

The Impact of Faith Science

Abstract:

The direct, scientific and successful proof of the existence of God in 2008 defined faith science (faithology). Faith science further defined three major concepts, namely faith evolution, conscious existence in all life forms, and existence energy equivalence. Faith science has been fundamentally advancing mankind's thinking in new, right, and better directions. Here I report the identification of two major impacts within the first year of the defining concept of faith science. The first major impact of faith science happened immediately since its first research article was disclosed. It scientifically ended the most recent wars between science and faith – the new atheism movement. Under the leadership of the top science journal *Nature*, which accurately reflected the then mainstream science status, from 2004-2008, new atheism had been steadfastly built to deny the existence of God in both mainstream science and the general public through various venues, including critically through scientific approaches. The timely sharing my discovery of the principle of faith science in early December 2008 has changed top science journals' position, such as *Nature* and *Science*. Two pieces of news in November and December 2008 can be used to demonstrate the transitions. The second major impact of faith science is

that the controversy of discoverer of the theory of Natural Selection for more than a century and a half had been scientifically readdressed during the period of 2008-2009. While studying the history of evolutionary thoughts, I came across that Charles Darwin was accused of stealing the credit of Alfred Russel Wallace in defining the principle of natural selection during their time, i.e. 1850s, which had been scientifically an unsolved mystery. My work on the proof of the Wallace – Darwin theory of Natural Selection led me to discover, unexpectedly, that Wallace had already proved species' mutability in 1855, e.g., life forms are changeable, not fixed, and he further completed its mechanism in early 1858. However, mainstream science has a doctrine, stating that evolution is a fact, but not proven. Darwin's dishonesty has become obvious to me during my studies. My work, shared through multiple venues, has led to the worldwide cancelations, though not completely, of celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the publication of Darwin's book, "On the Origin of Species" on November 24, 2009. When that day was the time for celebration, it actually became the beginning of the correction of the Darwin fraud. For example, *The New York Times* editors carefully designed and published articles with photographs that day, displaying an idea from my shared work, or the same one as mine from a newly developed scientific perspective.

By early December 2009, faith science survived its first year. It generated two major impacts:

The first major impact – God walks back into mainstream science

By the end of 2008, top science journals *Science* and *Nature* changed their tones toward religion. I submitted my work on December 5 to *Nature*, *Nature Precedings* and others. Though my work were neither published nor posted, they had an impact at the editor level that two pieces of news can be used to demonstrate. One was published before my sharing of my work, "Vatican Science Conference Offers an Ambiguous Message" (by John Bohannon, *Science* 322: 1038, 14 November 2008). The other one was published after my sharing, "Vatican formalizes rules on human stem-cell research" (Declan Butler, *Nature* 456: 852, 18/25 December 2008), and it is even with a Vatican picture (by Punchstock). These two pieces of news show very different tones, from educating, arguing against, and more negative ones, to respecting and more positive ones towards Vatican. To the best of my knowledge, my work may be the single one that has reversed these dynamics.

In the news published in *Science*, the first paragraph reads: "Scientists who gathered at the Vatican last week for a closed-door conference* on evolutionary origins are giving the event mixed reviews. Those who hoped for a clear

*Scientific Insights into the Evolution of the Universe and of Life, Vatican City, 31 October – 4 November 2008.

statement of support for evolution from the Catholic Church went home empty-handed. Others, expecting little, were happy with a détente between science and faith. But a few criticize what they heard from the Vatican's controversial point man on evolution, Austrian Cardinal Christoph Schonborn. 'He believes there are gaps in evolution and [that] God acts in those gaps,' says John Abelson, a molecular biologist at the University of California, Davis, who gave a talk at the meeting. This is a 'nearly 19th century' view, Abelson says, amounting to support for the intelligent design movement. Pope Benedict XVI did not clarify his own ambiguous statements on evolution."...

In the news published in *Nature*, a short form of 134 words in the paper journal, and also a longer version of 550-word online are both available. The first few paragraphs state: "The Roman Catholic Church has reaffirmed its opposition to embryonic stem cell research in a document that updates its 20-year-old position on biomedical research and reproductive medicine." "The instruction *Dignitas Personae* not only condemns embryonic stem cell research, and in vitro fertilization (IVF) but also formalizes its many previous positions including banning human cloning to produce embryonic stem cells, and human-animal cloned chimaeras." ... "It clearly raises the bar," says John Allen, a Vatican expert; "The Vatican is entitled to its theological position, but many other world religions have a permissible view on human embryonic stem cell research," says Insoo Hyun, ... "if we go down that road of moral complicity where do we stop?"

From the titles to the context, these two reports have made significant position changes. See the following for more details on how the top science journals had reflected the new development and acted from 2004 to 2008.

The new atheism moment (2004-2008)

The world's number one science journal *Nature* published editorials with comments on God, often with featured news report, every year from 2004 to 2008, to steadfastly build up an atheism world. Here are quoted editorial comments –

“...science recognizes no god, forcing it to do so will only produce bad science” (*Nature*, 432: 657, 2004).

