revolution, the natural philosophers (who later became known as scientists) were largely upheld religion. It appears that both theologians and natural philosophers understood that natural philosophy and religion were engaged in a joint inquiry into nature and also the two disciplines complemented each other (Barbour, 2000). According to Pumfrey, Cantor and Dixon (2010) natural philosophers worked based on religious motives and "drew their social sanctioning from religion" (p. 26).

Even in the period from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, some scientists publicly wrote about their religious beliefs. Robert Boyles considered the work of scientist as a 'worship of God' and to Johannes Kepler astronomers astronomers were 'priests of the most high God, with respect to the book of nature' (Pumfrey, Cantor & Dixon, 2010 p. 26). To these scientists and others with similar beliefs not mentioned here, science and religion were about the pursuance of knowledge regarding the universe. The position of scientist have changed over time. Now the belief in a supernatural being as the cause of occurrences and the architect of the universe is in conflict with the knowledge generated through science.

Science considers materials and the way they behave and interpret the observation as is, without connecting it to any supernatural being. Now it appears science sees God as the 'God of the Gaps'. Religion is brought into science when science cannot offer any explanation for a phenomenon. It is only here the public gets to know scientists know a supernatural, all seeing and knowing God exist. Even in such cases 'intelligent designer' is used instead of God. Certain events and propositions caused the science-religion conflict. This paper discusses some of the remarkable events in history that caused the science and religion conflict. The paper specifically discusses how the work of Galileo Galilei, Darwin's origin of species, the big-bang theory, and scientific materialism and biblical literalism have contributed to the science-religion conflict.

II. GALILEO GALILEI AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Born in 1564, Galileo is undoubtedly a great figure in the history of Science science-religion conflict. Galileo is celebrated as one of the most well-known scientists who sort harmony between knowledge of nature and the Bible. He was of the view that, anyone who is pursing heaven should consult the Bible, and anyone who wants to understand the workings of nature should consider empirical observation and reasoned demonstrations. Galileo was one of the few philosophers who had the belief that

Copernican astronomy was an accurate dissemination of the universe. The Copernican system, said planets moved on small epicycle, which in turn moved randomly in circular orbit that were centered on the sun. The Copernican system was a model that portrayed the sun as the center of the solar system. Galileo and other handful of mutual philosophers who were in favor of Copernican astronomy, saw it as a model superior to the Ptolemaic model the Catholic Church ascribed to.

The Ptolemaic model said the earth was the center of the universe and all other bodies, including the sun revolved around the earth. This was the standard knowledge on the universe passed on from Plato and Aristotle. This standard knowledge was constructed from several literal interpretations of the scripture, (chronicle 16: 30, Psalm 96: 10, Joshua 10: 13, Psalm 104: 5), that suggested the earth was stationary and standard astronomical model of the Greek astronomer Ptolemy (Pretorius, 2012).

By denouncing the geocentric universe and going for the Copernican model, Galileo was not only challenging the status-quo, he was challenging the word of God. The very thing the Catholic Church draws and administers political power from. The scientist and philosopher who were seeking to propagate truth, had landed on a virtual minefield of political power and not even his friend the Pope could defer him because the Ptolemaic model was upheld by the Catholic scientists as well.

According to Dixon (2012) 'the election in 1623 of Cardinal Maffeo Barberini as Pope Urban VIII must have seemed to Galileo like the answer to his prayer' (P. 28). This is not just because Barberini was an educated and well-cultured person, he was a friend and an ardent supporter of Galileo's work. Barberini had even written a poem 'In Dangerous Adulation' in 1620 to express how much he admired Galileo's telescopic discoveries. Galileo had meetings with Urban VIII in 1624. In these meetings, Urban VIII's assured Galileo he could discuss the Copernican theory as a hypothesis and not as a matter of fact. Urban VIII's reasoned it was possible for God to move the heavens as He (God) desired, and so it was presumptuous for Galileo to proudly declare he had discovered an accurate nature of the solar system.

Galileo presented Dialogue as a discussion among three characters; an Aristotelian, a Copernican, and a commonsensical man. However, it was dear to readers that Galileo was making a case for the Copernican model. In effect, he had produced a Copernican favorite piece of propaganda, thus breaching the conditions of the 1616 injunction and the provision given by his friend Pope Urban VIII. The Dialogue put Galileo trouble. He was sent to Rome and tried before the inquisition.

