

Contentious Relationship between Science and Religion

Sinaa Fahad Kadhim

Ministry of Education, Iraq

Sinaa20f@gmail.com

Abstract:

This paper offers a succinct—by no means comprehensive—summary of research that has been shown to be pertinent to both "science" and "religion" as well as the case studies gathered in the current special issue. "Religion" and "science" are not in opposition to one another; they both have their respective fields. Science, or the study of matter, aims to give a physical explanation for the universe's manifestations. It seeks to delineate its principles and articulate them mathematically, resulting in numerous innovations for humanity. However, despite its substantial achievements, "science" is incapable of addressing issues beyond the realm of matter, such as those related to humanity's fate and the significance of existence.

"Religion" addresses the social, moral, and spiritual facets of human nature. The findings indicate that populations' understanding of the link between "religion" and "science" varies depending on their affiliations, practices, and beliefs of all types. The prior research on scientists' attitudes toward "religion" and acceptance of the conflict paradigm is called into question by these findings. "Religion" and "science" are often viewed as at odds due to widely held beliefs, such as the notion that "religion" and "science" are entirely distinct fields. The majority of scientists, however, do not perceive any conflict between "religion" and "science." Moreover, these contradictions do not represent a significant departure from research that has indicated that there is no real conflict between the epistemological frameworks of "science" and religious identity.

Keywords: Science, Religion, The Relationship Between Science and Religion.

Introduction

Many academics assert that "science" and "religion" are inherently antagonistic and need to remain separate; yet, their relationship has historically fluctuated between conflict and antagonism as well as peace and collaboration.

The logical positivists were a school of early twentieth-century philosophers who maintained that, despite different reasons, "science" and "religion" belong to distinct, non-overlapping realms. Only assertions that can be independently verified by evidence or that make logical sense are considered significant by positivists. Science's claims hold significance since they are based on observable material entities. Conversely, religious beliefs discuss immaterial concepts such as love, Allah, ethical behavior, sanctification, and free will. According to the positivist definition, these beliefs are deemed meaningless. Frederick Copleston stated that the central idea of positivism was that "the scientific method was the only means of acquiring anything that could be called knowledge," as experience alone serves as the foundation for knowledge (Meyer, S. C., 2003; Mahomedy, A. C., 2016).

Scholars studying philosophy, theology, history, and "science" have been examining the connection between "science" and "religion" since the 1960s. The European Society for the Study of "Science" and "Theology" meets every two years, and both "science" and "religion" are recognized as acceptable fields of study. Among its contributors are (former) scientists with enduring interests in "religion," such as atmospheric scientist Katharine Hayhoe, physicist John Polkinghorne, and molecular biophysicist Alister McGrath, as well as theologians like John Haught and Sarah Coakley, philosophers interested in "science" like Nancey Murphy, and several other authors. Recently, authors in the domains of "science" and "religion" have also acquired qualifications in the interdisciplinary field (De Cruz, H., 2017).

In the 1960s, writers such as Ian Barbour (1966) and Thomas F. Torrance (1969) contested the prevailing notion that "science" and "religion" were either antagonistic or indifferent to each other, initiating the systematic study of their relationship. Barbour's *Issues in Science and Religion* (1966) delineated some recurring themes in the field, including a comparison of the ideas and methodologies employed in both domains. *Zygon*, the inaugural specialist magazine on "science" and "religion," was founded in 1966. From the late 1980s to the 2000s, authors formulated contextual methodologies encompassing comprehensive historical assessments of the interplay between "science" and "religion" (e.g., Brooke, 1991), whereas initial investigations into "science" and "religion" focused primarily on methodological challenges (Brooke, John Hedley, 1991).