“That is bad news for researchers. Unlike ‘creation science’, which uses the Bible as its guide, intelligent design tries to use scientific methods to find evidence of God in nature” (*Nature*, 434: 1053, 2005).

“After all, to many people, including scientists, the world simply make more sense without the existence of God, and religious interventions are either offensive or irrelevant” (*Nature*, 442: 110, 2006).

In responding to Senator Sam Brownback's writing in *The New York Times* (May 31 2007) "Man was not an accident and reflects an image and likeness unique in the created order. Those aspects of evolutionary theory compatible with this truth are a welcome addition to human knowledge. Aspects of these theories that undermine this truth, however, should be firmly rejected as atheistic theology posing as science." *Nature* journal states, under the title of "Evolution and the Brain" with the subtitle of "With all deference to the sensibilities of religious people, the idea that man was created in the image of God can surely be put aside", "Scientific theories of human nature may be discomfoting or unsatisfying, but they are not illegitimate." "In Brownback's defence, it should be acknowledged that these are deep waters. It is fairly easy to accept the truth of evolution when it applies to the

external world — the adaptation of the orchid to wasps, for example, or the speed of the cheetah. It is much harder to accept it internally — to accept that our feelings, intuitions, the ways in which we love and loathe, are the product of experience, evolution and culture alone. And such acceptance has challenges for the unbeliever, too. Moral philosophers often put great store by their rejection of the 'naturalistic fallacy', the belief that because something is a particular way, it ought to be that way. Now we learn that untutored beliefs about 'what ought to be' do, in fact, reflect an 'is': the state of the human mind as an evolved entity. Accepting this represents a challenge that few as yet have really grappled with.” “It remains uncertain how the new sciences of human behavior emerging at the intersections of anthropology, evolutionary biology and neuropsychology can best be navigated. But that does not justify their denunciation on the basis of religious faith alone. Scientific theories of human nature may be discomfoting or unsatisfying, but they are not illegitimate. And serious attempts to frame them will reflect the origins of the human mind in biological and cultural evolution, without reference to a divine creation” (*Nature*, 447: 753, 2007).

On July 17, 2008, under the title of “Templeton’s Legacy” with a subtitle of “The Templeton Foundation’s exploration of science and faith merits tolerance, not outright rejection”, *Nature* states, “This publication would turn away from religion in seeking explanations for how the world works, and believe that science is likely to go further in explaining human moral impulses than some religious people will welcome. Thus it shares a degree of suspicion with many in the scientific community at any attempt by religiously driven organizations to fund science. A chief concern is that the influential Templeton Foundation might be seeking to inject religion into the scientific world. And it is easy to

understand that concern given the political activism of many American fundamentalists and their efforts to promote ideas such as intelligent design which posits a divine hand in evolution. The foundation's most vigorous critics accuse it of attempting to lace science with spiritualism. That claim is somewhat ironic, as Templeton himself seemed to have just the opposite in mind. He believed institutional religion to be antiquated, and hoped a dialogue with researchers might bring about advances in theological thinking" (*Nature*, 454: 253-254, 2008).

Science also published editorials related to God. For example, an editorial was published with the title - "Acts of God?" Donald Kennedy, the then Editor-in-Chief, wrote - "The various interrelationships among nature, God, and the law, it seems to me, are becoming more complex and confusing in the modern world." "Contemporary science is making it difficult to sustain such distinctions, and perhaps it can do something to clarify matters." (*Science*, 311: 303, 2006).

For another example, in January 2008, under the title of "Science and God in the Election", the Editor-in-Chief wrote - "Some of my scientist friends are religiously committed, others are actively disengages, and both kinds are principled. Most of them are disinclined to join the religion versus science debate, which has become uncomfortably combustible." (*Science*, 319:12, 2008)

In addition to the above mentioned *Nature* and *Science* editorials, other journals, all major scientific ones as far as I have read, had joined the new atheism movement, many with particular harsh tones (see examples of articles that appeared in *PNAS*, *NEJM*, *Lancet*, *FESBS*, *Cell*, *JCI* etc). Although there have been scientists standing out to defend faith, for example, the well-known Dr. Francis Collins

published a book, "*The Language of God, A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief*", it did not convince the mainstream science that science and faith can be bridged. Under the title of "Building bridges", *Nature* editorial comments on the book, "Given the scale of the gulf, that is a laudable ambition" (see *Nature*, 442:110, 2006).

The chaos between faith and science had remained, and it had reached its highest ever peak towards the end of 2008.

In fact this new atheism movement had been seemingly quite successful. For example, from my personal experience, by 2007 and 2008, I could hear neither any Christmas music nor any Christmas advertisements in the public media like TV and Radio stations even after Thanksgiving. I remember that we would usually begin to hear Christmas music and commercials from the media not long after Halloween. During 2007 - 2008 when I was mentioning God and faith to young generations, most of them were shaking their heads, and disinterested.

