



In This Issue

James K. A. Smith argues that science is always pursued by humans from a cultural perspective because anything human beings do is from a cultural perspective. This reminds us that our science pursuits can become entangled with false beliefs. What is claimed as a finding of science is not automatically a trump card.

In the next article, Robert Bishop describes, in an incisive history, the telling example of materialism creeping into the scientific endeavor. For Bishop, the *methodological* naturalism of the long-practiced scientific method should be quite distinct from the *metaphysical* naturalism that some have claimed rather vociferously of late. Confusing science with a metaphysical claim against God's reality and presence is an accretion of a materialist culture. Such is not entailed by scientific method properly understood and carried out.

In the following article, René van Woudenberg specifically delineates some of the limits to what science can describe. A great strength of the scientific method is in recognizing what it does not achieve,

as well as what it does. Science does not investigate or represent all that we know. Science is good at what it does, but due humility and accuracy require that we also recognize what it does not do.

In that honest context, Kathryn Applegate has found methodological naturalism to be an effective tool to understand much of God's creation. Applegate advocates that practicing science from the perspective of methodological naturalism, properly understood, is not anti-God, as some have charged. She appreciates as well that methodological naturalism offers a culture of cooperation and correction that helps people to work together across cultural divides.

Walter Bradley then gives us an example of directing the powerful tools of science and engineering to the service of the poor—a sterling use.

As always, ongoing discussion is crucial for potential insight and correction. In letters to the editor, Edwin Yamauchi and Kenell Touryan suggest an earlier date for the birth of Jesus than the one advocated by James Nollet in our December issue. Those letters are preceded by the always appreciated review of the latest books.

James C. Peterson, *Editor*



Reviewers in 2012

We wish to thank the following scholars for their crucial service in anonymous peer review.

Thomas Ackerman
Jon Cawley
Chris Dahm
Edward Davis
Jack Davis
Paul Evans
Michael Everest
Paul Fayter
Rebecca Flietstra
Patrick Franklin
Owen Gingerich
Brian Greuel
Hans Halvorson

Allan Harvey
D. Gareth Jones
Christopher Kaiser
Michael Keas
Joanna Klein
Arie Leegwater
H. Newton Malony
Keri McFarlane
Sara Miles
Alan Millard
Alan Padgett
Donald Petcher
Alvin Plantinga

D. B. Poli
Del Ratzsch
Richard Schaeffer
Aaron Sherwood
Arnold Sikkema
James Sire
Judith Toronchuk
Michael Valco
Christine VanPool
Dennis Venema
José Young
John Walton