Conflict between "science" and "religion" has existed since the seventeenth century, when modern "science" first began. The trial of Galileo Galilei, a pioneer of modern science, exemplifies this contradiction. The Catholic Church condemned his support of Copernicus's heliocentric hypothesis as heretical. He was compelled to retract his claims that the sun is fixed and at the center of the cosmos, and that Earth is not. Galileo learned in 1609 that a Dutchman had created a "spyglass" by fitting two lenses together within a tube. However, to this version, he built his own telescope and pointed it skyward to observe the stars(Zanstra, H. (1968).

Galileo discovered in 1609 that a Dutchman had made a "spyglass" via enclosing two lenses within a tube. Using this description as guidance, he built his own telescope and pointed it upwards to view the stars and planets. Galileo saw his findings as solid proof that the heliocentric theory was true. The conventional view, which is based on the Bible and the works of Aristotle, is that the universe is limited to having one center of rotation(Zanstra, H. (1968).

The majority of scientists do not believe that there is a conflict between "religion" and "science" because a great deal of research has established the existence of a strong and enduring relationship between the two and has shown that each has its own domain and is not at odds with the other. Furthermore, the research has shown that there is no genuine conflict between the cognitive frameworks of "science" and religious identity, therefore these conflicts do not represent a significant departure from the norm. Here are some of the studies

The connection between religion and science is related to	The relationship between religion and science	Reference
1- interpretations of quantum physics and quantum reality	<p>It is demonstrated that interpretations of quantum physics require the existence of consciousness. However, if a minimum realism regarding the outside world is accurate, then the consciousness required by quantum reality must be "global," not just that of the scientific observer. It cannot be only "local." It is believed that God alone possesses the essential qualities seen in global consciousness. The physical universe depends on quantum reality, and quantum reality depends on God's mind. As a result, God's consciousness is necessary for the physical universe.</p>	<p>Priest, S. (2024). Quantum Physics and the Existence of God. <i>Religions</i>, 15(1), 78.</p>

2- global religions and scientific endeavors.	<p>The study of global religions has evolved into what some are referring to as a brand-new academic discipline that combines science and religion. The last 20 years have seen an unparalleled rise in public knowledge of and interest in this nuanced and sometimes tense interaction between science and religion. The process of reciprocal contact has benefits and drawbacks for both religious traditions and scientific endeavors. The historical record indicates a deep and enduring relationship between science and religion in all literate societies.</p>	<p>Arion, A. C. (2018). Relationship between Faith and Science in the Major World Religions. ICOANA CREDINTEI. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Scientific Research, 4(07), 51-66.</p>
3- science and belief in God.	<p>Dawkins contends that there are compelling arguments against the presence of God based on meticulous observations of</p>	<p>Bergman, J., & Sharp, D. (2008). Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator. New Leaf Publishing Group.</p>

	<p>the cosmos. And Stephen Meyer makes a counterargument by looking at three significant scientific advancements made in the past 100 years that go against atheism's predictions. Rather, these scientific findings—derived from the fields of cosmology, physics—prove the presence of a transcendent, sentient, and active Creator. In summary, science is quite supportive of belief in God.</p>	
<p>4- the systematic study of science and religion</p>	<p>With writers like Ian Barbour (1966) and Thomas F. Torrance (1969) challenging the conventional wisdom that science and religion were either at odds or uninterested in one another, the systematic study of science and religion began in the 1960s. Several recurrent topics in the area were outlined in Barbour's <i>Issues in Science and</i></p>	<p>Goswami, A. (2008). <i>God Is Not Dead: What Quantum Physics Tells Us about Our Origins and How.</i></p>

	<p>Religion (1966), which also included a comparison of the theories and methods used in the two disciplines. The first specialized journal on science and religion, <i>Zygon</i>, was established in 1966 as well. Authors from the late 1980s to the 2000s developed contextual methods, including in-depth historical analyses of the relationship between science and religion (e.g., Brooke 1991), while the early study of science and religion concentrated on methodological difficulties.</p>	
<p>5 - Coexistence between religion and science</p>	<p>There is a growing body of work by Muslim scholars—mostly scientists—on science and religion in light of the unfavorable correlation between science and Western civilization. According to physicist Nidhal Guessoum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guessoum, Nidhal, 2011, <i>Islam's Quantum Question: Reconciling Muslim Tradition and Modern Science</i>, London and New York: Tauris.

