

Science and Religion

Archbishop Charles Chaput <absp.cchaput@archphila.org> To: David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com> Cc: "Fr. John Nguyen" <fr.jnguyen@archphila.org> Tue, Jun 7, 2016 at 4:15 PM

Dear Mr. Roemer,

You overstate yourself when you say that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith wants you to instruct anyone. Please be honest. If this were true, the Congregation would have notified me and they didn't.

May God give you an honest heart.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

+cjc

From: David Roemer [mailto:david@dkroemer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 3:30 PM
To: Fr. John Nguyen; Archbishop Charles Chaput
Subject: Science and Religion

[Quoted text hidden]



The Magis Center

David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

Tue, Dec 20, 2016 at 7:53 AM s-adphila.org>

David Roemer <david@dkroemer.com>

To: "Charles J. Chaput" <shepherd@adphila.org>, John Chung Nguyen <fr.jnguyen@chs-adphila.org> Cc: "John C. McCarthy" <mccartjc@cua.edu>, Elizabeth Shaw <mail@reviewofmetaphysics.org>

Dear Bishop Chaput,

In your email to me dated June 7, 2016, you dismissed my claim that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith wants me to instruct the Catholic Church in the United States about the arguments for God's existence. There have been two developments arising from my mission that you, in particular, should be aware of because of your association with the Magis Center which promotes irrational arguments for God's existence.

Academic freedom is related to our drive as human beings to know and understand everything. Civil liberties, on the other hand, are rooted in our freedom of will. Columbia U. violated the academic freedom of its students and faculty by declining my offer to give a lecture/lesson on the arguments for God's existence. This is now a civil matter because the General Counsel of Columbia got involved, and I filed an ethics complaint against her with the New York State Unified Court System on October 18, 2016. The question of whether or not you can prove God exists is now a legal question in New York State.

The other development is that I got an email from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy asking me to document my criticism this entry

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmological-argument/

This entry completely ignores Etienne Gilson's understanding of the "cosmological-argument." It discusses only the irrational arguments promoted by the Magis Center. I'v asked the editors of the Review of Metaphysics, the Thomist, the Journal of the American Academy of Religion, and the New Oxford Review to help me assist the SEP. You can help be either withdrawing from the Magis Center or helping me submit the requested documentation.

I'v attached a lesson plan about God's existence, which is based on the following essay:

https://www.academia.edu/23340072/WHY_PEOPLE_BELIEVE_GOD_CAUSED_THE_BIG_BANG Very truly yours, David Roemer 347-414-2285





Bob Kurland 6 days ago (edited) +1.1 Reply thanks for your comment David. I was associated with Magis Center for a while, but I left, because I did not believe that science can "prove" the existence of God, anymore than it can disprove His existence. The standards of verification for science are entirely different from those for metaphysical or theological arguments. . Science is limited to verifying or refuting hypotheses that can be guantitated. If the theory is not guantitative it cannot be tested scientifically. I contend that everything science does show is entirely consistent with the presence of an omniscient, omnipotent Creator.

I don't understand your comment that the Big Bang "is evidence that God does not exist because it is evidence that God is not intelligible". A common theological point of view is that God being God, we can not know all that He is. This view was put forth by a number of theologians of old, including St. Thomas Aguinas and St. Augustine. Also, see my posts. .http://rationalcatholic.blogspot.com/2012/05/mathematics-handmaiden-of-theology.html and

http://rationalcatholic.blogspot.com/2013/04/god-symmetry-and-beauty-in-science-ii.html Show less