Scientia Moralitas International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
ISSN 2472-5331 (Print) | ISSN 2472-5358 (Online) | Vol. 11, No. 1, 2026
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21628195

Faith and Science in the Twentieth Century: Georges Lemaître, the Anthropic Principle, and the Legacy of John Paul II

Eng. **Florian Ionita**
PhD Cand., The Faculty of Roman-Catholic Theology, Bucharest University, Romania
florianionitaro@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This article examines the relationship between religious faith and the natural sciences during the twentieth century, focusing on cosmology, quantum mechanics, and the anthropic principle. Through a historical-interpretive review of the literature, the study traces how discoveries such as cosmic expansion and the fine-tuning of physical constants reopened metaphysical questions once considered closed. Particular attention is given to Georges Lemaître, whose theory of the primeval atom anticipated Big Bang cosmology, and to Pope John Paul II's addresses to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences. The analysis argues that although these findings do not prove a Creator's existence, they remain compatible with a theistic reading, reframing rather than resolving the science–faith debate.

KEYWORDS: Science, Faith, Cosmology, Anthropic Principle, Complementarity, Georges Lemaître, Big Bang, Epistemology

1. Introduction

The industrial expansion that began in the nineteenth century and accelerated through the twentieth created strong incentives to invest in research across mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and medicine. One of the by-products of this expansion, the heat engine, motivated fundamental research into thermodynamics, whose second law introduced the concept of entropy: the observation that, in an isolated system, disorder tends to increase and cannot spontaneously decrease without an external input of energy.

The second law carries an important cosmological implication. If the universe is a closed system subject to entropy, it cannot have existed for an infinite time, because an infinitely old system would already have reached maximal disorder. This observation led some physicists and philosophers of science to argue that the universe must have had a beginning, and, further, that whatever begins to exist requires a cause. This second step is a philosophical inference – sometimes called a kalam-type cosmological argument – rather than a conclusion of thermodynamics itself, and it is best treated as such rather than as a direct physical proof (Kragh, 2018).

Roughly contemporaneous with the development of thermodynamics, physics diversified into astrophysics, concerned with the macro-universe, and quantum mechanics, concerned with the micro-universe. Both fields would later be invoked in debates about the compatibility of science and faith, although neither can, by its own methods, establish or refute the existence of God.

Early astronomical tools – the spectroscope (1814) and the identification of the Doppler effect (1848) – allowed scientists to study the chemical composition and motion of distant stars. Building on these tools, Alexander Friedmann, a Russian mathematician, proposed in 1922 that the universe could expand or contract over time, a solution to

Einstein's field equations that Einstein himself initially rejected. Five years later, the Belgian mathematician, astronomer, and Catholic priest Georges Lemaître independently derived a law of proportionality between the recession velocity of galaxies and their distance, a relationship that Edwin Hubble confirmed observationally in 1929 at the Mount Wilson Observatory (Farrell, 2005; Holder & Mitton, 2013).

Hubble's observation that light from distant galaxies is systematically redshifted, and that the degree of redshift increases with distance, provided strong empirical support for Friedmann's and Lemaître's theoretical work. In 2018, in recognition of Lemaître's contribution, the International Astronomical Union recommended that this relationship be referred to as the Hubble–Lemaître law, although historians of science have noted that the episode is more historically complex than popular accounts suggest (International Astronomical Union, 2018; Kragh, 2018).

This opening episode sets the pattern for the rest of the article: a genuine and well-documented scientific development – the discovery of cosmic expansion – that reopened questions about origins which had seemed closed to earlier generations of physicists, and which has since been interpreted in different ways by scientists and theologians alike.

2. Quantum Mechanics and the Uncertainty Principle

Alongside the challenge that thermodynamics posed to the idea of an eternal universe, the emergence of quantum mechanics between 1900 and 1930 raised a different kind of philosophical question. Werner Heisenberg's uncertainty principle (1927), first outlined in a letter to Wolfgang Pauli, held that certain pairs of physical properties, such as position and momentum, cannot both be measured with arbitrary precision.

