

Chapter 1 : Double Helix: Obama, Race, Science, and Religion | Religion Dispatches

Is there any evidence for evolution? Can Genesis be trusted as an authentic document for the origins of man? This is an updatar on a previous study. Support.

In examining centuries of religious texts, natural philosophy, ethnological and social science along with new studies of ancient human DNA, Keel traces the unacknowledged connections between Christian thinking about creation and ancestry, and modern theories of human origins and racial diversity. Did modern science invent this notion that we share a common ancestor? If you think about that historically, this answer is no. That this mother of modern humans was named after the first woman in the Bible is no coincidence, Keel noted. The case of race in science, Keel says, is particularly unique in that contemporary scientists have inherited European Christian beliefs that influence the questions they ask and the answers they create when studying human biodiversity. Recognizing this, however, involves rethinking commonsense notions about the assumed conflict between science and religion. By the 6th century, crude maps of the globe were divided into three regions: Asia, Europe and Africa. Below each region was the name of the son who founded its population. Even today geneticists generally believe there are three main races: African, European and East Asian, he said. Other human evolutionary development is considered recent, regional and often derivative from these three primary forms. A multiregional theory of human evolution, in which anatomically modern humans developed independently in Africa, Europe and Asia, has practically disappeared amid the Out of Africa model currently in vogue. For Keel, however, Out of Africa persists as a guiding framework for scientific research because we continue to live within a Euro-American culture invested in the idea of common human ancestry, which believes the role of science “much like the Christian theology that preceded it” is to give a universal account of where all humans come from. Increasingly, genetic research has provided grounds for us to be less and less certain about what it means to be purely human and to claim a common genetic heritage. Keel notes that the human genome is a messy relic littered with the genetic remnants of our hominid predecessors. Even the genome of Neanderthals contains DNA from a still unidentified hominid. What we have instead is a story of multiple waves of population dispersal, multiple evidence of humans mixing with each other, where it becomes difficult to say that there was a stable, pure racial group at one point in time that then was lost through mating with different people. But we also know that we are a constantly changing population. He said the book is not intended as an indictment of science, but as an invitation to think outside the narrow confines of genetic inheritance and into the factors that afflict humans today. How I design research? How I interpret data? I think when we call our inherited traditions to our awareness it allows us to confront them, and then it allows us to think differently.

Chapter 2 : The Science of Race | Facing History and Ourselves

Keira Stone calendriredelascience.com Science Race And Faith A Life Of John Science Race And Faith A Life Of John Summary: Science Race And Faith A Life Of John Pdf Ebook Download placed by Keira Stone on October 21

Page ranges should be limited to one or two pages when possible. You can help improve this article by introducing citations that are more precise. October Learn how and when to remove this template message

