

OPEN CHRISTIAN PRESS

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE AGE

*Exposing Modern Deceptions, Counterfeit Christianity, and the Church's
Captivity to the Spirit of the Age*

PART I

THE SPIRIT AND INTELLECTUAL ARCHITECTURE OF THE AGE

CHAPTER 4

Scientism, Naturalism, and the Exclusion of the Creator

Prof. Sixbert SANGWA

Open Christian University | Center for Faith and Work
ORCID 0000-0001-8650-1444 | ssangwa@openchristian.education

Edited by Prof. Dr. Placide Mutabazi

First Open Christian Press edition, 2026
Open Christian Press, an Open Christian University imprint
books.openchristian.education

CHAPTER PUBLICATION METADATA

Abstract

This chapter distinguishes disciplined scientific investigation from scientism and methodological naturalism from metaphysical naturalism. It argues that science, properly understood, studies the observable and inferable structures, processes, and regularities of creation, whereas scientism transforms one powerful mode of inquiry into a total philosophy of reality. Metaphysical naturalism goes further by excluding the Creator, divine agency, spiritual realities, moral purpose, miracle, and final causation before evidence is interpreted. Building upon the preceding chapters' analysis of autonomous authority and the war against truth, the chapter examines how naturalistic assumptions reshape accounts of cosmic and biological origins, Adam and the fall, death, human uniqueness, consciousness, free agency, morality, religion, miracle, medicine, suffering, and bioethics. It presents major Christian positions on origins fairly while defending divine creation, the historical first human pair, the historical fall, the image of God, universal sin, and Christ as the last Adam. It engages the strongest case for scientific naturalism, including the success of natural explanation, evolutionary theory, neuroscience, institutional self-correction, and the historical failures of religious authorities. It answers by showing that methodological success within nature does not prove that nature is all that exists, that mechanisms do not abolish agency or purpose, and that scientism relies upon philosophical claims that no experiment can establish. Contemporary concerns include reproducibility, publication incentives, corporate and political influence, genome editing, embryo selection, reproductive technologies, euthanasia, and the commodification of human life. Particular attention is given to African contexts, where imported secular naturalism often competes with superstition, occult syncretism, and misinformation. The chapter concludes by calling scientists, pastors, scholars, physicians, students, and churches to truthful inquiry, intellectual humility, moral courage, repentance, holiness, and readiness for Christ's return.

Keywords: scientism; metaphysical naturalism; biblical creation; image of God; consciousness; miracles; Christian bioethics

Publication details

Book: *The Gospel According to the Age: Exposing Modern Deceptions, Counterfeit Christianity, and the Church's Captivity to the Spirit of the Age*

Chapter: Chapter 4: Scientism, Naturalism, and the Exclusion of the Creator

Author: Prof. Sixbert SANGWA

Book editor: Prof. Dr. Placide Mutabazi

Publisher: Open Christian Press, an Open Christian University imprint

Edition: First edition

Publication year: 2026

Language: English

Suggested citation

Sangwa, S. (2026). Scientism, naturalism, and the exclusion of the Creator. In P. Mutabazi (Ed.), *The Gospel According to the Age: Exposing modern deceptions, counterfeit Christianity, and the church's captivity to the spirit of the age* (Chapter 4). Open Christian Press.

Rights and Scripture notice

Copyright © 2026 Sixbert Sangwa. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission from the publisher, except as permitted by applicable copyright law. Scripture quotations marked CSB have been taken from the Christian Standard Bible®, Copyright © 2017 by Holman Bible Publishers. Used by permission. Christian Standard Bible® and CSB® are federally registered trademarks of Holman Bible Publishers.

Publisher: books.openchristian.education | editor@openchristian.education

When the Microscope Becomes a Throne

A microscope can reveal the architecture of a cell. It cannot tell the observer why a human life is sacred. A telescope can measure light from distant galaxies. It cannot decide whether the heavens declare the glory of God. A brain scan can display patterns associated with memory, fear, pain, or decision. It cannot photograph guilt, prove that love is an illusion, or pronounce that the person inside the scanner is nothing more than electrical activity. A clinical trial can compare treatments. It cannot determine whether every technically possible intervention ought to be performed. The instruments are powerful because their questions are disciplined. They become dangerous when their limits are concealed and their findings are promoted into a total account of reality.

The modern conflict is therefore not a simple war between faith and science. That story is historically careless and spiritually misleading. The conflict concerns jurisdiction. What may scientific methods investigate? What conclusions do their findings justify? Which questions require philosophy, history, ethics, theology, testimony, or revelation? May a method designed to study regular physical processes declare that nothing exists beyond regular physical processes? May expertise in genetics, neurology, or medicine confer authority to redefine personhood, moral responsibility, marriage, death, worship, or God?

Chapter 1 identified the gospel according to the age as an architecture of transferred authority. Chapter 2 traced the intellectual tributaries through which autonomous reason, empiricism, naturalism, and materialism gained cultural power. Chapter 3 showed how the struggle over authority becomes a struggle over truth, language, evidence, and credibility. The present chapter follows the argument into the laboratory, clinic, classroom, seminary, and bioethics committee. Once revelation is excluded from public knowledge, the natural world is easily treated as self-explanatory, the human being as complex matter, consciousness as brain activity alone, morality as adaptive preference, religion as psychological projection, and miracle as impossible before any testimony is heard.

This chapter does not attack science. It defends science from scientism. It honours the physician who studies disease, the biologist who examines living systems, the engineer who makes water safer, the agronomist who protects crops, the psychologist who carefully describes trauma, and the researcher who retracts a cherished conclusion when the evidence fails. Such work can be an expression of neighbour-love and dominion under God. The target is not the instrument in the servant's hand. It is the moment the instrument is placed upon the altar and asked to speak as lord.

Scientism is not more scientific than science. It is a creed about science. It says that only what can be measured is real, only what can be tested by approved empirical methods is knowledge, and only technical expertise may speak authoritatively about the human future. Its contradiction is immediate. The proposition that only scientifically verifiable claims are meaningful is not itself a scientifically verifiable claim. No experiment has demonstrated that experiments are the only route to truth. Scientism borrows the prestige of science to conceal a philosophical coronation.

Prof. Sangwa's earlier work described this well: if science is a tool, scientism is a throne; if science is a method for investigating the measurable, scientism is the dogma that only the measurable is real (Sangwa, 2026c). That distinction governs

this chapter. Genuine science listens carefully to creation. Scientism demands that creation remain silent about its Creator.

Science Beneath the Creator

Science is not one timeless method applied identically in every discipline. Astronomy cannot manipulate galaxies in a laboratory. Geology reconstructs events from traces. Epidemiology studies populations through statistical inference. Physics often tests mathematical models. Biology combines observation, experiment, historical reconstruction, and comparison. Psychology and neuroscience work with complex human subjects whose experiences cannot be reduced to one variable. What joins these fields is not a single mechanical procedure but a family of disciplined practices ordered toward reliable knowledge of the natural world.

Those practices ordinarily include careful observation, operational definition, measurement, hypothesis formation, comparison, experimentation where possible, mathematical or conceptual modelling, transparent methods, criticism, replication, and correction. Scientific conclusions are often provisional, not because truth is relative, but because human investigators are finite and evidence may be incomplete. A provisional conclusion may still be well supported. Humility does not require pretending that every view is equally plausible. It requires stating the degree and limits of warrant honestly.