The philosophical significance (Rotaru, 2005a, pp. 431-446) of this result lies less in the mathematics than in what it implies about scientific observation itself. Heisenberg argued that quantum measurements yield knowledge about the outcomes of an interaction between the observer and the system, rather than direct access to an independently existing particle. Science, on this reading, is not a neutral observer of nature but an active participant in the phenomena it studies, since the method of investigation is inseparable from the object investigated.

This epistemic humility – the recognition that scientific knowledge is mediated and partial – does not, by itself, support any particular theological conclusion. Its relevance to the wider argument of this article is more indirect: it illustrates how mainstream twentieth-century physics itself came to question the strict, deterministic materialism of the nineteenth century, creating an intellectual climate in which questions once considered exclusively metaphysical could be discussed again alongside the natural sciences.

3. Relativity, Cosmic Expansion, and the Primeval Atom

In 1931, Lemaître proposed that the universe originated from a single, extremely dense "primeval atom," whose disintegration marked the beginning of space and time. The hypothesis met considerable resistance among physicists of the period. Arthur Eddington, Lemaître's former teacher, called the notion of an absolute beginning "philosophically repugnant," largely because, in his words, it suggested an act of creation. The astrophysicist Fred Hoyle, who coined the dismissive term "Big Bang" in 1949, also opposed the theory and publicly speculated that Lemaître's training as a Catholic priest had shaped his cosmology (Farrell, 2005; Holder & Mitton, 2013).

Lemaître himself consistently rejected any conflation of his physics with his faith, insisting that the primeval-atom hypothesis stood or fell on its empirical merits alone. He is also credited with being among the first physicists to propose that space and time themselves might be subject to quantization, and with anticipating the existence of a relic background radiation, later observed as the cosmic microwave background.

The historical record therefore supports two separate claims that should not be merged: first, that Lemaître's science met the ordinary standards of physical argument and was eventually vindicated by observation; and second, that some of his contemporaries' resistance to the theory was influenced, at least in part, by its perceived theological implications rather than by physics alone (Kragh, 2018). This episode illustrates how metaphysical assumptions can shape the reception of a scientific theory, independently of the theory's own validity, and it is this entanglement – not the physics of the Big Bang as such – that bears most directly on the relationship between science and faith.

4. The Incompleteness Theorem and Its Limits

In 1931, the mathematician Kurt Gödel published his incompleteness theorems in "On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related Systems." The theorems establish, in outline, that any consistent formal axiomatic system powerful enough to express elementary arithmetic contains true statements that cannot be proven within that system, and that such a system cannot demonstrate its own consistency using only its own axioms.

Gödel's result is a precise, technical statement about the limits of formal axiomatic systems in mathematical logic. It has genuine philosophical implications for the philosophy of mathematics and for debates about the limits of formalism, but its scope is narrower than popular accounts often suggest. The logician Torkel Franzén, in a study devoted specifically to correcting such misreadings, cautioned that the incompleteness theorems are frequently invoked in theological, anti-mechanist, and postmodern arguments in ways that extend far beyond what the theorems formally establish (Franzén, 2005). Any appeal to Gödel's theorem in support of a theological claim – for instance, that human reason is necessarily incomplete without revelation, or that a transcendent mind is required to "complete" what formal systems cannot – should therefore be treated as an analogy or a philosophical extrapolation, not as a mathematical entailment of the theorem itself.

It remains a documented biographical fact, independent of what the theorem itself proves, that Gödel held a personal, rationalist, and broadly theistic philosophical outlook and defended versions of the ontological argument for God's existence in his own philosophical writings. This is a fact about Gödel the philosopher, not a conclusion of Gödel the mathematician, and the two should be kept distinct.

For the purposes of this article, the incompleteness theorem is best read as a cautionary case study: it shows how a genuine and important scientific result can be, and often has been, stretched beyond its proper domain in the science–faith debate. Used carefully, it illustrates only that even the most rigorous formal systems humans construct have inherent limits – a modest point about the scope of formal reason, rather than a proof of anything beyond it.