	<p>(2011), religion and science may coexist together. Unlike other Muslim writers involved in the dispute between science and religion, he does not accept the concept of considering the Qur'ān as a scientific encyclopedia.</p>	
6- science and Christianity	<p>According to certain writers, Christianity was distinct and played a major role in igniting the scientific revolution. Despite these optimistic interpretations of Christianity's connection between science and religion, there remain persistent points of conflict. For instance, Christian extremists continue to vehemently oppose the notion of evolution. In sharp contrast to the academic literature, the conflict perspective between science and Christianity predominates in the popular domain. This is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evans, Michael S., 2016, <i>Seeking Good Debate: Religion, Science, and Conflict in American Public Life</i>, Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

	<p>largely because of the loud, conservative Christian minority's disproportionate influence in American public discourse, which silences more moderate views (Evans 2016).</p>	
<p>7- Mind and faith</p>	<p>Responding to apparent contradictions between one's particular religion's precepts and the ostensibly supported findings of one's best scientific or philosophical account is known as the faith-reason debate. The idea of demonstration (burhān) is central to this problem. A demonstration starts with initial principles that are ostensibly absolutely certain, necessary, and true, from which conclusions can be legitimately drawn. An outstanding illustration of this method may be found in Ghazālī's <i>Incoherence of the</i></p>	<p>McGinnis, J., & Acar, R. (2023). Arabic and Islamic philosophy of religion.</p>

	<p>Philosophers. According to Ghazālī, while it is a responsibility to give a reasoned defense of one's religion's core principles, only those who are intellectually qualified and religiously schooled have this obligation; it must be denied to those who do not.</p>	
8- Appreciated and despised	<p>The idea that science and religion have always been at odds with one another first surfaced during the Enlightenment in the seventeenth century, when science was valued and religion was despised. A number of significant scientific historians have offered a methodical reassessment of the conflict thesis throughout the final three decades of the twentieth century. explains the viewpoint that faith and science</p>	<p>Ferngren, G. B. (2022). Science and religion. In The Routledge History of American Science (pp. 200-214). Routledge</p>

	<p>are compatible, not antagonistic. Darwin's theory was modified by social Darwinists to address social and cultural challenges, which eventually took over colleges and institutions. Modern physics started addressing problems outside of classical physics from 1895, especially in the areas of quantum mechanics and special and general relativity.</p>	
<p>9- The origin of religion and science</p>	<p>The tale of how "religion" came to be includes the origins of "science." The two classification categories of "religion" and "the religions" are fragile. It is well known that most academics find it extremely challenging to define religion precisely.</p>	<p>Harrison, P. (2006). Science and "Religion Constructing the boundaries. The Journal of Religion, 86(1), 81-106.</p>
<p>10 Historically connecting science and religion</p>	<p>sciences, with fresh information on the most recent subjects in the field Students</p>	<p>McGrath, A. E. (2020). Science& religion: A new introduction. John Wiley & Sons.</p>

	<p>who study Science and Religion are given a comprehensive overview of the main ideas and important discussions around the relationship between science and religion.</p> <p>This well-known textbook explores how science and religion handle important topics and explores the link between the two fields across time. It incorporates history, philosophy, the natural sciences, and theology.</p>	
--	---	--

Conclusion:

"religion" and the natural world have long been contentious subjects. Apart from the usual scholarly disputes that are present in every discipline, "religion" and "science" do not conflict with one another. Each has its own field. The study of science, the study of matter, aims to give a physical interpretation of the manifestations of the universe by identifying its laws and expressing them mathematically. This process weakened the Earth's energies and led to the creation of many inventions for humanity.