The biblical worldview supplies profound reasons to investigate nature. Creation is not divine, so it may be studied without worshipping it. Creation is not chaotic at its foundation, because the God of wisdom called it into being. Human beings are made in God's image and therefore possess genuine, though limited, capacities to reason, classify, cultivate, and exercise stewardship. The world is intelligible because it is sustained by the Word through whom all things were made. The regularities studied by science are not evidence that God is absent. They are expressions of His ordinary providence.

Genesis 1:1-31 presents creation through divine speech, distinction, order, fruitfulness, and blessing. Light and darkness, waters and land, plants and animals, male and female are neither accidental fragments nor rival gods. They belong to one created order beneath one Lord. Psalms 103:1-6 portrays the heavens as a public witness to divine glory. Psalms 104 delights in ecological interdependence, creaturely diversity, provision, seasons, and dependence upon God's Spirit. The biblical response to creation is not intellectual laziness. It is reverent attention.

The history of science is too complex to be reduced to the slogan that Christianity invented science, but it is equally false to portray science as the inevitable victory of unbelief over faith. Early modern scientific development occurred through diverse interactions among theology, natural philosophy, mathematics, patronage, institutions, and technical practice. Many influential investigators understood their work as the study of God's creation. Others held heterodox or sceptical views. The relationship was neither perpetual harmony nor perpetual warfare (Brooke, 1991; Harrison, 2015; Numbers, 2009).

The Galileo affair remains a warning to the church. Religious authorities can attach Scripture prematurely to a contested scientific model and then defend institutional prestige as though they were defending revelation. When evidence

corrects a human interpretation, Christians should receive the correction. Scripture is infallible; our readings are not. Yet the lesson does not establish the opposite error, that scientific institutions are infallible or that every theological claim must submit to current consensus. Both church and academy contain fallible persons, incentives, traditions, and power.

The Christian posture is therefore neither fear nor surrender. It is epistemic stewardship. This continues the author's earlier insistence that reason and observation are valuable servants but cannot become the sole arbiters of spiritual truth (Sangwa, 2024b). We study because creation belongs to God. We test claims because false witness is sin. We honour expertise because complex work requires disciplined formation. We refuse expert idolatry because every expert remains a creature. We receive medicine with gratitude and ask moral questions medicine cannot answer. We distinguish what the data show from the worldview through which the data are interpreted.

From Method to Metaphysics

Naturalism must be defined carefully. Methodological naturalism is a practical rule used in scientific inquiry: when studying regular natural processes, the investigator seeks explanations in terms of observable, testable, and inferable natural causes. A physician investigating an infection looks for pathogens, exposure routes, immune responses, and effective treatments. An engineer examining a collapsed bridge studies materials, loads, construction, and design. Such inquiry need not deny God. It simply addresses a particular level of causation with methods suited to it.

Metaphysical naturalism is a different claim. It says that nature is all that exists, that every real cause is physical, and that divine or spiritual realities are unreal, unknowable, or irrelevant. The first is a methodological limitation. The second is an ontology. The success of the method does not prove the worldview.

A metal detector may be highly reliable for finding metal. If it finds no wooden beam, it has not demonstrated that wood does not exist. It has operated according to its design. A microscope's inability to measure justice does not make justice imaginary. A laboratory cannot reproduce Julius Caesar's assassination, but historians may still know that it occurred through documents, testimony, material evidence, and inference. The appropriate method depends upon the object and kind of claim.

The enlargement of method into metaphysics often occurs without announcement. A researcher may report a correlation between a brain region and a decision. A popular summary then states that the brain made the decision before the person did. A biologist may describe mechanisms by which populations change. A public philosopher announces that humanity has no created nature. A cosmologist proposes a model of early cosmic development. A commentator says the universe created itself. At each stage, additional philosophical claims enter the argument while the authority of science remains on the label.

This distinction does not create a protected religious zone immune to evidence. A claim about a healing, relic, prophecy, or historical event may be tested. Scripture itself commands believers to test spirits, witnesses, and signs. The point is not that supernatural claims require no evidence. It is that evidence is

broader than laboratory repeatability and that no method is authorised to dismiss a class of reality merely because its instruments were not designed to measure it.

Scientism appears in strong and soft forms. Strong scientism says that science is the only genuine source of knowledge. Soft scientism grants some value to ethics, philosophy, or art but treats science as the final court before which all serious claims must appear. Both forms face the same difficulty. Science operates within assumptions it cannot establish by its own procedures: that an external world exists, that nature displays sufficient regularity, that human reasoning can track truth, that observation and inference deserve trust, that honesty is obligatory, and that falsification or correction is preferable to manipulation. These are philosophical and moral commitments, not laboratory findings.

Haack (2012) identified scientism through signs such as the use of scientific language as honorific decoration, the extension of scientific authority beyond its competence, and the dismissal of other forms of inquiry. Sorell (1991) similarly described scientism as the exaggerated valuation of natural science in comparison with other branches of learning. The problem is not excellence in science. It is imperial science, a discipline crossing its border while denying that borders exist.

The Creation Science Investigates

The biblical doctrine of creation answers a deeper question than the chronology of physical events. It declares why anything exists, to whom it belongs, what kind of reality it is, and toward what purpose it moves. Scientific models may describe states and processes within the universe. They do not remove the need for an account of existence itself.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" ([Genesis 1:1](#)) is not a primitive placeholder awaiting replacement by a physical theory. It identifies the ontological dependence of all created reality upon God. God is not one cause inside the universe competing with other causes. He is the Creator of the entire order in which causes operate. His agency and creaturely processes are therefore not mutually exclusive in the way two physical mechanisms may be.

When a gardener waters a plant and the plant grows through cellular, chemical, and biological processes, the explanation "the gardener watered it" is not defeated by the explanation "water moved through the soil and roots." They answer different but compatible questions. In a far higher and unique way, divine creation and providence do not compete with physical description. The doctrine of creation says that every process, law, field, particle, organism, and rational capacity exists because God wills and sustains it.

[Colossians 1:15-17](#) places Christ at the centre: all things were created by Him, through Him, and for Him, and all things hold together in Him. The universe is therefore not merely from God but for Christ. Purpose is not added by human imagination to indifferent matter. Creation possesses a Christological end.

Naturalistic cosmology can model the expansion, early conditions, and large-scale structure of the universe, but questions remain that no equation answers by itself. Why is there a universe rather than nothing? Why do laws or regularities exist? Why are they mathematically intelligible? Why can minds formed within the universe understand them? Why do contingent physical realities exist at all? A cosmological model can move the explanatory boundary. It cannot abolish metaphysics.

Christians should avoid crude "God of the gaps" reasoning. God is not invoked only where present scientific explanation fails. If tomorrow's science explains a process currently unknown, the Creator has not retreated. God is Lord of the understood as well as the unexplained. The danger of gap reasoning is that it treats natural explanation as territory lost by theology. Biblical creation instead affirms that complete physical knowledge, if creatures could attain it, would still describe a dependent creation.

The same restraint applies to fine-tuning arguments. The apparent sensitivity of life-permitting conditions may reasonably contribute to a cumulative case for design, and naturalists have proposed multiverse or selection explanations. None of these debates should be reduced to a slogan. The Christian confession does not rest upon one probability calculation. It rests upon God's self-revelation, the intelligibility of creation, the resurrection of Christ, and the whole counsel of Scripture.

Prof. Sangwa's earlier reflection on cosmology rightly insisted that the authority of Scripture must not be replaced by scientific theory and that models of cosmic origins are interpreted through philosophical assumptions (Sangwa, 2024a). The present argument sharpens that distinction: a scientific model is not identical to atheism, and rejecting atheism does not require misrepresenting the evidence. The Christian scholar must be more truthful, not less, because the world belongs to the God of truth.