According to Dixon (2008), Galileo's trial was more on what can be described as politics of knowledge than a science-religion conflict. Agreeing with Dixon (2008), Pretorius (2012), put forward three reasons why he supports the argument that Galileo was against church politics rather than the church. First, the party with the authority to discover and well-documents the method that led to the discovery would have his knowledge and method used by all. Secondly, there was a party that was known to have the power to make statements about the nature of reality. Thirdly, the argument was not necessarily between the church and Galileo. It was between two disagreeing camps in the Catholic Church. Two camps had emerged - Catholic astronomers who were pro-Copernican and adhered to Copernican's mathematics and the pro-Ptolemaic Catholic astronomers who accepted the Ptolemaic model of a geocentric solar system. There is no doubt the Catholic Church was more of a political establishment than a religious establishment, however they had religious concerns as well. If the church had allowed science to modify knowledge derived from scripture, it would have meant that scripture is errant and the general public would not be consider as absolute truth anymore.

The Bible was the medium through which the Catholic Church was exercising its authority and political powers over the people. The Bible is the word of God. The writers were inspired by God to write the text in the Bible. God had inspired Joshua to write that the moon and the sun were stopped from moving. That is to say the sun is not stationary. God had also inspired Daniel to write that the earth does not move because it has been firmly established. These were religious teachings taught by the church. Now Galileo was saying that was not the case. The moon moves, but not the sun, and the earth is not firmly held. He was throwing away religious teachings. What he was saying in the 'Dialogue' was that religion got it all wrong, he the scientist has got it all right. He was telling the church, the God they trusted and through whom they exercised their political authority was wrong.

If God had been wrong with the very thing he had created, then other texts could be wrong too. Religion (the Christian religion) would have no bases. If Urban was interested only in fortifying his position, his reason for not allowing Galileo to publish his work would not have centered on God. Though the church was politically inclined and Galileo was a scientist, the clash was that of two ideas, a scientific idea and a religious one. When Darwin wrote that he could not see how anyone could wish Christianity to be true, he was amplifying what would have happened if Pope Urban VIII and the church had not found a way of defending religion.

III. DARWIN'S ORIGIN OF SPECIES

Darwin was born in Shrewsbury, Shropshire, England 1809. He became an 'apprentice doctor' at the University of Edinburgh Medical School in 1825 but soon quit the apprenticeship. He quit because he did not like the work involved and the lectures were boring. He went to assist Robert Edmond Gant in researching into anatomy and life cycle of marine invertebrates. In 1827, he presented to the Plinian society, his own findings relating to black spores, to the displeasure of his father, Robert Darwin. In 1828, Robert Darwin sent Charles Darwin to Christ College at Cambridge to study, but Darwin was disqualified from taking anything but the ordinary degree course. He did well in the ordinary course and graduated in 1831. In that same year he graduated, he joined HMS Beagle as a companion to the ships. He joined Beagle at the invitation of the captain, Robert Fitzroy, to join him (the captain) to undertake the collection and observations relating to materials of natural-historical interest. In five years, they went to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Darwin's observations which were related to the aim of the expedition centered on rock formations, plants, animal and the indigenous people.

Back in England, Darwin started to make sense of the numerous observations and specimen he had collected over the five-year period during the voyage. He got two alternative explanations, none of which was palatable to him. He considered that, first, perhaps each species had been created at a particular place and time, and second, possibly, all life had spontaneously started in a simple form, and had gradually developed in the direction of perfection and greater complexity. What he wanted was an explanation based on natural laws and not that God might have intervened miraculously in the history of life. There was the theory of transmutation developed by Jean Baptiste Lamarck, which could be used to support the second option, however there are some thematically assumptions Darwin find unacceptable. For example, there were the assumptions that, is a continuous spontaneous generation of life and that it makes an ascent up a single ladder of life which all life climbs in one direction, and that a creature's own voluntary effort has the possibility of altering its physical structure. This theory was widely believed to be associated with unacceptable religious ideas of determinism and materialism.

Earlier aboard beagle, Darwin had read Charles Lyell's publication. Lyell had argued that, the history of the earth was characterized by gradual changes that operate over very long periods of time and not regular catastrophes. From this, Darwin concluded that if geological changes could be explained by gradual modification over time as Lyell has written, then biological change could too. This was helpful in explaining the variation in the Galapagos finches.