The concepts of "science" and "religion" are a recent invention: Furthermore, the phrase "religion and science" or "science and religion" emerged in the 19th century, not before, due to the reification of both concepts. It was in the 17th century that the concept of "religion" received its modern shape despite the fact that ancient texts like the Bible, the Quran, and other sacred texts did not have a concept of religion in the original languages and neither did the people or the cultures in which these sacred texts were written. Throughout classical South Asia , the study of law consisted of concepts such as penance through piety and ceremonial as well as practical traditions. Medieval Japan at first had a similar union between "imperial law" and universal or "Buddha law", but these later became independent sources of power. Christianity accepted reason within the ambit of faith. In Christendom , reason was considered subordinate to revelation , which contained the ultimate truth and this truth could not be challenged. Even though the medieval Christian had the urge to use their reason, they had little on which to exercise it. In medieval universities, the faculty for natural philosophy and theology were separate, and discussions pertaining to theological issues were often not allowed to be undertaken by the faculty of philosophy. It was an independent field, separated from theology, which enjoyed a good deal of intellectual freedom as long as it was restricted to the natural world. In general, there was religious support for natural science by the late Middle Ages and a recognition that it was an important element of learning. With significant developments taking place in science, mathematics, medicine and philosophy, the relationship between science and religion became one of curiosity and questioning. Renaissance humanism looked to classical Greek and Roman texts to change contemporary thought, allowing for a new mindset after the Middle Ages. Renaissance humanism was an "ethical theory and practice that emphasized reason, scientific inquiry and human fulfillment in the natural world," said Abernethy. With the sheer success of science and the steady advance of rationalism , the individual scientist gained prestige. This allowed more people to read and learn from the scripture, leading to the Evangelical movement. The people who spread this message, concentrated more on individual agency rather than the structures of the Church. It teaches people to be satisfied with trivial, supernatural non-explanations and blinds them to the wonderful real explanations that we have within our grasp. It teaches them to accept authority, revelation and faith instead of always insisting on evidence. Because of this both are incompatible as currently practiced and the debate of compatibility or incompatibility will be eternal. Carroll , since religion makes claims that are not compatible with science, such as supernatural events, therefore both are incompatible. According to Dawkins, religion "subverts science and saps the intellect". Ellis , Kenneth R. Miller , Katharine Hayhoe , George Coyne and Simon Conway Morris argue for compatibility since they do not agree that science is incompatible with religion and vice versa. They argue that science provides many opportunities to look for and find God in nature and to reflect on their beliefs. What he finds particularly odd and unjustified is in how atheists often come to invoke scientific authority on their non-scientific philosophical conclusions like there being no point or no meaning to the universe as the only viable option when the scientific method and science never have had any way of addressing questions of meaning or God in the first place. Furthermore, he notes that since evolution made the brain and since the brain can handle both religion and science, there is no natural incompatibility between the concepts at the biological level. He argues that leaders in science sometimes trump older scientific baggage and that leaders in theology do the same, so once theological intellectuals are taken into account, people who represent extreme positions like Ken Ham and Eugenie Scott will become irrelevant. It was in the 19th century that relationship between science and religion became an actual formal topic of discourse, while before this no one had pitted science against religion or vice versa, though occasional complex interactions had been expressed before the 19th century. If Galileo and the Scopes trial come to mind as examples of conflict, they were the exceptions

rather than the rule. Galileo was found "vehemently suspect of heresy", namely of having held the opinions that the Sun lies motionless at the center of the universe, that the Earth is not at its centre and moves. He was required to "abjure, curse and detest" those opinions. The Church had merely sided with the scientific consensus of the time. Only the latter was fulfilled by Galileo. Although the preface of his book claims that the character is named after a famous Aristotelian philosopher Simplicius in Latin, Simplicio in Italian, the name "Simplicio" in Italian also has the connotation of "simpleton". Most historians agree Galileo did not act out of malice and felt blindsided by the reaction to his book. Galileo had alienated one of his biggest and most powerful supporters, the Pope, and was called to Rome to defend his writings. Grayling, still believes there is competition between science and religions and point to the origin of the universe, the nature of human beings and the possibility of miracles [65] Independence[edit] A modern view, described by Stephen Jay Gould as "non-overlapping magisteria" NOMA, is that science and religion deal with fundamentally separate aspects of human experience and so, when each stays within its own domain, they co-exist peacefully. Stace viewed independence from the perspective of the philosophy of religion. Stace felt that science and religion, when each is viewed in its own domain, are both consistent and complete. In science, explanations must be based on evidence drawn from examining the natural world. Scientifically based observations or experiments that conflict with an explanation eventually must lead to modification or even abandonment of that explanation. Religious faith, in contrast, does not depend on empirical evidence, is not necessarily modified in the face of conflicting evidence, and typically involves supernatural forces or entities. Because they are not a part of nature, supernatural entities cannot be investigated by science. In this sense, science and religion are separate and address aspects of human understanding in different ways. Attempts to put science and religion against each other create controversy where none needs to exist. He views science as descriptive and religion as prescriptive. He stated that if science and mathematics concentrate on what the world ought to be, in the way that religion does, it may lead to improperly ascribing properties to the natural world as happened among the followers of Pythagoras in the sixth century B. Habgood also stated that he believed that the reverse situation, where religion attempts to be descriptive, can also lead to inappropriately assigning properties to the natural world. A notable example is the now defunct belief in the Ptolemaic geocentric planetary model that held sway until changes in scientific and religious thinking were brought about by Galileo and proponents of his views. Kuhn asserted that science is made up of paradigms that arise from cultural traditions, which is similar to the secular perspective on religion. Polanyi further asserted that all knowledge is personal and therefore the scientist must be performing a very personal if not necessarily subjective role when doing science. Coulson and Harold K. Schilling, both claimed that "the methods of science and religion have much in common. Dialogue[edit] Clerks studying astronomy and geometry France, early 15th century. The religion and science community consists of those scholars who involve themselves with what has been called the "religion-and-science dialogue" or the "religion-and-science field. Journals addressing the relationship between science and religion include Theology and Science and Zygon. Eugenie Scott has written that the "science and religion" movement is, overall, composed mainly of theists who have a healthy respect for science and may be beneficial to the public understanding of science. She contends that the "Christian scholarship" movement is not a problem for science, but that the "Theistic science" movement, which proposes abandoning methodological materialism, does cause problems in understanding of the nature of science. This annual series continues and has included William James, John Dewey, Carl Sagan, and many other professors from various fields. Science, Religion, and Naturalism, heavily contests the linkage of naturalism with science, as conceived by Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett and like-minded thinkers; while Daniel Dennett thinks that Plantinga stretches science to an unacceptable extent. Scientific and theological perspectives often coexist peacefully. Christians and some non-Christian religions have historically integrated well with scientific ideas, as in the ancient Egyptian technological mastery applied to monotheistic ends, the flourishing of logic and mathematics under Hinduism and Buddhism, and the scientific advances made by Muslim scholars during the Ottoman empire. Even many 19th-century Christian communities welcomed scientists who claimed that science was not at all concerned with discovering the ultimate nature of reality. Principe, the Johns Hopkins University Drew Professor of the Humanities, from a historical perspective this