Origins, Adam, the Fall, and Death

Debates about origins are not only debates about rocks, fossils, genes, and dates. They reach into the doctrines of humanity, sin, death, marriage, redemption, and resurrection. If Adam is only a literary symbol, if the fall is only an image of universal human immaturity, and if death is the original engine of creation rather than an enemy bound to sin, the structure of the gospel is altered.

The biblical narrative presents Adam and Eve as the first human pair, created by God, placed in a real garden, joined in marriage, commissioned to exercise dominion, tested under a divine command, and judged after historical disobedience (Genesis 2:4-25; Genesis 3:1-24). Later Scripture does not treat Adam merely as a poetic representation. Genealogies connect him to later history. Jesus grounds marriage in the Creator's making of male and female (Matthew 19:4-6). Paul contrasts Adam's disobedience with Christ's obedience and the reign of death with the gift of righteousness (Romans 5:12-21). In 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, death comes through a man and resurrection through a man. Christ is the last Adam, not the last metaphor.

The theological stakes are substantial. The historical fall explains why creation experienced as good is now marked by disorder, suffering, alienation, and death. It locates evil neither in matter itself nor in God's original design but in creaturely rebellion and its judgment. It preserves moral accountability while acknowledging inherited corruption. It prepares the meaning of Christ's obedience, atonement, resurrection, and the promised liberation of creation from decay (Romans 8:18-25).

Christians disagree over how Genesis relates to contemporary scientific chronologies and evolutionary theory. A fair chapter must represent those disagreements accurately.

Young-earth creationists ordinarily read the creation days as six consecutive ordinary days, connect the genealogies to a recent creation, affirm direct divine creation of major kinds, and insist that human and animal death cannot be placed before the fall without theological cost. They challenge uniformitarian assumptions and interpret much geological evidence through creation and the flood (Mortenson & Ury, 2008).

Old-earth creationists accept ancient cosmic and terrestrial ages while maintaining special divine creation, purpose, and usually a historical Adam. They may read the days as long epochs, analogical days, or a literary structure compatible with extended chronology (Ross, 2001).

Evolutionary creationists hold that God providentially used evolutionary processes to produce biological diversity and humanity. Many interpret Genesis primarily as theological proclamation rather than modern scientific description. Their positions on Adam range from a historical specially appointed pair within a larger population to archetypal or genealogical proposals (Collins, 2006; Swamidass, 2019; Walton, 2009).

Intelligent design arguments attempt to infer design from features such as specified complexity, information, or irreducible organisation. The movement does not necessarily identify the designer or establish the full Genesis account. It is therefore not equivalent to biblical creationism, even where its critique of undirected naturalism overlaps with Christian concerns (Dembski & Wells, 2008; Meyer, 2009).

Naturalistic evolution treats undirected physical processes as sufficient for the origin and development of life and ordinarily rejects a historical fall, divine purpose, or an ontological distinction between humanity and other animals. Here the dispute is explicitly metaphysical as well as scientific.

This book adopts the authority of Scripture and the historical reading of Adam, Eve, the fall, and the entry of death through sin as non-negotiable. It also receives the six-day creation account as real divine action rather than mythologised human self-understanding. The author has elsewhere defended a recent-creation reading and the theological significance of the seven-day structure (Sangwa, 2026e). Yet conviction does not permit careless argument. The standard chronology of contemporary cosmology and geology is measured in billions of years, and the mainstream scientific synthesis accepts common ancestry in some form (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2008). A Christian writer must state this honestly before challenging assumptions, interpretations, or theological implications.

Truth does not need invented fossils, misquoted scientists, or deathbed conversion stories. The widely circulated claim that Charles Darwin renounced evolution shortly before death is not supported by reliable historical evidence and should not be used. An apologetic that bears false witness wounds the very Scripture it seeks to defend. The proper response is to examine arguments, evidence, assumptions, and consequences without fabrication.

Evolutionary Theory and Evolutionary Naturalism

Evolution is a word with several meanings. It may refer to observable changes in allele frequencies, adaptation within populations, speciation, common

ancestry, or a comprehensive naturalistic history of life. Confusion begins when evidence for one meaning is treated as proof of every other meaning.

Variation, inheritance, mutation, selection, genetic drift, and adaptation are genuine biological realities. Christians need not deny them. Selective breeding long demonstrated that populations can change. Modern genetics has deepened understanding of heredity, variation, and common patterns among organisms. The serious debate concerns the reach and sufficiency of these mechanisms, the interpretation of commonalities, the history of life, the origin of biological information, and the theological meaning attached to the account.

Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* proposed natural selection as a principal mechanism shaping species over time (Darwin, 1859/2009). The theory did not explain the origin of the universe or the first life. Later evolutionary biology incorporated genetics, molecular biology, developmental biology, ecology, and population theory. It is therefore historically inaccurate to treat contemporary evolutionary theory as identical to Darwin's nineteenth-century formulation.

It is also inaccurate to claim that evolutionary biology automatically entails atheism. Some Christians accept evolutionary mechanisms under divine providence. The metaphysical extension appears when evolution is presented as an undirected total explanation that renders divine agency, purpose, creation, and revelation unnecessary. At that point, a biological framework becomes an origin story, anthropology, ethic, and eschatology.

Evolutionary narratives have been used to explain morality, religion, cooperation, sexual behaviour, cognition, and reason. Such research may illuminate how capacities or behaviours contribute to survival and social life. It cannot by itself establish whether a belief is true or an obligation is morally binding. Explaining why humans developed a tendency to believe that cruelty is wrong does not prove that cruelty is objectively wrong. A genealogy of belief is not yet a justification of belief.

The problem becomes reflexive when naturalism explains reason itself solely as a survival adaptation. Natural selection rewards reproductive fitness, not truth as such. Often true beliefs support survival, but a naturalist must explain why cognitive faculties shaped by non-rational processes are generally reliable in abstract metaphysics, mathematics, moral reasoning, or theories about their own origin. Plantinga (2011) develops this as an evolutionary argument against naturalism. The argument is debated, but the burden it identifies is real: a worldview must account for the trustworthiness of the reasoning by which the worldview is affirmed.

Evolutionary theory has also been connected historically with social Darwinism, eugenics, racial hierarchy, and colonial narratives of progress. The relationship must be handled precisely. Racism, empire, selective breeding, and theories of hierarchy existed before Darwin. Evolutionary concepts did not mechanically produce these evils. They were appropriated within existing political, economic, and racial ideologies. Nevertheless, the language of struggle, fitness, heredity, degeneration, and biological progress supplied new scientific prestige to some destructive programmes. The lesson is not guilt by association. It is that scientific theories can acquire moral uses their technical content does not justify.

The biblical doctrine of humanity resists every ranking of persons by evolutionary development, race, intelligence, disability, or productive fitness. All

peoples share one human dignity and one fallen condition. No population is nearer to God because it is technologically dominant. No disabled person is a biological mistake whose value depends upon future contribution. The image of God is not awarded by competition.

Image-Bearers or Complex Matter?

Naturalism does not merely offer an account of human origins. It changes the meaning of the human person. If reality is only matter and energy, then every aspect of personhood must ultimately be reducible to physical processes. Thought becomes neural computation. Love becomes chemistry plus evolutionary strategy. Moral responsibility becomes a social tool. The soul becomes an outdated name for brain function. Death becomes the dissolution of an organism, not an appointment before God.

