

The Modern Relevance of God

SPECIAL PODCAST SERIES

RICHARD LLOYD JONES WITH CLÁUDIA B. S. PACHECO

“

To embrace sanity is to accept truth, live love, and be good.

Norberto Keppe

Thinking with Somebody Else's Head presents...
The Modern Relevance
of God Special Podcast Series

Science and Spirituality



Instituto de Ciência e Tecnologia

KEPPE & PACHECO

Mantenedor das



PRESENCIAL

FACULDADES TRILÓGICAS

EAD

Science Turns its Back on God

Richard Lloyd Jones:

Welcome to episode three of the Modern Relevance of God audio course. In this episode, let's begin to look at how science turned its back on God. Well, this is a little complicated because obviously there are many scientists in the world who do profess to a belief in God. Louis Pasteur, for one, even declared that the more he studied nature, the more he stood amazed at the work of the Creator. He thought science would bring people nearer to God. But I don't think that's what's happened.

I remember a Swedish friend of mine telling me a remarkable story that illustrates that. She was in her grade 11 biology class in Stockholm, and they were discussing Darwin's Theory of Evolution and a young woman raised her hand, a Catholic in this principally Protestant country, and said, "But I don't believe in that theory; I believe in a Creator." And my friend said everyone in the class whirled their heads around, staring at her in disbelief. And then they proceeded to destroy her. You know, that derision that heaps down on you when you're a teenager and you do something uncool. This student was simply cut out of the conversations at school, persona non grata in any of the social situations, a kind of adolescent shunning, teenage ex-communication, if you will.

And I think the same thing is happening in modern science. I was listening to an interview with English biologist, Rupert Sheldrake, recently where he alluded to this rejection of dissent in science. The Orthodox scientific view, he said, has never been tolerant of dissenting views. It's like the scientific revolution led us from one period of intolerance, the inquisition-like elimination of dissenting views, to another: the scientific dogma we experience today.

Well, let's dig into that a bit in this class with engineer and inventor, Cesar Soos, who's been studying and working closely with Norberto Keppe's New Physics for the past 30 years.

Cesar Sóos:

I was reading a book on the Metaphysics of science and the author, Edwin Burt, said that Rene Descartes in 1619, it appeared to be the Spirit of Truth showed up in a dream. And this spirit told Descartes that he had been chosen to lay down the basis of knowledge for the years ahead. And this was to be found in mathematics.

Jones:

And what's the significance, Cesar, of having a mathematization of the scientific view?

Sóos:

The problem is that mathematics is just one language of nature; it's not the basis of nature. Nature is much, much, much more than mathematics, even though nature expresses itself in mathematical terms.

Jones:

What did they exclude when they mathematized science?

Sóos:

Science began to be something quantifiable. This was a very big hit against metaphysics, for example, against theology, which exposes values who are much superior than a physical world only. And this helped build up a system of knowledge based on matter, based on senses.

Jones:

What's the implication for us of this?

Sóos:

The worst implication of that is the implications we see today: materialism that took control over all kinds of knowledge. Our knowledge today, our science today is based on matter because matter is something that we can mathematize, we can quantify. And that's the worst consequence.

Jones:

And also, I think we have the exclusion of the study of the being, the ontology, that they would have studied in theological philosophical schools before this mathematization of science. And losing the study of the being also causes us to lose

the study of ethics, of values, of qualities of being, of ways we should be, of ways we should behave, ways we should treat other people ...

Sóos:

Exactly Richard. Mathematics gives a false idea that you are a God, you are a God-like being. And we are not. We are subjected to the universal laws. Metaphysics deals with the being and the being is much more than quantifiable qualities. The being especially is love, is reason, is logic, is everything that science encompasses and much more than that. Intuition, consciousness. Man cannot develop a science to understand himself if this science does not consider the superior elements he has. For example, how can you develop a science that does not consider intuition, does not consider consciousness? Or if it does, it considers it from the point of view of a physical reaction, of chemical reactions in your brain.

Jones:

It seems to me then that this break if we want to call it that from the more metaphysical world stripped us of the study of universals. And science it seems today wants to avoid that acknowledgement of something pre-existing something intelligent, something already there.

Sóos:

Exactly. The very idea of evolutionism brought by Darwin and others before him, even from Aristotle, you know, this very idea is wrong because it is inserted in time and space, and time and space are inserted in a greater realm, in the transcendental realm. The study of the being lies outside time and space. The being is; it's not in development, in evolution. And the superior force that created the universe – because the universe didn't come out of nothing – so this force made this outside time and space.

We are in a trap Richard. We create theories, and these theories, according to the scientific method of today, must be falsifiable if it is to be a scientific theory. So, this means that all theories have to come from the human mind. And the idea of God is impossible for this kind of approach. So, they ruled out theology, which is the basis of all knowledge, and so we are like in a trap. How can scientists propose a solution for our problem if they created a system that does not accept the solution?

Jones:

And not accepting a solution that doesn't fit their dogmatic view, is I think what Cesar's saying here. You see what you want to see, might be another way of saying that. In this same book that Cesar was referring to, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science*, the author, Edwin Burtt, makes the point that any modern philosophy that at-

tempted to address the questions of man's place in the universe as being important or central was quickly dismissed by a science bent on reducing the wonders of creation to mere chance meetings of chemicals. So radical has been this shift in our modern world that philosophy books today are peppered with the considerations of how to live in a temporal and impermanent existence. And this clearly illustrates the dominance of a materialistic scientific view. The consequences of this materialism in science will be the subject of our next class on the Modern Relevance of God. That's up next.

[Listen to Episode 1](#)

[Listen to Episode 2](#)

[Download PDF for Episode 1](#)

[Download PDF for Episode 2](#)

rich@richjonesvoice.com

<https://stopradio.org>

<https://somebodyelseshead.wordpress.com>