points out that much of the current-day clashes occur between limited extremists—both religious and scientific fundamentalists—over a very few topics, and that the movement of ideas back and forth between scientific and theological thought has been more usual. He also admonished that true religion must conform to the conclusions of science. Buddhism and science Buddhism and science have been regarded as compatible by numerous authors. For example, Buddhism encourages the impartial investigation of nature an activity referred to as Dhamma-Vicaya in the Pali Canon—the principal object of study being oneself. Buddhism and science both show a strong emphasis on causality. In his book *The Universe in a Single Atom* he wrote, "My confidence in venturing into science lies in my basic belief that as in science, so in Buddhism, understanding the nature of reality is pursued by means of critical investigation. Christianity and science Science and Religion are portrayed to be in harmony in the Tiffany window Education Francis Collins, a scientist who happens to be a Christian, is the current director of the National Institutes of Health. Among early Christian teachers, Tertullian c. These ideas were significantly countered by later findings of universal patterns of biological cooperation. According to John Habgood , all man really knows here is that the universe seems to be a mix of good and evil , beauty and pain , and that suffering may somehow be part of the process of creation. Habgood holds that Christians should not be surprised that suffering may be used creatively by God , given their faith in the symbol of the Cross. The "Handmaiden" tradition, which saw secular studies of the universe as a very important and helpful part of arriving at a better understanding of scripture, was adopted throughout Christian history from early on. Heilbron , [99] Alistair Cameron Crombie , David Lindberg , [] Edward Grant , Thomas Goldstein, [] and Ted Davis have reviewed the popular notion that medieval Christianity was a negative influence in the development of civilization and science. In their views, not only did the monks save and cultivate the remnants of ancient civilization during the barbarian invasions, but the medieval church promoted learning and science through its sponsorship of many universities which, under its leadership, grew rapidly in Europe in the 11th and 12th centuries, St. He was not unlike other medieval theologians who sought out reason in the effort to defend his faith. Lindberg states that the widespread popular belief that the Middle Ages was a time of ignorance and superstition due to the Christian church is a "caricature". According to Lindberg, while there are some portions of the classical tradition which suggest this view, these were exceptional cases. It was common to tolerate and encourage critical thinking about the nature of the world. The relation between Christianity and science is complex and cannot be simplified to either harmony or conflict, according to Lindberg. There was no warfare between science and the church. A degree of concord between science and religion can be seen in religious belief and empirical science. The belief that God created the world and therefore humans, can lead to the view that he arranged for humans to know the world. This is underwritten by the doctrine of *imago dei*. In the words of Thomas Aquinas , "Since human beings are said to be in the image of God in virtue of their having a nature that includes an intellect, such a nature is most in the image of God in virtue of being most able to imitate God". As science advanced, acceptance of a literal version of the Bible became "increasingly untenable" and some in that period presented ways of interpreting scripture according to its spirit on its authority and truth. Later that year, a similar law was passed in Mississippi, and likewise, Arkansas in In , these "anti-monkey" laws were struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States as unconstitutional, "because they established a religious doctrine violating both the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution. In , the United States Supreme Court ruled that creationism is religion , not science, and cannot be advocated in public school classrooms. It includes a range of beliefs, including views described as evolutionary creationism , which accepts some findings of modern science but also upholds classical religious teachings about God and creation in Christian context. Bowler argues that in contrast to the conflicts between science and religion in the U. These attempts at reconciliation fell apart in the s due to increased social tensions, moves towards neo-orthodox theology and the acceptance of the modern evolutionary synthesis.