Scripture gives a richer and more demanding anthropology. Human beings are formed from the ground and animated by God's breath (Genesis 2:7). They are embodied creatures, not souls accidentally imprisoned in matter. They are also more than matter. They bear God's image, receive moral commands, enter covenant relationships, worship, reason, speak, cultivate, rule under God, and answer for their actions (Genesis 1:26-28).

Prof. Sangwa's chapter on humanity summarises this biblical position: humanity is neither an accident of impersonal forces, a self-created identity, a divine spark trapped in matter, nor a machine to be optimised by technocratic systems (Sangwa, 2026b). The image of God remains after the fall, which is why every life retains dignity even when reason, independence, health, social recognition, or productivity is diminished.

The precise philosophical relationship between body and soul has been described in several ways within Christian thought. Substance dualism distinguishes the immaterial soul from the body. Holistic dualism emphasises the unity of the person while retaining a real distinction. Some non-reductive physicalists seek to affirm embodied unity without an independently existing soul. The biblical data require caution against both material reductionism and contempt for embodiment. Death is an unnatural rupture, yet the final Christian hope is bodily resurrection, not permanent disembodiment (1 Corinthians 15:35-58).

Reductionism has practical consequences. When human beings are treated primarily as biological organisms, economic producers, data profiles, reproductive resources, or neurological machines, dignity becomes conditional. The unborn may be valued by wantedness. The disabled by independence. The elderly by cognitive function. The worker by productivity. The patient by quality-adjusted life calculations. The student by measurable performance. The citizen by compliance risk. The embryo by genetic desirability.

Institutions need measurements, but measurements can become moral disguises. A metric sees what it was designed to count. It may not see the person. The biblical image doctrine declares that the person exceeds every score because value precedes performance.

Consciousness, Mind, and Free Agency

Neuroscience has illuminated the intimate dependence of human experience upon the brain. Injury can alter memory, personality, language, inhibition, or perception. Medication can relieve symptoms or change mood. Trauma affects attention and physiological regulation. Sleep, hormones, nutrition, disease, and development shape cognition. Christian theology should welcome truthful knowledge of embodied life.

The inference from dependence to identity, however, is not automatic. That conscious experience changes when the brain changes does not prove that consciousness is nothing but brain activity. A damaged radio distorts music, but the analogy does not prove that the brain merely receives an external mind. It only shows the logical point that correlation and dependence do not settle ontology.

The "hard problem" of consciousness concerns why physical processing is accompanied by subjective experience at all (Chalmers, 1995). Neuroscience can identify neural correlates of wakefulness, attention, report, and perception. It can compare theories such as global neuronal workspace and integrated information theory. It remains disputed whether these accounts explain subjective experience or map the conditions under which it occurs (Koch, 2019; Tononi et al., 2016).

Materialist theories offer several options. Reductive physicalism identifies mental states with physical states. Non-reductive physicalism treats mental properties as dependent upon but not simply reducible to lower-level descriptions. Emergentism argues that consciousness arises from sufficiently complex organisation. Functionalism defines mental states by causal roles. Panpsychism treats consciousness or proto-consciousness as fundamental to matter. The proliferation of positions is itself evidence that the metaphysical question has not been closed by brain imaging.

The same caution applies to free will. Libet and colleagues (1983) reported neural readiness potentials preceding participants' reported awareness of deciding to move. Popular summaries announced that the brain decides before the person. Later work complicated that interpretation. Schurger et al. (2012) proposed that readiness potentials may reflect stochastic neural accumulation rather than an already completed unconscious decision. Maoz et al. (2019) found important differences between arbitrary and deliberate decisions. Contemporary reviews warn that neuroscience contributes to the debate but does not simply settle philosophical questions about freedom, causation, and responsibility.

If every belief and decision is merely the unavoidable output of prior physical causes, rational persuasion becomes difficult to explain. An argument would not be accepted because it is true but because a causal chain produced acceptance. Praise, blame, repentance, justice, and responsibility would require reinterpretation as social technologies. Many naturalists adopt compatibilism, defining freedom as action in accordance with one's desires even if those desires are determined. This can preserve important forms of agency, but it does not remove the deeper question of whether persons genuinely answer to reasons and could be morally responsible.

Biblical responsibility does not require an autonomous will independent of God, body, history, character, or influence. Human freedom is creaturely, morally conditioned, and corrupted by sin. Scripture can speak of bondage to sin

while commanding repentance. God's sovereignty and human responsibility coexist without being reduced to a simple mechanism. The person is neither an uncaused god nor a passive machine.

Pastoral care must honour this complexity. Mental illness is not automatically demonic oppression, personal sin, or weak faith. Neurological and psychological treatment may be necessary. At the same time, diagnosis does not erase every dimension of moral agency, spiritual need, relationship, or hope. The church must not force every wound into one explanatory box.

Morality Without the Creator

Naturalistic accounts of morality often begin with genuine observations. Humans are social beings. Empathy, reciprocity, kinship, cooperation, punishment, reputation, and group survival shape moral behaviour. Cultures transmit norms. Brains respond to suffering and fairness. These findings may help explain how moral sentiments develop and why communities sustain cooperation.

Description is not obligation. To say that humans evolved an aversion to betrayal is not to prove that betrayal is objectively wrong. To say that cooperation benefits groups is not to establish that the strong ought to protect the weak when exploitation benefits them. The word "ought" cannot be extracted automatically from the word "is."

Evolutionary moral anti-realists accept this implication and treat morality as an adaptive construction. Moral realists attempt to preserve objective values while explaining their evolutionary origin. Street (2006) formulated a Darwinian dilemma: if evolutionary forces shaped evaluative judgments independently of moral truth, confidence in those judgments appears threatened; if evolution reliably tracked moral truth, the account needs explanation. Ruse and Wilson (1986) argued more radically that morality may function as an illusion placed upon us by genes to secure cooperation.

Such views do not mean their advocates behave immorally. Atheists can show courage, fidelity, generosity, and compassion. Christians can behave wickedly while professing objective morality. The question is not who can perform good actions. It is what makes good objectively good, why every person possesses equal worth, and why obligation binds even when disobedience is profitable and hidden.

The biblical answer grounds morality in the holy character of God, creation according to His wisdom, the image of God, divine command, neighbour-love, the example of Christ, and final judgment. God's commands are not arbitrary decrees issued by raw power. They express who He is and what accords with the good order He created. Because every person bears His image, genocide, rape, torture, racial supremacy, abuse, exploitation, and false witness are not wrong merely because current societies condemn them. They violate persons who belong to God and laws grounded in His character.

Romans 1 does not claim that unbelievers know nothing moral. It teaches that they suppress truth while retaining knowledge sufficient for accountability (Romans 1:18-25). Romans 2 speaks of conscience and the work of the law written on hearts (Romans 2:14-16). Common moral knowledge is therefore compatible with widespread moral rebellion.

When morality is detached from the Creator, dignity often migrates toward autonomy, sentience, intelligence, or wantedness. Those unable to exercise autonomy become vulnerable. The unborn child cannot negotiate consent. The person with severe dementia cannot display rational independence. The profoundly disabled may not satisfy productivity measures. The biblical doctrine of the image of God protects precisely those whom functional definitions abandon.

Religion Explained Away

Naturalism frequently explains religion through causes that do not require God. Feuerbach interpreted God as projected human essence. Freud treated religion as wish fulfilment and a response to helplessness. Marx connected religion to suffering and social power. Cognitive science of religion examines agency detection, memory, ritual, group cohesion, and intuitive beliefs. Evolutionary accounts explore whether religious practices enhance cooperation or function as by-products of other capacities.