The Galapagos finches nicely illustrate the dilemma Darwin faced as he thought of his work and the history of life. On the Galapagos Islands, finches, giant tortoises and mockingbirds differed in form from one Island to the other and also between island and South America mainland. The most remarkable difference in the finches on the different islands was the size and shape of their beaks. Darwin had to believe there had been independent acts of creation by God on the mainland and on each island. But this seemed theologically and scientifically inelegant. Landmark's theory of transmutation would not work since there was no obvious way of arranging the different species in a single line with one developing from the other. Thomas Malthus' *An Essay on the Principle of Population* provided a clue.

Thomas Malthus' concern was with human populations. According to Dixon (2008), Malthus held the view that human population had a natural tendency to increase exponentially from one generation to the another in succession, while the amount of food produced by a society increases arithmetically. Since the population growth rate does not commensurate with available resource each generation struggles for resources. The weak perishes and the strong survives. Darwin perceived something singular happened on the islands - a competition of resource, the struggle for existence in which the strong survives and the weak perishes. This became the central idea of Darwin's theory.

Darwin's dilemma was resolved. He had to explain the adaptation of living things to their environment as well as the roots of different species by random inheritable variation, geographical distribution, competition for food, water and air, and the survival of the fittest over vast eons of time and not in terms of the workings of a supremely powerful and intelligent designer called God. Natural selection as we now know it may come in different shades; a predator, shortage of food, disease, sudden change in the weather, and drought. When any of or a combination of these struck, the individuals in each generation who by chance develop resistance to become better equipped to cope would thrive and pass on the resistance traits to their offspring, while the poorly adapted would perish. If this process is repeated for millions of years, a whole new species could evolve from the simplest life forms. This is where Darwin stirred the rift between science and religion.

Charles Darwin's assertion that the origins of life, for example, humans had nothing to do with a 'Creator God' was stunning. This 'Creator-God', according to Francis (2007) "was the God of the Bible: to argue anything else seemed fanciful at best and heretical at worse" (P. 9). To accept Darwin's theory required that one rethinks Christian ideas, most especially, the ideas based on the text of Genesis, where man was said to have been created in the image of God. Three questions that arise and are of concern to Christians especially, are: if man and all other creatures came from a common ancestor, when did they commit the act of sin that resulted in the fall of man, and was there need for someone to rescue man from the consequences of their sins, and do other living creatures commit sin? Theologians as well as church leaders had to challenge Darwin's ideas and ultimately reject them.

Not everyone within the Christian church was against Darwin's ideas. There were some theologians within the church who were persuaded by Darwin's ideas. Henry Drummond, novelist Charles Kingsley and Frederick Temple were some of the men within the church who upheld Darwin's ideas. To these men, God might have created the species populating the earth through variation and natural selection rather than by successions of miracles. To them, after creation, new species begun to emerge as a result of variation and natural selection. There was indeed greater splendors and decency, and more order and simplicity in the idea that God had created through a systematic process of evolution, instead of the idea that God occasionally step in to up the earth's flora and fauna after a catastrophe. Though these men and others, possible, supported Darwin, they could not openly defend Darwin.

Most of the people in religious cycles who had denounced Darwin's theory had expressed opinion similar to Wilberforce in the Wilberforce-Huxley debate in 1860. In the debate, Wilberforce did not base his resistance to evolution on the literal reading of the Bible, however, he derived it from a commitment to biblically inspired idea of creation in which human beings were uniquely created and made superior to all other creatures. In Christian teachings, God took on the form of man and came to live among humans as Jesus Christ in order to save the most special and cherished creation, called human. Wilberforce's assertion that man was only an upgraded ape and not creation's ultimate and perfect creature was demeaning to humanity and to God. Wilberforce's point has been reiterated by Christians, Jews and Muslims alike when the implications of evolution for their religious beliefs come for discussion.

Darwin did more than categorizing humans as part of nature, by outlining the role of natural selection plays in evolution. He created, according to Zimmerman (2009), the chief unifying principle of biology and made biology become an integrated science instead of a random collection of facts. At the same time, he contributed to widening the divide between science and religion just as the cosmologist's story of the big-bang has done.