Chapter 3 : Relationship between religion and science - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

What are science and religion, and how do they interrelate? Science and religion is a recognized field of study with dedicated journals e. *Journal of Religion and Science* , academic chairs e. Most of its authors are either theologians e. The systematic study of science and religion started in the s, with authors such as Ian Barbour and Thomas F. Torrance who challenged the prevailing view that science and religion were either at war or indifferent to each other. *Zygon*, the first specialist journal on science and religion, was also founded in While the early study of science and religion focused on methodological issues, authors from the late s to the s developed contextual approaches, including detailed historical examinations of the relationship between science and religion e. Peter Harrison challenged the warfare model by arguing that Protestant theological conceptions of nature and humanity helped to give rise to science in the seventeenth century. Peter Bowler , drew attention to a broad movement of liberal Christians and evolutionists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who aimed to reconcile evolutionary theory with religious belief. It had contributors from philosophy and theology e. The aim of these conferences was to understand divine action in the light of contemporary sciences. Each of the five conferences, and each edited volume that arose from it, was devoted to an area of natural science and its interaction with religion, including quantum cosmology , Russell et al. See also Russell et al. The legal battles e. However, even if one were to focus on the reception of evolutionary theory, the relationship between religion and science is complex. For instance, in the United Kingdom, scientists, clergy, and popular writers, sought to reconcile science and religion during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, whereas the United States saw the rise of a fundamentalist opposition to evolutionary thinking, exemplified by the Scopes trial in Bowler , In recent decades, Church leaders have issued conciliatory public statements on evolutionary theory. Pope John Paul II affirmed evolutionary theory in his message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, but rejected it for the human soul, which he saw as the result of a separate, special creation. The Church of England publicly endorsed evolutionary theory e. Brown , including an apology to Charles Darwin for its initial rejection of his theory. For the past fifty years, science and religion has been de facto Western science and Christianityâ€™to what extent can Christian beliefs be brought in line with the results of western science? The field of science and religion has only recently turned to an examination of non-Christian traditions, such as Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, providing a richer picture of interaction. In order to understand the scope of science and religion and what interactions there are between them, we must at least get a rough sense of what science and religion are. Indeed, they are terms that were coined recently, with meanings that vary across times and cultures. Tylor , who systematically used the term for religions across the world. Philosophers of science have attempted to demarcate science from other knowledge-seeking endeavors, in particular religion. For instance, Karl Popper claimed that scientific hypotheses unlike religious ones are in principle falsifiable. They disagree, however, on how to precisely and across times and cultures demarcate the two domains. One way to distinguish between science and religion is the claim that science concerns the natural world, whereas religion concerns both the natural and the supernatural. Scientific explanations do not appeal to supernatural entities such as gods or angels fallen or not , or to non-natural forces like miracles, karma, or Qi. For example, neuroscientists typically explain our thoughts in terms of brain states, not by reference to an immaterial soul or spirit. Naturalists draw a distinction between methodological naturalism, an epistemological principle that limits scientific inquiry to natural entities and laws, and ontological or philosophical naturalism, a metaphysical principle that rejects the supernatural Forrest Since methodological naturalism is concerned with the practice of science in particular, with the kinds of entities and processes that are invoked , it does not make any statements about whether or not supernatural entities exist. They might exist, but lie outside of the scope of scientific investigation. However, these stronger conclusions are controversial. The view that science can be demarcated from religion