5. The Complexity of Life and the Origin of the Genome (1950–2003)

Advances in molecular biology in the second half of the twentieth century revealed the extraordinary molecular complexity of even the simplest living cells, including the coded information carried in DNA and the elaborate translation machinery of ribosomes and proteins. This complexity has led some authors to argue that the transition from non-living chemistry to the first living organisms was so improbable that it constitutes evidence of design.

That inference should be distinguished carefully from what origin-of-life research has actually established. The Miller–Urey experiment (1953) demonstrated that amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, can form spontaneously from simple gases under conditions thought to resemble early Earth (Miller, 1953, pp. 528–529). Since then, researchers have proposed several competing models for the emergence of self-replicating chemistry, including the RNA-world hypothesis and metabolism-first models, and have used comparative genomics to reconstruct probable features of the Last Universal Common Ancestor, or LUCA, estimated to have lived roughly 3.5 to 4.2 billion years ago (Weiss et al., 2016). The mechanism by which life first arose remains an open and actively researched empirical question in biology, not a settled case for either a purely naturalistic or a designed origin.

It is on this point that caution is especially warranted: the current absence of a complete, experimentally verified account of abiogenesis is a genuine and interesting gap in scientific knowledge, but an evidentiary gap is not, by itself, positive evidence for a designer. Treating it as such risks the “God-of-the-gaps” pattern that many theologians, no less than scientists, have long cautioned against, since it makes the argument for God's existence hostage to the current, and likely temporary, limits of a single field of research.

What can be said with more confidence is that the sheer molecular complexity of even minimal living systems raises the bar for any purely reductive account of life's origin, and that this complexity is itself a legitimate object of ongoing scientific inquiry. In the context of this article's broader argument, the biology of life's origin illustrates a recurring theme: twentieth-century science repeatedly discovered structures and processes far more intricate than earlier materialist assumptions had predicted, without thereby settling the philosophical question of whether that intricacy points beyond nature itself.

6. The Anthropic Principle and the Fine-Tuning of Physical Constants (1960–2000)

A separate line of argument, developed mainly from the 1960s onward, concerns the apparent fine-tuning of the physical constants that govern the universe. Physicists have catalogued roughly twenty independent constants – governing, among other things, the strength of gravity, the cosmological constant, and the ratio of matter to radiation – whose values appear to fall within a narrow range compatible with the formation of stars, heavy elements, and, ultimately, life. This observation gave rise in the 1970s to what is now called the anthropic principle, from the Greek anthropos, or “human being” (Barrow & Tipler, 1986).

The physicist Luke Barnes, in a widely cited review of the fine-tuning literature, distinguished the empirical claim from its interpretation: that many constants occupy a narrow life-permitting range is a matter of calculation that is not seriously disputed among physicists, but what that narrow range implies is genuinely contested (Barnes, 2012). Some physicists treat fine-tuning as evidence for a multiverse, in which our observed constants are simply the ones compatible with observers existing to measure them; others regard the anthropic principle itself as a tautology that explains nothing on its own, since a selection effect only tells us that we could not observe a universe incompatible with our own existence, not why such a universe exists at all (Barnes, 2012, pp. 529–564.). Still others, in both physics and theology, read fine-tuning as more consistent with a designed universe than with an unguided one (Barrow & Tipler, 1986; McGrath, 2009).

This article does not attempt to adjudicate that debate, which remains open among specialists in physics, philosophy of science, and theology alike. What can be stated with more confidence is the narrower, empirical point: the values of the relevant physical constants are, as a matter of measurement, considerably more constrained than a naive expectation of randomness would predict. Whether this constraint calls for a physical explanation (such as a multiverse), a design explanation, or is better understood as a feature of physical law we do not yet fully grasp, is a question that exceeds the competence of physics alone to settle.

Within the argument of this article, fine-tuning functions similarly to the origin-of-life question in Section 5: it is a well-documented empirical finding that has reopened a metaphysical conversation the early twentieth century had largely closed, without itself constituting proof for either a naturalistic or a theistic conclusion.

