

Bridging Science and Religion – the Pathway Is Wider Now

Chun (George) Yang, MD, PhD

The relationship between science and religion can be categorized into four types: 1. Conflict (evolution / creation wars); 2. Independent (co existence); 3. Dialogue (debate); and 4. Integration (bridge / unification). The wars between evolution and creation have been reversed over a span of 80 years. For example, from Scope trial (1925) to Dover trial (2005). Hence, bridging science and religion has been the most difficult Challenge. Currently, the popular teaching is no mix of science with religion. The established, not renewed mainstream doctrines support such a teaching. Mainstream science rejected creation science, intelligent design etc., listing them as pseudoscience. However, empirical research into spirituality and health as well as medicine has a long history staying in mainstream. Experimental studies of God are published in mainstream journals since at least a decade ago. Even though, the critical breakthrough has been made since 2008, which critically changed mainstream directions.^{1,2} Science and religion can be successfully bridged through our work. Recently, several direct studies of gods, focusing on “moralizing gods” are published in the journals *Science*, *Nature*, etc. This demonstrated that the pathway gets wider to unify science and religion.

May be presented on request: We further use energinity, energy centered theory and application, as an example to illustrate initiated new science, biomedicine, and theology. (even more wider pathway)

1. Yang C. How God Exists: $MG = kEG$. Available from Nature Precedings
< <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/npre.2008.2647.1> > (2008).

Also available at < <http://energinity.com/page23-40.pdf> >

2. Yang C. The Impact of Faith Science. Available from Nature Precedings
< <http://hdl.handle.net/10101/npre.2010.5306.1> > (2010)

Also available at < <http://energinity.com/fsimpact.pdf> >

Pope's Revolution Continues

Chun (George) Yang, MD, PhD

When Pope Francis was elected in 2013, already, he is called by many as revolutionary - “gentle revolution”, “quiet revolution”, etc. By 2015, we noticed the Pope's calling for “a bold cultural revolution” in his doctrine. At that time, we were still wondering what the Pope revolution actually was. The past several years have been phenomenal. The Pope has continued his revolution. The Pope calls young people to lead a life of “revolution of service”. The Pope calls the Church to learn to give away the unhelpful old traditions. He said, “God often purifies, simplifies, and makes us grow by taking away, not by adding, as we might do”. This is reductionism – similar to scientific thinking. Now we are in Christmas season (Catholic calendar: December 25, 2019 to January 6, 2020). The Christmas is among the most important holidays in a year. Also, the Pope preaches – God's birth a revolution of love and tenderness. “What we are living is not a simply an epoch of change, but a change of epoch”, as Pope Francis preaches recently.

Correctly Understanding the Bible

Chun (George) Yang, MD, PhD

Attending a church in Brookline, MA, I take out the Bible from the back of the seat and read it. I see the Bible is not clear about the two versions of genesis. Many versions of the Bible have the same issue. So I raise this question to the preacher. Some parishioners support me. But the leadership doesn't, insisting that genesis is ONLY one version. I could not help to argue: we need to correctly understand the Bible and teach it in a better way. Be more transformational. We have to know why there are two versions of genesis – how human being is appeared on the earth. They are intentionally put there by ancient scholars. To my understanding, the first version of genesis is an evolutionary idea. (Genesis 1:1) (Also see: Yang, C. “Genesis: A Vision of Evolution, Creation, and More”. *Nature Precedings* < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/npre.2008.2683.1> >, 2008; Yang, C. *Faith Science*, page 37-40. 2009. Also available at < <http://energinity.com/page23-40.pdf> >) The second version is a human centered approach. (Genesis 1:2). The Bible is God's inspired words. God and human are co authors of the Bible as doctrine states. The Bible does not give out everything a correct answer. The Bible gives Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit inspires human to find correct answer. Please join us in this right direction.

Happy WHAT Holiday

Chun (George) Yang, MD, PhD

Thank you for saying “Happy Holiday” to us. Thank you for sharing happiness with us. However, please tell us which holiday you mean. Thank you.

In America, the last three months of a year can be named as a holiday season. From Halloween, Thanksgiving, Christmas, to New Year's day - Happy Halloween! Happy Thanksgiving! Merry Christmas! Happy New Year! These are standard and clear messages for holiday greetings. However, increasingly, many of us are now using “Happy Holiday” or “Happy Holidays” instead, particularly during Christmas celebrations. A careful thought found that “Happy Holiday” may not be a proper alternative to “Merry Christmas”. Simply, “Happy Holiday” is NOT a clear message. What holiday do we mean? When we try to share some holiday enjoyment, shouldn't we be clear what holiday happiness we are sharing with? I say Merry Christians to you because I am a Christian. You say Happy Hanukkah to me because you are a Jew. Aren't they are double happiness to be shared?

For Christians, the celebration of Christmas is also differed among different denominations. For most protestants the December 25 is the only holiday for Christmas. The roman catholic celebration of the Christmas considers the December 25 a beginning of the Christmas season. It lasts until January 6, a period of 13 days celebration.

Improper Trespass Notice at Hospital? Rule of Justice in Medicine

Chun (George) Yang, MD, PhD

Some hospital physicians do not like peer's different opinions, even which are often proven correct and better ones. For example, is the patient's paraplegia directly related to cancer invasion or vertebrates fractures due to a fall? The treatment could be radically different. For example, radiation for the former but contradicted to the later. Here we report an actual case how some hospitals mishandled it. The patient was able to walk although with apparent difficulty and pain. X-ray then CT scan suggested spinal cord compression. During two ER visits, the oncologist did not recommend an immediate admission. Patient went back home, and was able to walk after supper. During the night, the patient tried to get up for bathroom, fell on the floor, and could not stand up again (paraplegia 08/30/2017). The third time visiting the ER, the patient was admitted. T8-T10 vertebrates fractured. Considering the patient's paraplegia was due to injury, the peer, also, a health care proxy (HCP), recommended targeted medicine to treat the mutation that causes the cancer, letting the injury to heal. However, the oncologist insisted that the paraplegia was due to cancer invasion and pathological fracture, surgery or radiation therapy was recommended. The patient declined operation. The oncologist emphasized that radiation therapy (RTX) is the only hope for the patient if the patient wanted to stand up again. After one dose of RTX, however, the patient's BLE lost all reserved functions and became no sensation and no motion. The patient had to stop RTX. Not only injury is contradicted to radiation, but later, a literature review also suggests that the patient's cancer type is likely a radiation resistance. Such an argument, however, was not recorded, recognized, appreciated, nor credited by the hospital. Rather, the hospital gave the peer and HCP a trespass notice. The second hospital followed the restriction. But the third hospital removed the restriction five days after the patient was admitted. In a nursing home nurses and therapists who appreciate the peer and HCP's innovative care efforts, the patient gradually recovers significantly for BLE sensations and motions with targeted medication combining other newly developed approaches. However, when the patient was admitted to the second hospital for evaluation, it continued some new discovery, but failed to recognize other equally important new method. Ordered new discovery of blood tumor maker tests, it did not recognize a new method to treat a pain, Hoyer lift associated spinal pain, an innovative care. It also stopped the patient's physical therapy (PT) as well as occupational therapy (OT) since Feb 6, 2018. The hospital "incapacitated" the patient, put an ad in news paper, manipulatively haired the hospital's temporary guardian, removed the peer as the patient's HCP, and sent the patient far away from home. Now, more than one year and ten months, the patient has not received proper PT and OT. There are other examples of abusing trespass notice. We will share when time is right. This case needs justice care, doesn't it? We have been calling for justice in medicine.