These approaches may reveal truths about false religion and human psychology. People do project desires onto gods. Religious institutions can protect power. Fear can intensify ritual. Communities use sacred narratives to establish identity. Scripture itself denounces idols made by human hands, prophets who speak from imagination, priests who exploit worshippers, and rulers who use religion for control.

The genetic fallacy occurs when an account of how a belief arose is treated as proof that the belief is false. A person may believe that fire burns because a parent warned him, because he was injured, or because he conducted an experiment. The causal history of the belief does not determine its truth. Likewise, neural activity associated with prayer does not prove that no one is heard. Every thought has embodied correlates if human beings are embodied creatures.

Psychological scrutiny must also be applied symmetrically. Belief in God may comfort the fearful. Unbelief may comfort the person who does not want judgment, command, or repentance. Neither conclusion is validated by its emotional convenience. The question remains whether God exists and has acted.

The God of Scripture is not an uncomplicated projection of human desire. He contradicts the sinner, judges secret motives, commands love of enemies, refuses ethnic ownership, humbles the proud, protects the weak, and saves through a crucified Messiah. Humanity did not naturally invent the offence of the cross as a flattering mirror. The gospel announces grace while stripping the self of every claim to autonomous innocence.

The Closed Universe and the Rejection of Miracle

A miracle is not a divine violation of an autonomous machine. The universe is not independent property into which God occasionally trespasses. A miracle is an extraordinary act of the Creator within the creation He continuously sustains, performed to reveal His power, mercy, judgment, or redemptive purpose.

The regularity of nature is necessary for recognising miracle. If no stable order existed, an extraordinary sign could not stand out. Biblical faith therefore does

not oppose regularity. It attributes regularity to providence and extraordinary acts to the same Lord.

Hume's famous discussion of miracles argued that testimony must be weighed against the uniform experience supporting natural laws and that human beings are vulnerable to credulity, wonder, and deception (Hume, 1748/2000). Christians should accept the ethical demand to test testimony. False miracles exist. Exaggerated healing claims, manipulated testimonies, and staged signs dishonour God and harm the vulnerable. Chapter 3 already established that the church cannot defend truth by falsehood.

The problem arises when the prior probability of miracle is made effectively zero because nature is assumed closed. Then no evidence could be sufficient, and the conclusion has been placed inside the premise. If God exists and created the world, miracle is not metaphysically impossible. The historical question becomes whether a particular event occurred and what evidence supports it.

Predictive prophecy is often dismissed through late dating or reinterpretation when fulfilment appears too precise. Some critical arguments are based on legitimate linguistic and historical evidence; others are governed by the assumption that genuine prediction cannot occur. The investigator must distinguish evidence from antiscientific rule.

The virgin conception, Christ's signs, His authority over nature, exorcisms, healings, and resurrection belong to the identity and mission of Jesus. Removing them does not preserve a morally useful core. It reconstructs another Jesus acceptable to a closed universe.

The Resurrection: The Event Scientism Cannot Permit

The bodily resurrection of Jesus is the decisive confrontation between biblical revelation and metaphysical naturalism. Christianity does not proclaim that the disciples experienced timeless meaning after Jesus died. It proclaims that the crucified Jesus was raised bodily by God, appeared to witnesses, and became the firstfruits of those who sleep (1 Corinthians 15:1-28).

The resurrection is not repeatable in a laboratory because it is a unique act of eschatological new creation. Historical knowledge routinely concerns unrepeatable events. It proceeds through testimony, documents, material traces, explanatory scope, and comparison of hypotheses. The resurrection claim should therefore be examined historically, not dismissed because ordinary biological processes do not raise the dead.

The evidence includes the early proclamation that Jesus was raised, the centrality of the empty tomb tradition, appearances claimed by individuals and groups, the transformation of frightened disciples into public witnesses, Paul's conversion, and the emergence of resurrection faith within a Jewish setting that expected resurrection at the end rather than one Messiah rising in advance (Wright, 2003). Scholars disagree over the interpretation of this evidence, but metaphysical naturalism cannot claim neutrality if it excludes the conclusion in advance.

Historical argument does not regenerate the heart. Saving faith is the work of God through the gospel and the Holy Spirit. Yet faith is not belief without

evidence. John states that signs were written so readers may believe that Jesus is the Messiah and have life in His name (John 20:30-31). Luke investigated testimony. Paul invited scrutiny of witnesses. The gospel enters public history.

If Christ has not been raised, Christian faith is futile. If He has been raised, metaphysical naturalism is not merely incomplete. Its closed universe has been broken open by the Lord of creation. Death is not the final authority, and every laboratory, state, university, corporation, and human body will stand within the judgment and renewal announced by the risen Christ.

Expertise, Institutions, and the Prestige of Science

Modern life depends upon expertise. No individual can independently verify every bridge design, medicine, aircraft system, statistical model, or genetic test. Specialised training, peer review, professional standards, and institutional memory are necessary goods. The Christian should not mistake ignorance for independence.

Expertise is weighty evidence, not revelation. Scientific institutions are social institutions inhabited by fallible people. They possess methods of correction, but they also contain incentives that can reward novelty, positive findings, publication volume, prestige, funding alignment, or fashionable conclusions. The self-correcting character of science is a real strength, yet correction may be slow, resisted, or uneven.

Ioannidis (2005) drew attention to the ways small samples, flexible analyses, low prior probabilities, and publication practices can produce unreliable findings. The Open Science Collaboration (2015) reported that many influential psychology findings did not replicate at the original effect sizes. Munafo et al. (2017) called for methods that increase transparency and reproducibility. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2019) distinguished reproducibility from replicability and recommended stronger reporting, data access, and institutional reform. Registered Reports, preregistration, open materials, and replication initiatives represent serious attempts at correction.

These problems do not prove that science is fraudulent. They demonstrate that science is human. A failed replication is not evidence that every established finding is false. A conflict of interest does not automatically invalidate a result. A dissenter is not correct merely because institutions reject him. Error is corrected by better evidence, transparent methods, independent testing, and honest debate, not by viral suspicion.

Funding can shape research questions. Corporate sponsorship may influence design, analysis, or publication. Governments may direct priorities through security, health, development, or ideological goals. Journals may prefer striking positive results. Universities may reward volume more than slow verification. Media may convert tentative findings into certainty. Public officials may invoke "the science" as though complex evidence produced one morally compulsory policy.

The phrase "follow the science" can be responsible when it means attend carefully to the best available evidence. It becomes scientistic when scientific findings are used to conceal value judgments, trade-offs, uncertainty, or political choice. Science may estimate the health effects of a policy. It cannot by itself

decide how liberty, risk, equity, family responsibility, economic survival, and moral duty should be balanced.

The church faces a parallel temptation. Pastors may denounce scientific institutions while presenting unverified claims, false statistics, or fabricated testimonies. Christian scholars may cite weak sources because they support a preferred conclusion. Such behaviour is not faith. It is false witness dressed for religious service. A watchman who sounds the alarm at every shadow trains the city to ignore him when fire comes.

Medicine, Suffering, and Human Limits

Medicine is one of the clearest examples of science serving mercy. Sanitation, antibiotics, surgery, anaesthesia, obstetric care, vaccination, trauma treatment, nutrition, imaging, and mental health care have relieved immense suffering. Christians should thank God for truthful discovery and skilled care.

Scripture does not force a choice between prayer and medicine. God may heal through ordinary means, extraordinary intervention, or the final resurrection. Luke was identified as a physician. Paul recommended a practical remedy to Timothy. The Good Samaritan used available treatment. Prayer is not threatened when a doctor acts, because the doctor, knowledge, body, and means all exist beneath providence.