7. Textual Antiquity and Interpretive Claims in the Hebrew Bible

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 gave scholars, for the first time, access to Hebrew biblical manuscripts dating from roughly the third century BCE, centuries earlier than the previously available medieval Masoretic codices. Comparative textual criticism has since shown a high degree of consistency between the Qumran manuscripts and the later Masoretic tradition, particularly for the Torah and the Prophets, alongside a smaller number of genuine textual variants (Tov, 2012). This finding strengthens confidence in the transmission history of the Hebrew Bible; it is a conclusion of textual criticism, however, and should not be conflated with a claim about the scientific or historical accuracy of the text's content, which is a separate question.

Some authors have further argued that certain cosmological (Rotaru, 2005b pp. 295-324) or anthropological statements in the Hebrew Bible – for example, that the universe had a beginning, or that humanity shares a single common ancestry – anticipated later scientific findings in ways that would have been difficult for an ancient Near Eastern culture to arrive at independently. This argument should be treated with particular caution. Many ancient cosmogonies, not only the biblical one, include an account of a beginning, so the observation is less singular than it may first appear; and the comparison sometimes drawn between the biblical account of a single origin for humanity and the population-genetics concepts of “Y-chromosomal Adam” and “mitochondrial Eve” rests on a common misunderstanding. These are technical terms for the most recent common patrilineal and matrilineal ancestors of currently living humans; population geneticists date them to different periods and do not treat them as a literal single first couple living together, so the parallel with Genesis is, at most, a loose analogy rather than a scientific equivalence.

A more defensible claim, and the one this article adopts, is the historical-literary one: the Hebrew Bible's insistence on a single, non-idolatrous Creator (Rotaru, 2005c, pp. 35-52), its refusal to deify any human ruler, and its account of a temporally bounded cosmos are distinctive within the literature of the ancient Near East, and they are transmitted in texts whose textual stability is now well documented by manuscript evidence (Tov, 2012). Whether that distinctiveness reflects revelation, as the author of the source text and much of the theological tradition maintain, or simply a particular society's theological and philosophical trajectory, as a purely historical account would maintain, is a question this article leaves open rather than resolves.

This section illustrates, more than any other, the central methodological caution this revision seeks to apply throughout the article: textual and historical claims about the Bible's antiquity and transmission are properly the domain of textual criticism and history, and should be argued on that evidence, while claims about what those texts reveal about ultimate reality belong to theology and philosophy, and should be argued, and clearly labelled, as such.

8. The Catholic Church and Science: The Witness of Pope John Paul II (1978–2005)

Karol Wojtyła, the first Slavic pope and the first non-Italian pope in more than four centuries, made engagement with the scientific community a recurring theme of his pontificate. His first address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, delivered on 10 November 1979 to mark the centenary of Albert Einstein's birth, described the search for truth as the shared task of both science and faith and called for a formal re-examination of the Galileo affair (Pontifical Academy of Sciences, 1979). In that same address, John Paul II quoted Georges Lemaître, a former president of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, on why the Church should take an interest in scientific inquiry: nothing genuinely human, Lemaître had argued, is foreign to Christian concern, and the believing scientist shares with the unbelieving one the same task of deciphering the workings of nature, differing only in the confidence that the puzzle has, in principle, a solution (Pontifical Academy of Sciences, 1979).

Across his pontificate, John Paul II returned repeatedly to the ethical dimension of scientific progress, particularly regarding weapons of mass destruction, the applications of genetics, and environmental responsibility, and he appointed more than a hundred members to the Academy, including the physicist Stephen Hawking. His recurring position, consistent with that of Lemaître, was one of complementarity: the Church and the scientific community, though methodologically distinct, were understood as engaged in a shared human project rather than as rivals for the same explanatory territory.

This section grounds the article's broader argument in an institutional example: the model of complementarity was not merely a philosophical proposal advanced by individual scientists such as Lemaître, but was also adopted, over several decades (Rotaru, 2023, pp. 62-79), as the working position of the Catholic Church's own scientific academy, lending the model both historical continuity and institutional weight.

9. Conclusions

Discussions of the relationship between faith and science continue, and will likely continue, as astrophysics and molecular biology keep producing new findings. Recent examples include the observational evidence for dark matter and dark energy, thought to account for roughly eighty percent of the universe's total mass-energy content; the unexpectedly high radiation density measured by the Voyager probes in interstellar space; and the 2012 confirmation of the Higgs boson, popularly termed the “God particle,” at CERN.