in its methodological naturalism is more commonly accepted. For instance, in the Kitzmiller versus Dover trial, the philosopher of science Robert Pennock was called to testify by the plaintiffs on whether Intelligent Design was a form of creationism, and therefore religion. Building on earlier work e. Still, overall there was a tendency to favor naturalistic explanations in natural philosophy. This preference for naturalistic causes may have been encouraged by past successes of naturalistic explanations, leading authors such as Paul Draper to argue that the success of methodological naturalism could be evidence for ontological naturalism. Explicit methodological naturalism arose in the nineteenth century with the X-club, a lobby group for the professionalization of science founded in by Thomas Huxley and friends, which aimed to promote a science that would be free from religious dogmas. The X-club may have been in part motivated by the desire to remove competition by amateur-clergymen scientists in the field of science, and thus to open up the field to full-time professionals Garwood For example, Kelly Clark argues that we can only sensibly inquire into the relationship between a widely accepted claim of science such as quantum mechanics or findings in neuroscience and a specific claim of a particular religion such as Islamic understandings of divine providence or Buddhist views of the no-self. For example, Mikael Stenmark distinguishes between three views: Subsequent authors, as well as Barbour himself, have refined and amended this taxonomy. For one thing, it focuses on the cognitive content of religions at the expense of other aspects, such as rituals and social structures. Moreover, there is no clear definition of what conflict means evidential or logical. Nevertheless, because of its enduring influence, it is still worthwhile to discuss this taxonomy in detail. The conflict model, which holds that science and religion are in perpetual and principal conflict, relies heavily on two historical narratives: The conflict model was developed and defended in the nineteenth century by the following two publications: Both authors argued that science and religion inevitably conflict as they essentially discuss the same domain. The vast majority of authors in the science and religion field is critical of the conflict model and believes it is based on a shallow and partisan reading of the historical record. Ironically, two views that otherwise have little in common, scientific materialism and extreme biblical literalism, both assume a conflict model: While the conflict model is at present a minority position, some have used philosophical argumentation e. Alvin Plantinga has argued that the conflict is not between science and religion, but between science and naturalism. The independence model holds that science and religion explore separate domains that ask distinct questions. The lack of conflict between science and religion arises from a lack of overlap between their respective domains of professional expertise. NOMA is both descriptive and normative: Gould held that there might be interactions at the borders of each magisterium, such as our responsibility toward other creatures. One obvious problem with the independence model is that if religion were barred from making any statement of fact it would be difficult to justify the claims of value and ethics, e. Moreover, religions do seem to make empirical claims, for example, that Jesus appeared after his death or that the early Hebrews passed through the parted waters of the Red Sea. The dialogue model proposes a mutualistic relationship between religion and science. Unlike independence, dialogue assumes that there is common ground between both fields, perhaps in their presuppositions, methods, and concepts. For example, the Christian doctrine of creation may have encouraged science by assuming that creation being the product of a designer is both intelligible and orderly, so one can expect there are laws that can be discovered. According to Barbour , both scientific and theological inquiry are theory-dependent or at least model-dependent, e. In dialogue, the fields remain separate but they talk to each other, using common methods, concepts, and presuppositions. Wentzel van Huyssteen has argued for a dialogue position, proposing that science and religion can be in a graceful duet, based on their epistemological overlaps. The integration model is more extensive in its unification of science and theology. Barbour identifies three forms of integration. The first is natural theology, which formulates arguments for the existence and attributes of God. It uses results of the natural sciences as premises in its arguments. For instance, the supposition that the universe has a temporal origin features in contemporary cosmological arguments for the existence of God, and the fact that the cosmological constants and laws of nature are life-permitting whereas many other combinations of constants and laws would not permit life is used in contemporary fine-tuning arguments. The second, theology of nature, starts not from science but from a religious framework, and examines how this can enrich or even revise findings of the sciences. For example,