The church has sometimes harmed people by treating every illness as personal sin, demon possession, or lack of faith. Such claims can delay treatment, intensify shame, and protect false healers. Jesus rejected simplistic connections between individual sin and particular suffering ([John 9:1-3](#)). The book of Job exposes friends who defend a tidy theology by accusing the sufferer.

The opposite error is medical scientism. Medicine becomes a total authority when it claims the right to define personhood, moral sex, the meaning of death, the value of disability, or the proper ends of human life. A physician may know how to suppress pain. That expertise does not confer authority to decide that a life with pain is unworthy of protection.

Suffering belongs to the fallen condition and should be relieved where lawful means permit. It can also become a context of dependence, compassion, perseverance, and witness. Christianity neither romanticises preventable pain nor promises its elimination before Christ returns. The cross places God inside suffering without making suffering good in itself. The resurrection promises its defeat without granting human beings unlimited authority over life and death.

Assisted suicide and euthanasia illustrate the crisis. Advocates often speak from real fear of agony, abandonment, dementia, indignity, or medical overreach. Christians must answer with compassion, palliative care, presence, justice, and refusal to abandon sufferers. Yet compassion cannot become the administered death of the person who suffers. Dignity rests in God's image, not independence or comfort. Life is entrusted to us, but it is not authored by us ([Sangwa, 2026a](#)).

When Birth Becomes Design

Bioethics asks what ought to be done with biological knowledge and power. The question becomes urgent when technical capacity advances faster than moral wisdom.

Genome editing can correct or alter DNA. Somatic editing affects treated individuals and may offer therapy for serious disease. Germline or heritable editing affects embryos, gametes, and future generations. The World Health Organization has emphasised the scientific, ethical, social, and legal risks of human genome editing and has judged clinical heritable genome editing premature (World Health Organization, 2021). An international commission convened by the U.S. National Academies and the Royal Society likewise concluded that substantial scientific and governance conditions would have to be met before any responsible clinical pathway could even be considered (National Academy of Medicine et al., 2020). In 2025, major scientific organisations renewed calls for a ten-year moratorium on heritable human genome editing, reflecting continued concern about safety, governance, consent, and irreversible consequences (American Society of Gene & Cell Therapy et al., 2025).

The moral question is not whether healing is good. It is whether the child is received as a creature or designed as a product. Prof. Sangwa's recent work frames the issue precisely: embryo editing brings society before the question of whether the child is a gift under God or a biological project to be optimised (Sangwa, 2026d).

In vitro fertilisation has helped many couples facing infertility, a profound sorrow that churches should treat with tenderness. Yet procedures may create multiple embryos, subject them to selection, freeze them indefinitely, or destroy those not chosen. Preimplantation genetic testing can identify serious monogenic conditions, but the logic can shift from treatment to selection of which lives may begin or continue. Polygenic embryo screening attempts to rank embryos by probabilistic estimates for complex traits. Its predictive limits are substantial, and critics warn of inequity, overclaiming, and eugenic pressure (Turley et al., 2021).

Commercial surrogacy can turn pregnancy into a contract and the child into the object of competing claims. Germline intervention can burden persons who cannot consent. Disability screening can communicate that some forms of life are mistakes to be prevented rather than neighbours to be welcomed. Genetic enhancement can intensify inequality by giving the wealthy access to biological advantages marketed as responsible parenting.

The Christian response must distinguish therapy from enhancement, while recognising that the line is sometimes contested. Correcting a pathogenic mutation in a living patient is morally different from selecting among embryos according to preferred traits. Restoring function is different from redesigning humanity around competitive desire. Yet even therapy must be governed by safety, justice, consent, proportionality, and respect for life.

Human dignity cannot rest on intelligence, health, independence, consciousness, productivity, wantedness, or genetic quality. Every such criterion eventually creates people who possess less dignity. The image of God is not a performance threshold.

The same principle governs organ transplantation, prenatal diagnosis, reproductive technologies, cloning, embryo research, life extension, and end-of-life care. The question is not only, "Can it be done?" It is, "What kind of creature are we, whose body is this, who bears the risk, who benefits, who is discarded, and before whom will we answer?"

Chapter 21 will address transhumanism and technological immortality in detail. Here the warning is sufficient. When humanity forgets that the body is created, the body becomes raw material. When the child ceases to be gift, birth becomes manufacture. When medicine loses the Creator, healing can quietly become selection.

Africa Between Scientism and Superstition

African societies often face a false choice imported from outside and reinforced from within. On one side stands a Western secular naturalism that treats biblical revelation, spiritual reality, and traditional moral order as obstacles to development. On the other stands untested superstition, occult syncretism, miracle commerce, and misinformation. The church must refuse both.

Colonial education often presented European categories as universal reason and African knowledge as primitive. Contemporary donor programmes, professional accreditation, development institutions, and global policy can continue to carry moral assumptions about family, sexuality, reproduction, religion, and autonomy. A grant may fund valuable health or education work while importing an anthropology that detaches dignity from the Creator. Scientific terminology can function as moral authority even when the disputed conclusion is philosophical.

Yet resistance to imported naturalism can become romanticisation of indigenous claims. Not every ancestral practice is wise. Traditional healers may possess valuable botanical knowledge, but claims about spirits, curses, divination, or ritual power must be tested. A society does not defend itself from scientism by abandoning evidence.

African churches can also misuse supernaturalism. A pastor may tell a patient to stop medication. A prophet may identify every neurological or psychiatric condition as demonic. An infertile couple may be exploited by costly rituals. A child with disability may be stigmatised. False testimonies may be celebrated because they appear to prove spiritual power.

Biblical Christianity offers a third way. It affirms the supernatural without superstition, science without scientism, medicine without medical idolatry, and cultural belonging without syncretism. It trains Christian scientists, physicians, nurses, theologians, educators, farmers, engineers, and policymakers who can study evidence rigorously while remaining under Christ's lordship.

The African Christian scholar must resist intellectual dependency without rejecting correction. He must ask whose assumptions shape curricula, which research questions receive funding, and which moral conclusions are smuggled inside technical language. He must also refuse the pride that treats every local counter-narrative as suppressed truth. Scripture judges donor and diviner, professor and prophet, laboratory and shrine.

The Strongest Case for Scientific Naturalism

A serious critique must allow naturalism to speak in its strongest form.

Its advocate may argue that natural explanations have repeatedly succeeded where supernatural explanations failed. Disease once attributed to spirits is explained through pathogens, genetics, environment, and physiology. Lightning is understood through atmospheric electricity. Planetary motion no longer requires angels pushing celestial spheres. Appeals to divine action have sometimes stopped inquiry, while scientific investigation has produced vaccines, sanitation, communication, agriculture, and technologies that save lives.

Scientific methods are public, testable, and self-correcting. Researchers disclose methods, compare results, replicate findings, and revise theories. Revelation claims, by contrast, appear dependent upon disputed texts, traditions, and private experience. Religions disagree, perform miracles that cannot be verified, and often protect authority from criticism.

Evolution offers a unifying account of biological diversity. Genetics, fossils, comparative anatomy, and biogeography converge upon common descent. Neuroscience increasingly connects thought, memory, personality, and decision to brain function. Psychology and sociology explain religious belief through development, culture, cognition, and need. Morality can be understood through empathy, cooperation, reciprocal advantage, and social evolution.

Miracles conflict with well-established regularities and are usually supported by testimony vulnerable to error, exaggeration, legend, or manipulation. Naturalism therefore applies explanatory economy. It does not multiply invisible entities when natural causes are sufficient.