Recognition of Georges Lemaître's specific contribution to cosmology came comparatively late: only in 2018 did the International Astronomical Union recommend renaming Hubble's law as the Hubble–Lemaître law, a decision that has itself been the subject of historical debate about how credit for the discovery of cosmic expansion should properly be apportioned (International Astronomical Union, 2018; Kragh, 2018). Throughout his career, Lemaître maintained that his scientific work and his priesthood coexisted without contradiction, as two distinct and, in his view, complementary domains.

His theoretical framework remains consistent with observations from the Hubble and James Webb Space Telescopes, though recent images from the latter, which show large, well-formed galaxies earlier in cosmic history than standard models anticipated, have prompted revisions to the details of early galaxy formation rather than a rejection of Big Bang cosmology itself.

This article has argued that the proper relationship between twentieth-century science and religious faith is best described as complementarity rather than either conflict or proof. Repeatedly – in thermodynamics, quantum mechanics, cosmology, the incompleteness theorem, molecular biology, and fine-tuning – mainstream science reopened metaphysical questions that earlier materialist assumptions had treated as closed, without thereby resolving them in favor of either a purely naturalistic or a theological account. The Catholic Church, through the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and figures such as Georges Lemaître and John Paul II, has consistently promoted this complementary model rather than claiming that scientific discoveries constitute proofs of faith. Future research, particularly on the origin of life and the interpretation of fine-tuning, is likely to keep this conversation active rather than settle it.

References

Barnes, L. A. (2012). The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 29*(4), 529–564.

Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). *The anthropic cosmological principle.* Oxford University Press.

Farrell, J. (2005). *The day without yesterday: Georges Lemaître, Georges Lemaître, and the birth of modern cosmology.* Thunder's Mouth Press.

Franzén, T. (2005). *Gödel's theorem: An incomplete guide to its use and abuse.* A K Peters.

Holder, R., & Mitton, S. (2013). *Georges Lemaître: Life, science, and legacy.* Springer.

International Astronomical Union. (2018). *IAU members vote to recommend renaming the Hubble law as the Hubble–Lemaître law* [Press release]. https://www.iau.org/news/pressreleases/detail/iau1812/

Kragh, H. (2018). Hubble law or Hubble-Lemaître law? The IAU resolution. *arXiv.* https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.02557

McGrath, A. E. (2009). *A fine-tuned universe: The quest for God in science and theology.* Westminster John Knox Press.

Miller, S. L. (1953). A production of amino acids under possible primitive earth conditions. *Science, 117*(3046), 528–529.

Pontifical Academy of Sciences. (1979). *Address of John Paul II on the centenary of the birth of Albert Einstein.* https://www.pas.va/en/magisterium/saint-john-paul-ii/1979-10-november.html

Pontifical Academy of Sciences. (n.d.). *Pope John Paul II.* Vatican.

Rotaru, I-G. (2005a). *Istoria filosofiei, de la începuturi până la Renaştere [History of Philosophy, from the Beginning to the Renaissance].* Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Rotaru, I-G. (2005b). Logosul şi înţelepciunea (Logos and wisdom). In A. Boboc, N.I.Mariş, *Studii de istorie a filosofiei universale [Studies in the History of World Philosophy]* (XIII, pp. 295-324). Editura Academiei Române.

Rotaru, I-G. (2005c). *Aspecte antropologice în gândirea patristică şi a primelor secole [Anthropological Aspects in Patristic Thinking and the Early Centuries].* Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Rotaru, I-G. (2023). Aspects of Biblical Philosophy on the Development of World Civilizations. *Scientia Moralitas. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 8*(1), 62-79.

Tov, E. (2012). *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.). Fortress Press.

Weiss, M. C., Sousa, F. L., Mrnjavac, N., Neukirchen, S., Roettger, M., Nelson-Sathi, S., & Martin, W. F. (2016). The physiology and habitat of the last universal common ancestor. *Nature Microbiology, 1,* 16116. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.116