After the sharing of my work through multiple venues in early December 2008, things have changed since then. No more negative comments on God in those journals so far (as of November 2010 when this essay is being writing).

All of those above facts truly reflected the status of mainstream science toward religion. Therefore, my work was recognized by the top science editors, had influenced their work, and defined a new, right and better direction. (But they neither tell me nor the public that their significant transitions were due to the impact of my work, no credit for me.)

It is worth to notify that an initial study of entries from the Google search engine, including search in Wikipedia, defined that New Atheism, or the New Atheism

movement (2004-2008) was led by Harris S, Dennett D, Dawkins R, Stenger VJ, Hitches C, Pinker S, et al. Specifically, Harris has been hailed as the pioneer since his book, "The End of Faith", was published in 2004. But this is not the case in fact. As already demonstrated as the above, it had been mainstream science that had played a major role in the new atheism movement. Sometimes I also call it new scientific atheism moment. On the rise and fall of the new atheism movement from 2004 to 2008 will be continuously discussed elsewhere by me.

The second major impact – the Darwin fraud began to be corrected

The second major impact was on November 24, 2009, which was the 150th anniversary of the publication of Charles Darwin's book, "On the Origin of Species". But in fact, there was no celebration in major media, like newspapers - Wall Street Journal, USA Today, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, The Boston Globe, etc., and TV stations - Fox News, NBC, ABC, CBS, PBS etc. Only The New York Times published articles & photos but with the same idea as mine that placed Alfred Russel Wallace even more importantly than Darwin. My work was the single one to conclude the Wallace - Darwin theory of Natural Selection through scientific research. The discovery of faith evolution led me to intensively study evolution. My stance from very pro Darwin departed to pro Wallace in the discovery of Natural Selection Principle.

I looked at *The New York Times* published on the 24th November 2009. Very carefully, it is designed. Nothing is mentioned in the first page, and of course, no front lines for Darwin. Even in the Section of Science Times, there is no headline for Darwin. On the lower portion of its first page of Science Times, not the upper part is an article, "In

Snails and Snakes, Features to Delight Darwin” by Sean B. Carroll, with two pictures, Wallace’s was actually ahead of Darwin’s, not Darwin’s ahead of Wallace’s. Carroll wrote on Darwin, “In 1857, he wrote his first letter to the naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace, who was then making his way across the Malay Archipelago. Wallace’s own voyage and observations would independently lead him to the concept of natural selection.” He seems to recognize that Wallace and Darwin are co- discoverers of Natural Selection. However, the whole article was to “Delight Darwin”, reporting new study results on snails and snakes. It is with two photos - one of a pair of snails, and another one of jawbones of snakes by Cristina Grande and Nipam Patel. He hails Darwin’s “magnum opus”, which seems a contradiction to the overall design of the newspaper.

But in the third page of the Science Times, on the upper portion is an article, “Museum is Displaying Treasures of the other Evolution Pioneer” by Nicholas Wade, which is dedicated to Wallace. It is again with two pictures, Wallace’s was above Darwin’s, and it is with two additional larger photos of Wallace’s cabinet of species collections, and one drawer of butterflies openly and separately displayed. The article reports the whereabouts of the cabinet, which is owned by Robert E. Heggestad, who bought it when he was a young lawyer. It is loaned to the American Museum of Natural History for exhibition for the time being. Wade repeatedly wrote - Wallace “who had the idea of natural selection independently of Charles Darwin”; “Wallace conceived the idea of Natural Selection, while in Indonesia and described it in a letter to Darwin, promoting Darwin to announce his own theory on which he had been working for many years. Work by the two authors describing their versions of the theory of evolution were announced at a meeting of the Linnaean Society in 1858”; “After Darwin

published ‘Origin’ a year later, his book became the definitive statement of the theory, and Wallace’s role faded.” Therefore, from the delicate designation of the articles and photos in *The New York Times*, it can also be concluded that Darwin’s fraud began to be corrected, though it is far from enough in my opinion.

An indirect recognition...

On December 29, 2009, I wrote an email to *Nature Preceedings* and *Nature* reflected the above major impacts of my work and other related issues. Early spring this year, *Nature* published an editorial “Back to books Researchers should be recognized for writing books to convey and develop science.” (Feb 4, 2010). The editorial also states that “the effort and skill required to write a book needs to be rewarded in the career recognition of scientists who devote time to mastering the art to good effect – a recognition that is commonplace in the social sciences and humanities”. My recent work of two years 2008-2009 that I have published two books, “*Faith Science*” and “*Evolution Momentum*”, in the form of a draft last year, which are under copy- editing and certain updated revision for their second editions, was just slightly ahead of the editor’s appreciation of writing science books.

Submitted and communicated since November 22, 2010, modified March 24, 2011 and July 22, 2012.

How to cite this article:

Yang C. The Impact of Faith Science. Available at www.energinity.com/fsimpact.pdf

The first version of this essay is available at

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