The naturalist may also point to religious failure. Churches resisted evidence, defended false cosmologies, persecuted dissenters, protected abusive leaders, blamed sick people, and circulated unreliable apologetics. If revelation is so clear, why do its defenders disagree? Why prefer theological authority to methods that openly invite correction?

This is not a foolish case. It draws strength from genuine scientific achievement and genuine Christian failure. The church must repent where it has lied, coerced, obstructed treatment, or confused interpretation with revelation. A child saved by antibiotics is a good. A false miracle exposed by investigation is a good. A doctrine defended by fabrication deserves public correction.

Why Methodological Success Does Not Establish Metaphysical Sufficiency

The first answer is logical. Success in explaining processes within nature does not prove that nature is all that exists. The fact that pathogens explain infection does not show that God does not exist. It shows that infection has biological causes. The fact that planetary motion follows mathematical regularities does not make the Creator unnecessary. It reveals an ordered creation.

Second, explanations operate at different levels. A complete chemical description of ink does not explain the meaning of a written confession. A neural

description of grief does not explain whom the mourner lost or whether the grief is fitting. Mechanism and meaning are not competitors.

Third, naturalism cannot justify scientism through science. The claim that only natural causes exist is philosophical. It is not a conclusion measured by an instrument. Naturalism may be defended philosophically, but it must stop presenting itself as the uncontaminated voice of data.

Fourth, science depends upon rational and moral commitments naturalism must explain. Researchers believe truth is preferable to fabrication, reason can track reality, evidence should constrain desire, and persons possess enough agency to be responsible. These commitments are not generated by a p-value. A worldview that reduces reasoning to non-rational causal chains must explain why its conclusions deserve rational trust.

Fifth, naturalistic accounts face unresolved questions about existence, consciousness, normativity, and human dignity. Identifying neural correlates does not explain subjective experience. Describing moral evolution does not establish objective obligation. Explaining religious cognition does not prove God unreal. Scientific progress may narrow some mysteries while revealing deeper ones.

Sixth, the failures of religious authorities do not refute God. A corrupt judge does not prove justice unreal. A pastor's misuse of Scripture demonstrates the need to place the pastor beneath Scripture. *Sola Scriptura* is not blind trust in clergy. It is the judgment of every human authority by God's written Word.

Seventh, explanatory economy is not the rule that the fewest entities must always be true. It is a preference among explanations that adequately account for the evidence. If God exists, excluding Him is not economy but omission. The question must be settled by the total case, not by a methodological prohibition.

Finally, the resurrection stands as a historical claim that naturalism cannot permit without surrendering its closure. The Christian is not asked to choose God because science has gaps. He is summoned to repent because the Creator has spoken in Scripture and acted decisively in the crucified and risen Christ.

Correction, Rebuke, Exhortation, and Restoration

Correction must replace confusion with distinctions. Science is not scientism. Methodological naturalism is not metaphysical naturalism. Brain dependence is not proof of material identity. An evolutionary account of behaviour is not a foundation for moral obligation. Medical expertise is not moral sovereignty. Technical capability is not permission.

Rebuke is necessary where prestige is used to silence truth. The scientist who declares God impossible before examining evidence has crossed from investigation into dogma. The institution that presents moral ideology as settled science misuses public trust. The corporation that conceals adverse findings for profit treats human lives as costs. The church leader who tells a patient to abandon treatment, fabricates a healing, or repeats false evidence in God's name commits grave false witness.

Exhortation calls Christian scholars to excellence. Study the strongest arguments. Learn methods. Read primary sources. State uncertainty. Retract error. Do not hide intellectual laziness behind the word faith. Do not hide

cowardice behind professional neutrality. Bring every discipline beneath Christ without forcing a Bible verse into every technical sentence.

Restoration is possible. The believer frightened by scientific claims needs patient instruction, not mockery. The scientist who has confused method with metaphysics should be invited to examine first principles. The patient harmed by spiritual manipulation needs care, justice, and truthful theology. The pastor who has spoken carelessly must confess publicly where the error was public. The researcher who falsified data must accept accountability and restitution.

The gospel does not require the destruction of intellect. It requires the repentance of intellect. The mind is not saved by becoming less rigorous. It is renewed by being returned to its Creator.

A Pastoral Word to Different Readers

To the scientist who studies faithfully: your laboratory is not outside God's kingdom. Measure carefully, report honestly, resist pressure, and receive the wonder of creation as a summons to worship. Your expertise is a gift, not a crown.

To the Christian academic hiding faith for acceptance: prudence is sometimes necessary, but permanent silence can become discipleship by fear. You need not insert theology where it does not answer the question, yet you must not accept a worldview that forbids God before inquiry begins.

To the student told that science has disproved God: ask what the experiment actually demonstrated and what philosophy was added afterward. Do not fear evidence. The Creator is not threatened by His creation.

To the believer suspicious of all experts: humility applies to you too. A forwarded message is not research. An outsider is not truthful merely because he is rejected. Test every claim, including the claim you want to be true.

To the pastor: do not preach beyond your competence. Consult qualified professionals. Do not call every illness a demon, every treatment unbelief, or every disputed theory satanic. Teach creation, providence, miracle, and resurrection with confidence, and represent scientific questions honestly.

To the physician and mental health professional: your patient is more than a case, diagnosis, risk score, or nervous system. Honour embodiment, confidentiality, conscience, family, moral agency, and spiritual need. Do not allow professional authority to become a substitute priesthood.

To the person facing infertility, disability, terminal illness, or genetic disease: your suffering is not invisible to God. The church must not offer slogans where it owes presence, practical help, lament, treatment, and hope. Your worth does not decline with bodily capacity. In Christ, death is an enemy already defeated in principle and awaiting final destruction.

To the naturalist sincerely seeking truth: Christianity does not ask you to despise evidence. It asks whether the natural world can carry the metaphysical weight you place upon it. Examine the assumptions by which God, purpose, moral law, and miracle were excluded. Above all, examine Jesus Christ.

The Last Second Before the King Appears

The church must speak with urgency, but not panic. Scripture does not authorise date-setting or the identification of every scientific development as the direct fulfilment of one prophecy. It does reveal an age increasingly capable of redefining humanity, manipulating life, manufacturing persuasive realities, and promising salvation through control.

Scientism prepares the imagination for a managed future. If only the measurable is real, persons become datasets. If the body has no created meaning, it becomes programmable material. If death has no judgment beyond it, life may be prolonged, selected, or ended according to technical policy. If experts possess final authority, conscience becomes a compliance problem. If resurrection is impossible, technological continuity begins to look like salvation.

The deepest danger is not one machine, policy, or laboratory. It is worship. Romans 12:5 describes the exchange of the truth of God for a lie and the worship of created things rather than the Creator. Scientism is one form of that exchange. It kneels before created intelligence, measurable power, and human capacity.

Yet the closing hour also exposes the poverty of the idol. Science can postpone death but cannot cancel judgment. It can alter genes but cannot regenerate the heart. It can map the brain but cannot forgive guilt. It can simulate a voice but cannot breathe the Holy Spirit. It can extend sight across galaxies but cannot show the sinner the glory of Christ unless God opens blind eyes through the gospel.

Readiness for the rapture and the return of Christ is not technological withdrawal, panic, or speculative chronology. It is repentance, faith, holiness, truthfulness, love, doctrinal vigilance, and faithful service. The wise servant is found doing the Master's will (Matthew 24:42-46). The wise virgin keeps oil in the lamp. The faithful church refuses both the idol of expertise and the idol of suspicion.