IV. THE BIG BANG THEORY

Our universe when view from the theologian and cosmologist perspectives had a beginning; however, the two viewpoints disagree on the age of our universe and how it came into being. While the theologians say it was created in six days by spoken words of God, the cosmologist says and have some evidence to prove that, the universe is several billion years old and was created through what is termed as the Big Bang. Prior to the Big Bang theory, there were a number of attempts and models to suggest that our universe has a beginning.

What we now call the big bang theory started in 1915, when Einstein provided field equations for a relativistic theory of gravitation. Einstein's theory provided a new perspective of our universe. In the theory, he called general relativity, Einstein reasoned that gravity was not a force, but an effect of the curvature of space-time which is caused by mass-energy distribution. The theory, according to Luminet (2007), allowed scientists to overhaul existing cosmological theory. The universe which was somewhat a vague concept prior to general relativity, acquired a new consistency to become a physical entity defined in space-time. The universe as a concept became endowed with a rich structure, geometrically expressed in terms of curvature and topology, and, physically, in terms of matter and energy content.

Cosmological solutions of general relativity equations are obtained by assuming that matter-energy distribution in the universe are homogenous and isotropy. It was implied that space curvature does not vary from one point to another, even though it can change with time. Einstein was thinking of a static universe. It was a natural assumption because at the time, no astronomical observations had been made, indicating that stars have large velocities.

In 1922, Alexander Friedmann took a step which caused Einstein's static universe to be abandoned. He introduced an alternative in which space varied with time. This was the first time the issue of beginning and the end of the universe was raised in pure scientific terms. Friedmann mentioned that there was the possibility of a universe whose spatial curvature is constant, with respect to the three spatial coordinate and depends on time. He thought of a positively curved space, a matter density, time variable, and a vanishing cosmological constant. Through this, Friedmann, developed his "closed universe model" with the dynamics of contraction and expansion. When he died in 1925, his theoretical model was challenged by cosmological observations. About this same time, emerging scientific experimental data begun to question the validity of static cosmological models (Luminet, 2007).

Some notable examples of experimental data that came up were that of Arthur Eddington, George Lemaître and Edwin Hubble. Arthur pointed out that, among 41 spectra shifts of galaxies that were measured by Vesto Slipher, only five were not redshifted. Hubble proved that other galaxies existed, and that the universe is far larger than previously expected. Lemaître proved that there is a linear relationship for distance and redshift and that the universe is expanding.

In 1931 Lemaître made an assumption that Luminet (2007) described as outrageous. Lemaître reasoned that if the universe is expanding then it is logical to think that sometime in the past it was smaller and denser. Lemaître assumed the universe has a time-varying matter density and pressure, positively curved space, and a cosmological constant such that, starting from unity, firstly the universe expands, and then passes through a 'stagnation' phase during which its radius nears that of the Einstein's static solution, and then begin again in accelerated expansion. From this, Lemaître developed the revolutionary concept of "Primeval Atom". The concept, generally, is that, in the past the universe was so condensed that it was one object. An entity he posited as a quantum pure energy. The primeval atom, from Lemaître concept gave birth to our universe. It broke into fragments, then each fragment broke into smaller pieces, in a process similar to fireworks display and 'bang' the universe we born! This is what Fred Hoyle called the big bang when he teasingly called Lemaître 'The big bang man' in 1948.

The 'Big Bang theory' was amplified by the discovery of the Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation made in 1965 by two Bell Lab scientist Robert Wilson and Arno Penzias. The two scientists were testing out a microwave receiver when they noticed a low-temperature background which persisted when they tried removing all possible causes (Ball, 2003). They began to call other scientist to help them unravel the cause of 'noise' and if possible remove it. When they gave their findings to Jim Peebles, a Princeton University astrophysicist, the answer they received was, they had accidentally discovered the predicted radiation left over by the initial explosion that began the expansion of the universe itself. (Ball, 2003).

The Big Bang theory according to Rhee (2013), states that at a fixed time in the past, the universe which was in a state of huge density and pressure began to expand. As the universe grew older, it cooled, allowing random physical processes to come into play to produce the stars and galaxies we see. The theory is based on three cosmological observations; the existence of the cosmic background radiation, the expansion of the universe measured by the redshift of light emitted from galaxies, and thirdly, the relative amounts of helium, hydrogen and deuterium in the universe. Many people (especially those outside the scientific community) doubt the means by which these discoveries are made and hence the predictions and interest scientists draw from them. However, much of the debate and rejection of the Big Bang theory have centered on the supposed occurrence that took place at the birth of our universe as it was formed from the fragmentation of a Primeval Atom. (An idea similar to the ancient idea that everything in the universe hatched from a mundane egg). Lemaître's model was reviewed and fine-tuned to become the bases of the big bang theory (Luminet, 2007).