McGrath developed a Christian theology of nature, examining how nature and scientific findings can be regarded through a Christian lens. While integration seems attractive especially to theologians, it is difficult to do justice to both the science and religion aspects of a given domain, especially given their complexities. For example, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who was both knowledgeable in paleoanthropology and theology, ended up with an unconventional view of evolution as teleological which brought him into trouble with the scientific establishment, and with an unorthodox theology with an unconventional interpretation of original sin that brought him into trouble with the Roman Catholic Church. Theological heterodoxy, by itself, is no reason to doubt a model, but it points to difficulties for the integration model in becoming successful in the broader community of theologians and philosophers. Moreover, integration seems skewed towards theism as Barbour described arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate theism, but failed to discuss arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate the denial of theism. Natural historians attempted to provide naturalistic explanations for human behavior and culture, for domains such as religion, emotions, and morality. People often assert supernatural explanations when they lack an understanding of the natural causes underlying extraordinary events: It traces the origins of polytheism—which Hume thought was the earliest form of religious belief—to ignorance about natural causes combined with fear and apprehension about the environment. By deifying aspects of the environment, early humans tried to persuade or bribe the gods, thereby gaining a sense of control. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, authors from newly emerging scientific disciplines, such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology, examined the purported naturalistic roots of religious belief. They did so with a broad brush, trying to explain what unifies diverse religious beliefs across cultures, rather than accounting for cultural variations. In anthropology, the idea that all cultures evolve and progress along the same lines of cultural evolutionism was widespread. Cultures with differing religious views were explained as being in an early stage of development. For example, Tylor regarded animism, the belief that spirits animate the world, as the earliest form of religious belief. Comte proposed that all societies, in their attempts to make sense of the world, go through the same stages of development: The psychologist Sigmund Freud saw religious belief as an illusion, a childlike yearning for a fatherly figure. The full story Freud offers is quite bizarre: The sons felt guilty and started to idolize their murdered father. This, together with taboos on cannibalism and incest, generated the first religion. Authors such as Durkheim and Freud, together with social theorists such as Karl Marx and Max Weber, proposed versions of the secularization thesis, the view that religion would decline in the face of modern technology, science, and culture. Philosopher and psychologist William James was interested in the psychological roots and the phenomenology of religious experiences, which he believed were the ultimate source of institutional religions. From the 1920s onward, the scientific study of religion became less concerned with grand unifying narratives, and focused more on particular religious traditions and beliefs. Their ethnographies indicated that cultural evolutionism was mistaken and that religious beliefs were more diverse than was previously assumed. They argued that religious beliefs were not the result of ignorance of naturalistic mechanisms; for instance, Evans-Pritchard noted that the Azande were well aware that houses could collapse because termites ate away at their foundations, but they still appealed to witchcraft to explain why a particular house had collapsed. More recently, Cristine Legare et al.

Chapter 4 : Faith in Science | The UCSB Current

Breakthrough Prize winner Aron Wall on faith and science Prize winner conducts research at the Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics - and prays at Cupertino's New Life Church Share this.

Moreover, the view that science and religion are often in conflict is particularly common among Americans who are, themselves, not very religiously observant as measured by frequency of attendance at worship services. Those who are religiously unaffiliated often have supernatural beliefs and spiritual practices, even though they say they do not feel connected to a particular religion. The general public is closely divided in its views about the role of religious organizations in scientific policy debates. White evangelical Protestants and black Protestants are more inclined than people in other major religious groups to say churches should express their views on such topics. A majority of those with no religious affiliation say churches should keep out of science policy debates. These are some of the key findings from a Pew Research Center survey conducted Aug. Statistical modeling shows religious differences in affiliation and worship service attendance come to the fore when the issue is related to human evolution or the creation of the universe. Based on statistical modeling techniques that parse the independent effect of multiple factors at the same time, religious factors appear to be central to public views on only a handful of science topics. Similarly, religious group differences are particularly strong determinants of whether people perceive the existence of a scientific consensus about evolution and the creation of the universe. In addition, there are a handful of biomedical topics where differences in religious observance, as measured by frequency of worship service attendance, play a sizeable role in shaping public views. For example, public attitudes about offshore oil drilling are strongly related to political party affiliation and ideology. But there also are differences in views by age, gender and religious affiliation, even when differences in political orientation are held constant. For example, both evangelical and mainline Protestants are more likely than religiously unaffiliated Americans to support more offshore drilling, with other factors held constant. Still, on a number of other science-related topics, there is no independent effect of religious affiliation or frequency of church attendance on public attitudes, once differences by demographic background, educational attainment, science knowledge level and political background are taken into account. These include opinions about: The factors included in this analysis are gender, race and ethnicity, age, education, general knowledge about science, party affiliation and political ideology, along with religious affiliation and frequency of church attendance. As we did in our companion report , we note whether the strength of each factor is strong, medium or weak based on the statistical significance of each factor and the estimated difference in predicted probability between the maximum and minimum value for a given variable, holding all other variables at their means. See Appendix A for more details. The remainder of this report looks at the degree to which public views about science-related topics are associated with religious affiliation and worship service attendance. As is typical of Pew Research Center reports, we characterize the relationships shown in these cross tabulations sometimes referred to as bivariate relationships because they involve just two variables based on tests of statistical significance that take into account the complex sample design of the survey.