Despite its concrete accomplishments, "science" is incapable of resolving issues that extend beyond the examination of matter, including those concerning humanity's destiny and the significance of its existence. Furthermore, "science" cannot furnish information regarding an individual's societal relationships or offer a robust explanation for emotions such as love. In other words, "science" does not provide a philosophical framework for morality. It does not lessen the importance of "science" since there are many problems that "science" is unable to address because they are outside its purview and area of expertise. On the other hand, neither study on the specifics of material knowledge nor mathematical equations explaining the many components of the material cosmos can be found in "religion". These studies are outside the purview of "religion", which addresses the whole truths of life rather than its imperfect specifics, our comprehension of which is subject to change as our cognitive capacities advance.

The theologian and the scientific researcher have very different perspectives on existence. In order to build scientific ideas and connect scientific experiments with one another, "science" depends on

meticulous observation and experimentation. The prospect of discovering the fundamental principles that control the behavior of matter and natural forces is brightened by diligent study into the enduring regularities of the works of nature. One of the main characteristics of the scientific method is that each scientific theory is abandoned as soon as it is finished. There are no violent conflicts over scientific ideas, proving her incorrect. In contrast, the foundation of "religion" is revealed knowledge and revelation. Relative to evolving intellectual frameworks, established religious dogma asserts that it is an infallible truth that cannot be altered. Regardless of the depth and clarity of the evidence to the contrary, a sincere believer committed to that belief can only exhibit whole commitment and loyalty to his "religion". The truth that these religious beliefs asserted was conveyed to the adherents immediately, as opposed to the person immersing himself in a process of concept filtering and improvement. The problem that this revealed truth is prone to mistake persists eternally. Others will seek a legitimate explanation to persuade them to adhere to that ideology, even if the revealed truth is accurate.

References:

1. Meyer, S. C. (2003). The demarcation of science and religion. In *The History of Science and Religion in the Western Tradition* (pp. 43-51). Routledge.
2. Mahomedy, A. C. (2016). Epistemology and science: How the relationship fractured. Unpublished paper, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.
3. De Cruz, H. (2017). Religion and science.
4. Barbour, Ian G., 1966, *Issues in Science and Religion*, New York: Vantage.
5. Torrance, Thomas F., 1969, *Theological Science*, London: Oxford University Press.
6. Brooke, John Hedley, 1991, *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107589018
7. Zanstra, H. (1968). Is religion refuted by physics or astronomy?. *Vistas in Astronomy*, 10, 1-21
8. Fjelland, R. (2012). Science without God. *Sacred Science? On science and its interrelations with religious worldviews*, 87-100.
9. Priest, S. (2024). Quantum Physics and the Existence of God. *Religions*, 15(1), 78.
10. Arion, A. C. (2018). Relationship between Faith and Science in the Major World Religions. *ICOANA CREDINTEI. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Scientific Research*, 4(07), 51-66.
11. Bergman, J., & Sharp, D. (2008). *Persuaded by the Evidence: True Stories of Faith, Science, & the Power of a Creator*. New Leaf Publishing Group.
12. Goswami, A. (2008). *God Is Not Dead: What Quantum Physics Tells Us about Our Origins and How*.
13. Guessoum, Nidhal, 2011, *Islam's Quantum Question: Reconciling Muslim Tradition and Modern Science*, London and New York: Tauris.
14. Evans, Michael S., 2016, *Seeking Good Debate: Religion, Science, and Conflict in American Public Life*, Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
15. McGinnis, J., & Acar, R. (2023). Arabic and Islamic philosophy of religion.
16. Ferngren, G. B. (2022). Science and religion. In *The Routledge History of American Science* (pp. 200-214). Routledge
17. Harrison, P. (2006). Science and "Religion Constructing the boundaries. *The Journal of Religion*, 86(1), 81-106.
18. McGrath, A. E. (2020). *Science& religion: A new introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.