Following events that led to the big bang theory, one can perceive that science is trying to unravel the various process that occurred and brought our universe into being. No mention is made of a higher being, an intelligent designer, because these studies are not aimed at whether or not there was an intelligent being (God) behind creation. One could say that science is investigating what happen when God said let there be light. But it is doubtful that science can confidently assume that this is the case. The physicist is materialistic and he/she will take nothing from the theologian who is blinded by biblical literalism.

V. SCIENTIFIC MATERIALISM AND BIBLICAL LITERALISM

Scientific materialism and Biblical literalism are the major relative forces that have fueled and sustained the science-religion conflict. Science is not superstitious and religion is not materialistic. While the scientist holds materialism as the truth, Christians and others who believe in sacred texts see what they read as the truth. Scientific materialism and biblical literalism have, thus, caused these groups of professionals to see the other's philosophy as a threat. Even though the bible believer uses the products of science, the Bible believer does not accept the means by which the scientist interprets God's world. The scientist relies on faith, yet denounces many of the teaching of the bible only because it is a matter of faith. As a result, scientific materialism, a much younger philosophy, has in many ways portrayed an older philosophy, biblical literalism as 'no knowledge'.

The scientific revolution, the empiricism and the evolutionary naturalism of the nineteenth century ushered in scientific materialism. The intellectual heirs of this era are generally called Scientific Materialists. The scientific materialists see the scientific method as the only means to knowledge and matter in the universe. These two, knowledge and matter, are connected by the assumption that nothing except the entity and cause science deals with are real, and that only science can progressively unveil the nature of what is real.

Scientific materialism expresses a notion referred to as reductionism. `Reductionism holds that any multifaceted system is nothing than the sum of the various units that come together to form the system and that an account of the system can be reduced to accounts of the various units. It may also be viewed as a method of understanding the nature of multipart things, by reducing them to interactions of various parts. Reductionism may be epistemological or metaphysical. While epistemological reductionism says the theories and laws of the sciences can be reduced to the laws of physics and chemistry, metaphysical reductionism says the various components making up a system constitute its most basic reality. According to Barbour (1997), the materialists have the belief that all phenomena will in the end be explained in terms of the actions of the various material components which constitute the effective cause in the world.

The materialist relies heavily on the scientific method as the most unailing form of understanding due to their reproducibility. Theories formulated and their implications are tested by the scientific community against experimental observations and those formed to be coherent, comprehensive and have fruitful influence are generally accepted. As indicated by Barbour (1997) religious beliefs are not accepted in the scientific community since they lack experimental testing and criteria for their evaluation. It is only science which is universal, cumulative, open-minded, objective, and progressive. By contrast, religious traditions are closed-minded, subjective, and resistant to change.

To the materialist, the only form of understanding, there is, is science. Explanations in terms of evolutionary history, astronomical origins, and biochemical mechanisms exclude other forms of explanations. Science relies on objective concepts and leaves out of its inquiry, anything superstitious. Science does not accept the concept of God as a hypothesis formulated to explain phenomena, most especially when the 'God centered hypothesis' competes with scientific hypothesis. Religious experiences of societies formed by the historic traditions cannot substitute scientific research, they are only a way of life.

Writers of the middle-ages recognized diverse literary forms and levels of truth in scripture and they gave an allegorical interpretation to passage. It was such interpretation of the Bible passages, that, the catholic leaders depended on to condemn Galileo's idea of the universe (Barbour, 1997). Darwin's theory, even now, is seen by many as a challenge to the studies of humanity and also as a challenge to scripture. Religious groups hold that it is the prophets witness to the primary revelations, the life and person of Christ (for Christians) or other religious leaders that constitute scripture. Scripture therefore cannot be challenged by anyone or group, for challenging scripture means challenging God.

