1) Briefly describe/explain the Nonoverlapping Magisteria (NOMA) concept.

The concept separates Science and Religion into two different fields of study rather than them being in conflict allowing respectful discourse from both sides in the pursuit of common wisdom.

2) According to Gould, does science and religion conflict? Explain why or why not.

Gould believes that science and religion do not conflict as each are withing their own sphere while science deals with facts and religion deals more with values.

3) Can science study souls? Why or why not?

I believe Science and study almost everything including souls but things like souls are much harder to gain evidence on and support which is mainly while they are used under the context of religion. While the soul would be hard to provide evidence for as there is no way to physically separate one from somebody and observe it, Souls can be studied to the best of our ability now.

4) Can religious literature be used as a source for scientific explanations (theories)? Why or why not?

Gould believes that religious literature can be used as evidence or at least can be used as insight into a study as long as its not taken literally. He uses evolution as an example in this case to support this as evolution is more of a scientific theory but based on how you read the bible, it also fits into place.

5) Is Gould’s NOMA concept fallacious (= fundamentally flawed by invalid assumptions or errors in logic)? If so, what are these flaws?

I do not believe so, the only possible thing that could be an invalid assumption is that religious followers do not take the bible literally as many are taught to take the word the God as the truth. While he sees the two being in two different spheres people involved into a dogmatic religion would not see religion as being a sphere of morals, they would also see it as literally truth.