Chapter 5 : Religion in America: U.S. Religious Data, Demographics and Statistics | Pew Research Center

The case of race in science, Keel says, is particularly unique in that contemporary scientists have inherited European Christian beliefs that influence the questions they ask and the answers they create when studying human biodiversity.

They tried to explain the contradiction between the belief in human equality expressed during the American and French Revolutions and the emergence of slavery in the United States and several European countries see reading, *Who Is Human?* They included the following: Carolus Linnaeus, an eighteenth-century Swedish naturalist, was among the first scientists to sort and categorize human beings. He regarded humanity as a species within the animal kingdom and divided the species into four varieties: European, American, Asiatic, and African. Petrus Camper, an eighteenth-century Dutch professor of anatomy, believed that the ancient Greeks had come closer than other people to human perfection. He used Greek statues to establish standards of beauty and ranked human faces by how closely they resembled his ideal. Journalists, teachers, and preachers began to popularize their findings. Historian Reginald Horsman, who studied the leading publications of the time, notes: He also found no evidence for the racial hierarchyâ€”a kind of racial ladder on which Caucasians always stood at the top and Africans at the bottomâ€”that Morton had claimed to uncover. Man is distinguished from all other animals by the possession of certain definite faculties and powers, as well as by physical organization and proportions. He is the only two-handed animal on the earthâ€”the only one that laughs, and nearly the only one that weeps. Common sense itself is scarcely needed to detect the absence of manhood in a monkey, or to recognize its presence in a Negro. Frederick Douglass, a former slave and the most prominent nineteenth-century opponent of slavery in the United States. Tried by all the usual, and all the unusual tests, whether mental, moral, physical, or psychological, the Negro is a MANâ€”considering him as possessing knowledge, or needing knowledge, his elevation or his degradation, his virtues, or his vicesâ€”whichever road you take, you reach the same conclusion, the Negro is a MAN. His good and his bad, his innocence and his guilt, his joys and his sorrows, proclaim his manhood in speech that all mankind practically and readily understand. It is the province of prejudice to blind; and scientific writers, not less than others, write to please, as well as to instruct, and even unconsciously to themselves, sometimes, sacrifice what is true to what is popular. Fashion is not confined to dress; but extends to philosophy as wellâ€”and it is fashionable now, in our land, to exaggerate the differences between the Negro and the European. The temptation, therefore, to read the Negro out of the human family is exceeding strong. Harvard University Press, , Why is it so easy to accept and support popular ideas, even if they are incorrect, and so difficult to challenge them? What are the consequences when popular but untrue economic, political, or social ideas influence the thinking of scientists?

Chapter 6 : What U.S. Religious Groups Think About Science Issues

Science, Race, and Religion in the American South and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

Chapter 7 : NPR Choice page

Prentis, Science, Race and Faith Prentis, Science, Race and Faith Gill, Stewart REVIEWS add (though this account does not include it), the publication in of grossly unsympathetic government Blue Books on the educational and social situation in that country caused an unprecedented Nonconformist outcry, posing an intensified challenge to the Church of England.

Chapter 8 : Religion and Science (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Science, Race and Faith: A Life of John Mathew by Malcolm Prentis on ResearchGate, the professional network for

scientists. For full functionality of ResearchGate it is necessary to enable JavaScript.

Chapter 9 : Science & Faith - Wikipedia

In the 18th and early 19th centuries, scientists in Europe and the Americas studied "race science" – the idea that humankind is divided into separate and unequal races. They tried to explain the contradiction between the belief in human equality expressed during the American and French Revolutions and.