Religious groups' position that scripture is inerrant is the key contribution of religion to the science religion conflict. Some Christian evangelicals as well as traditionalists, insist, according to Ingram (2010), on the 'centrality of Christ without insisting on the infallibility of a literal interpretation of the Bible' (p. 23). However, in the United State, for example, there are several major denominations and radical fundamentalist groups that insist the Bible is inerrant, creating a conflict between biblical literalism and scientific materialism. For example, biblical literalism conflict with evidence of evolution, geological evidence suggesting the earth is about 4.5 billion years old, instead of the literalists' 6,000 years, and big bang theory as the event that gave birth to the universe. In all these examples the one that has been most contested is the origin of man.

In the United States alone, the theory of evolution has been contested in court two times, since 1925. In 1925, the governor of Tennessee signed an act which made it unlawful for the state of Tennessee's teachers to teach evolution and or any other theory that contradicts the story of the origin of man as recorded in the Bible. According to Dixon (2008) some lawyers and businesses of Dayton persuaded John Scope, a local school teacher, to put himself forward in response to an advertisement, to bring a test case, placed by the American Court Larbertie Union (ACLU). When the case came to an end, Scope was convicted and fine 100 dollars for teaching evolution. In 1981, Arkansas legislature passed a law that required that, Divine Creation story is given equal instructional time as evolution in public high school classes and texts. A year later, the U.S. District Court overruled the law,

because it was biased and therefore violated the constitutional separation of state and church. These cases bring to bear the conflict and tension created by scientific materialist and Biblical literalism.

Biblical literalism created the term creationism. Loosely defined, creationism is a religious opposition to evolution. The creationist believes that the universe, planet earth and life therein were created instantaneously and supernaturally by God and that humans as well as all other forms of life on earth were created by God in their current form. To the creationist the big bang theory and all other scientific theories about the universe and how it came into being are fallacies. Though we cannot say that plants and animals do not have the ancestry the creationist based their rejection of evolution and scientific theories of origin of the universe on the authority of sacred texts - Hebrews scripture, Christian Bible, the Quran etc.

Biblical literalists base their stance on a literal interpretation of the scriptures. This literal interpretation was questioned in the Scopes trial when Clarence Darrow cross-examined William Jennings Bryan. Bryan pointed out that saying Christian is the light of the word or salt of the world does not mean the Christian's body is light or salt. He said such statements recorded in the Bible were used illustratively and should be taken as such. On the number of days Genesis as the days for creation, Bryan said it might not be twenty-four-hour-days. Rather, they represented periods in creation which may be six days, six years, six million years, or even six hundred million years. He understood the recording in the bible which said Joshua stopped the sun, as Joshua stopping the earth from rotating.

Following literal interpretation, of what the Bible meant when it said the sun was stopped in the sky following the literal interpretation, we would say, like the Catholics believe back in 1600's that the sun moves about a stationary earth. We all know today that a literal interpretation of this scripture makes the Bible wrong. As calculated from the biblical text the earth is much older than the six million years the text indicates when the biblical literalist' interprets his/her sacred text literally, and thinks that it is the truth, he/she become blind to the knowledge and the real truth, science is revealing to us and sees science as ant-religion, because science is revealing knowledge those who wrote the text in the sacred books did not have. If Joshua had written the text today he would not have made that error, which suggested at the time of inspiring Joshua either God did not know the workings of his creation or Joshua did not get God right. Bryan knew the Bible was wrong on some scriptures, yet, when it came to humans, he insisted man had not evolved because the bible says so.

VI. CONCLUSION

The loud voice of the scientific materialist suggests to everyone that the scientist does not need religion to succeed in discovering knowledge, marginalizing those whose faith and believe could bridge the gap between science and religion. It puts in the minds of the ordinary person and those with religious affiliations that, science will collapse religion and so religious institutions should do all they can to resist any proposition put forward by science which contradicts or undermines religion. Religion killed Galileo even though he was right about the earth orbiting the sun. Darwin has and still not been taken seriously in saying all animals has evolved and we let me add that we will evolve into something else if the conditions in which we live is altered. Before the religious leaders mock Darwin, they should stop a moment and ask God, whether He created Adam brown, white, or black. Whether he created Adam smallish like a typical Asian or huge as an American. He created Adam and then Eve - maybe not in the form we see ourselves today - and possibly allowed natural disasters and geographical conditions to bring the differences we see today in our skins and stature. This is Darwin's Message to us and it is similar to the creationist big-bang theory.