We may indeed be living in the last second before midnight. Even if history continues longer than we expect, every reader stands one breath from eternity. Urgency is therefore never wasted. The question is not whether we have decoded the exact minute. It is whether the Creator will find us worshipping Him or the works of our own hands.

Conclusion: The Servant Must Not Become the Lord

Science is a noble servant when it studies creation truthfully, relieves suffering, corrects error, and remains accountable to moral wisdom. It becomes scientism when it declares itself the only judge of reality. Methodological naturalism can be a useful discipline for investigating regular processes. It becomes metaphysical naturalism when it turns a research rule into a universe without God.

The chapter has shown that this enlargement carries consequences. Creation becomes self-existing matter. Adam becomes symbol. The fall becomes

immaturity. Death becomes creator. Consciousness becomes computation. Morality becomes adaptation. Religion becomes projection. Miracle becomes impossible. Medicine becomes moral authority. The child becomes design material. Human dignity becomes a sliding scale.

The biblical alternative is not ignorance. It is knowledge under worship. The heavens declare glory. The cell displays ordered life. The mind receives truth as a creature. The body bears created meaning. The scientist and pastor stand beneath the same Word. Christ is not a hypothesis inserted where explanation fails. He is the One through whom, for whom, and in whom all things exist.

The church must therefore correct the confused, rebuke the arrogant, exhort the faithful, protect the vulnerable, and restore the repentant. It must confess where it has opposed sound evidence or used false claims. It must also refuse the demand that revelation be admitted only after passing through a court established without God.

The microscope must remain in the hand. It must not be placed upon the throne.

When the Creator is excluded and humanity is reduced to autonomous matter, a practical question immediately follows: what is life for? If there is no received purpose, pleasure, comfort, consumption, self-expression, and psychological affirmation readily become the nearest substitutes for salvation. Chapter 5 therefore turns from the naturalistic universe to the sovereign self that inhabits it: hedonism, consumerism, and therapeutic salvation.

References

- American Society of Gene & Cell Therapy, Alliance for Regenerative Medicine, & International Society for Cell & Gene Therapy. (2025, November 18). *Global scientific consortium reaffirms position on human heritable genome editing*. <https://www.asgct.org/news-publications/asgct-news/global-scientific-consortium-reaffirms-position-on-human-heritable-genome-editing>
- Brooke, J. H. (1991). *Science and religion: Some historical perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200–219.
- Collins, F. S. (2006). *The language of God: A scientist presents evidence for belief*. Free Press.
- Darwin, C. (2009). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection* (J. W. Burrow, Ed.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1859)
- Dembski, W. A., & Wells, J. (2008). *The design of life: Discovering signs of intelligence in biological systems*. Foundation for Thought and Ethics.
- Haack, S. (2012). Six signs of scientism. *Logos & Episteme*, 3(1), 75–95.
- Harrison, P. (2015). *The territories of science and religion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hume, D. (2000). *An enquiry concerning human understanding* (T. L. Beauchamp, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1748)
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLOS Medicine*, 2(8), Article e124. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>
- Koch, C. (2019). *The feeling of life itself: Why consciousness is widespread but can't be computed*. MIT Press.
- Libet, B., Gleason, C. A., Wright, E. W., & Pearl, D. K. (1983). Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential): The unconscious initiation of a freely voluntary act. *Brain*, 106(3), 623–642. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/106.3.623>

- Maoz, U., Yaffe, G., Koch, C., & Mudrik, L. (2019). Neural precursors of decisions that matter: An ERP study of deliberate and arbitrary choice. *eLife*, 8, Article e39787. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.39787>
- Meyer, S. C. (2009). *Signature in the cell: DNA and the evidence for intelligent design*. HarperOne.
- Mortenson, T., & Ury, T. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Coming to grips with Genesis: Biblical authority and the age of the earth*. Master Books.
- Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Percie du Sert, N., Simonsohn, U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ware, J. J., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1, Article 0021. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0021>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2008). *Science, evolution, and creationism*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/11876>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Reproducibility and replicability in science*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25303>
- National Academy of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, & The Royal Society. (2020). *Heritable human genome editing*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25665>
- Numbers, R. L. (Ed.). (2009). *Galileo goes to jail and other myths about science and religion*. Harvard University Press.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), Article aac4716. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Plantinga, A. (2011). *Where the conflict really lies: Science, religion, and naturalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Ross, H. (2001). *The Genesis question: Scientific advances and the accuracy of Genesis* (2nd ed.). NavPress.
- Ruse, M., & Wilson, E. O. (1986). Moral philosophy as applied science. *Philosophy*, 61(236), 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003819100021057>
- Sangwa, S. (2024a, June 22). *Can the Big Bang theory and biblical creation be reconciled?* Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/big-bang-theory>
- Sangwa, S. (2024b, March 5). *What does Scripture indicate about rationalism and empiricism?* Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/rationalism-and-empiricism>
- Sangwa, S. (2026a, July 8). *A civilization choosing death: Assisted dying and the biblical test of compassion without God*. Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/a-civilization-choosing-death-assisted-dying-and-the-biblical-test-of-compassion-without-god>
- Sangwa, S. (2026b). Humanity: Created in God's image, fallen in sin, accountable before God, and in need of redemption. *Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.65655/openchristianpress.126>
- Sangwa, S. (2026c, February 26). *Scientism, the beast, and the eclipse of the Holy Spirit: A Sola Scriptura warning for the twenty-first century*. Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/scientism-the-beast-and-the-eclipse-of-the-holy-spirit-a-sola-scriptura-warning-for-the-twenty-first-century>
- Sangwa, S. (2026d, July 19). *Before birth becomes design: Embryo editing and the biblical test of human redesign*. Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/before-birth-becomes-design-embryo-editing-and-the-biblical-test-of-human-redesign>
- Sangwa, S. (2026e, July 10). *Does the seven-day creation week reveal God's seven-thousand-year plan for humanity?* Open Christian University. <https://learn.openchristian.education/blog/sangwa/does-the-seven-day-creation-week-reveal-god-s-seven-thousand-year-plan-for-humanity>
- Schurger, A., Sitt, J. D., & Dehaene, S. (2012). An accumulator model for spontaneous neural activity prior to self-initiated movement. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(42), E2904-E2913. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210467109>
- Sorell, T. (1991). *Scientism: Philosophy and the infatuation with science*. Routledge.

- Street, S. (2006). A Darwinian dilemma for realist theories of value. *Philosophical Studies*, 127(1), 109-166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-005-1726-6>
- Swamidass, S. J. (2019). *The genealogical Adam and Eve: The surprising science of universal ancestry*. IVP Academic.
- Tononi, G., Boly, M., Massimini, M., & Koch, C. (2016). Integrated information theory: From consciousness to its physical substrate. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 17(7), 450-461. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2016.44>
- Turley, P., Meyer, M. N., Wang, N., Cesarini, D., Hammonds, E., Martin, A. R., Neale, B. M., Rehm, H. L., Wilkins-Haug, L., & Benjamin, D. J. (2021). Problems with using polygenic scores to select embryos. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 385(1), 78-86. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMs2105065>
- Walton, J. H. (2009). *The lost world of Genesis One: Ancient cosmology and the origins debate*. IVP Academic.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Human genome editing: Recommendations*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030381>
- Wright, N. T. (2003). *The resurrection of the Son of God*. Fortress Press.
- OPEN CHRISTIAN PRESS | BOOKS.OPENCHRISTIAN.EDUCATION