The big-bang theory takes center-stage each time the conflict between science and religion is mentioned. The theory is seen by the theologian as counter story of the origins of the universe as recorded in the Holy Scriptures. The question asked from the theologian's end is, who created the hot Atom that expanded to form the universe? The Scientist without admitting that it could come to a supreme being would say we can get nothing from something and something from nothing. The materialist's story of the creation of the universe as an attempt to describe the various processes that might have taken place when God gave the orders that created the earth and all that is within it. When God created the earth, it was without form, we may be talking about atom here. God said let there be light and bang the atom exploded, releasing large amount of energies which can still be detected today.

If science acknowledges that it is not trying to propose a counter story to all that religion has said about nature, but it is only trying to understand God's creations, and that in doing so religion can offer inspiration that will help achieve this goal, the conflict between science and religion will be a thing of the past. Religion uses the products of science. It embraces science, so long as science does not suggest a sacred texts wrong. If religion would abandon biblical literalism and see science as a tool that can enhance the interpretation of scripture, then science and religion would complement each other in the pursuit of knowledge.

Scientific Materialism and Biblical literalism, Galileo's model of the universe, Darwin's proof that we originated from apes, and the big bang theory have contributed to the science-religion conflict. Among these, the factor that has deepened the conflict are scientific materialism and biblical literalism. Because of materialism and biblical literalism, science throw away religious beliefs and religion slams scientific speculations thereby creating a constant conflict between science and religion.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ball, S. (2003). A Christian physicist examines the big bang theory. Retrieved from [http://www.kernworld.net/Docs/christianity and the big bang.pdf](http://www.kernworld.net/Docs/christianity%20and%20the%20big%20bang.pdf)
- [2] Barbour, I. G. (1997). Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues. New York: HarperSan Francisco.

- [3] Barbour, I. G. (2000). When science meets religion. New York: Harper-Collins.
- [4] Barlow, N. (1958). The autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809–1882, with original omissions restored. London: Collins.
- [5] Bergman, J. (2001). The effect of Darwinism on morality and Christianity. CA, USA: Institute for Creation Research.
- [6] Dixon, T. (2008). Science and religion a very short introduction. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- [7] Dixon, T. (2012). Science and religion a very short introduction. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- [8] Francis, K. A. (2007). Charles Darwin and The origin of species. CT USA: Greenwood Press.
- [9] Ingram, P. O. (2010). Buddhist-Christian Dialogue in an Age of Science Lanham, MD, and Plymouth, U.K.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers
- [10] Jensen, V. J. (1988). Return to the Wilberforce-Huxley Debate. The British Journal for the History of Science 21(2), 161-179.
- [11] Johnson, G. (1998) Science and Religion: Bridging the Great Divide. Retrieved from <http://crab.rutgers.edu/~goertzel/religion&science.htm>.
- [12] Jones, S. J. (2011). A Brief Survey of Sir Isaac Newton's Views on Religion, in Converging Paths to Truth, Michael D. Rhodes and J. Ward Moody (Ed) Deseret Book, 61–78.
- [13] Luminet, J. P. The Rise of Big Bang Models, from Myth to Theory and Observations. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0704/0704.3579.pdf>
- [14] Paz-y-Miño-C, G., & Espinosa, A. (2015). Evolution Controversy: A Phenomenon Prompted by the Incompatibility between Science and Religious Beliefs. International Journal of Science in Society, 7(2), 1-23.
- [15] Pretorius, M. (2012). Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction to Supposedly Competing Worldviews. Cornel W du Toit (Ed.) Knowing, Believing, Living in Africa: Perspectives from Science and Religion 15, 51-62.
- [16] Pumfrey, S., Cantor, G. N., & Dixon, T. (2010). Science and Religion: New Historical Perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Rhee, G. (2013). The Three Pillars of the Big Bang Theory. In Cosmic Dawn. New York: Springer.
- [18] Timberlake, T. K. (2013). Modeling the History of Astronomy: Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho. Astronomy Education Review 12(1), 010201.
- [19] Townes, C. (2003). The convergence of science and religion. Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith 55(3) 154 – 158.
- [20] Zimmerman, M. (2009). Why evolution is the organizing principle for biology. Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 89(1), 4 – 7.

