
```

+--+
| |
          SCIENCE AND FAITH
+-----+ +-----+
+-----+ +-----+   Vol 10, No. 1   May 2004
| |
| |   A publication of
| |   The Gospel and Information Network
+--+

```

```

--
O---
O<-<-<
+-----+
||      | through ||
|| Col  | Him    ||
|| 1:16 | and    ||
||      | for    ||
||      | Him    ||
|+-----+ +-----+|
|-----+ +-----+|
O _ /
// \\
\O/
!
/ \

```

Article archive available at www.mikelanderson.com

Unless otherwise indicated, copyright is held by the individual authors of the articles. This e-zine may be freely copied on condition it is done so in its entirety without alteration and free of charge.

To subscribe to Science & Faith put subscribe science_and_faith in the subject line of an e-mail message to scienceandfaith@mikelanderson.com

To unsubscribe to Science & Faith put unsubscribe science_and_faith in the subject line of an e-mail message to scienceandfaith@mikelanderson.com

Co-editors: Andy D Potts, Mike L Anderson

CONTENTS

Wisdom from the Past

WHITSUNDAY..... (John Keble)

When God of old came down from Heaven,
 In power and wrath He came;
 Before His feet the clouds were riven,
 Half darkness and half flame:

John Keble was Professor of Poetry at Oxford. The Christian Year, from which this excerpt is taken, was published in 1827.

Humour from the Web
 COOKING, PHYSICS AND SAVVY

ENGLISH IS TOUGH STUFF

NEWS BRIEFS..... (From the Internet)

- * Are fathers becoming obsolete?
- * Craft launched to test Einstein's theory
- * Domestication of cats pushed back
- * Sedna's behaviour stumps astronomers
- * Building up rather than breaking down a cell
- * South African fashion of 75 000 years ago
- * A single gene pivotal for human evolution
- * The end of a law in computer science?
- * If Greenland goes...
- * Who or what is belching methane on Mars?

Spot the Fallacy

DISSECTING DILEMMAS OR HOW MANY KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THERE IN THE WORLD?
.....(Mike L Anderson)

* Feature article *

SCIENCE AND RELIGION(H.R.L. Sheppard)

"However much controversy between science and theology must continue, there is not, and I do not think there can be, any controversy between science and Jesus Christ. Science deals with objective, concrete facts, and deals with them by a method of abstraction, which usually seems (to me) to leave out of its conclusions just the things that matter most to humanity; but, on the other hand, Jesus gives me precisely that scale of values which, as Professor Huxley for instance admits, science because of its necessarily limited outlook and methods can never give. Science certainly can and does help us to live a fuller and healthier life, physically and mentally, than we could otherwise attain to; but just as certainly there are whole realms of light, emotional, artistic, and religious, which are altogether outside its legitimate sphere."

The Very Reverend H.R.L. Sheppard was Dean of Canterbury. This essay was taken from "Science & Religion: A Symposium": (1931) Gerald Rowe, Ltd., London, pp. 83-92.

Wisdom from the Past

WHITSUNDAY John Keble

And suddenly there came a sound from Heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.
(Acts 2:2-4)

When God of old came down from Heaven,
In power and wrath He came;
Before His feet the clouds were riven,
Half darkness and half flame:

Around the trembling mountain's base
The prostrate people lay;
A day of wrath and not of grace;
A dim and dreadful day.

But when he came the second time,
He came in power and love,
Softer than gale at morning prime
Hovered His holy Dove.

The fires that rushed on Sinai down
In sudden torrents dread,
Now gently light, a glorious crown,
On every sainted head.

Like arrows went those lightnings forth
Winged with the sinner's doom,
But these, like tongues, o'er all the earth
Proclaiming life to come:

And as on Israel's awe-struck ear
The voice exceeding loud,
The trump, that angels quake to hear,
Thrilled from the deep, dark cloud;

So, when the Spirit of our God
Came down His flock to find,
A voice from Heaven was heard abroad,
A rushing, mighty wind.

Nor doth the outward ear alone
At that high warning start;
Conscience gives back th' appalling tone;
'Tis echoed in the heart.

It fills the Church of God; it fills
The sinful world around;
Only in stubborn hearts and wills
No place for it is found.

To other strains our souls are set:
A giddy whirl of sin
Fills ear and brain, and will not let
Heaven's harmonies come in.

Come Lord, Come Wisdom, Love, and Power,
Open our ears to hear;
Let us not miss th' accepted hour;
Save, Lord, by Love or Fear.

Humour from the web
COOKING, PHYSICS AND SAVVY

One day during cooking class, our teacher, Mrs. Pritchard, was extolling her secrets for preparing perfect sauces. When she ordered us to the stoves to prepare our assignments, she said, "Don't

forget to use wooden spoons." As I stirred my sauce, I contemplated the physics behind the mystery of the wooden spoon and decided it must have something to do with heat conduction. I approached Mrs. Pritchard to test my theory.

"Why wooden spoons?" I asked.

"Because," she replied, "if I have to sit here listening to all your metal spoons banging against metal pots, I'll go nuts!"

ENGLISH IS TOUGH STUFF

Dearest creature in creation
Study English pronunciation.
I will teach you in my verse
Sounds like corpse, corps, horse, and worse.
I will keep you, Suzy, busy,
Make your head with heat grow dizzy.
Tear in eye, your dress will tear.
So shall I: Oh hear my prayer.

Just compare heart, beard, and heard,
Dies and diet, lord and word,
Sword and sward, retain and Britain.
(Mind the latter, how it's written.)
Now I surely will not plague you
With such words as plague and ague.
But be careful how you speak:
Say break and steak, but bleak and streak;
Cloven, oven, how and low,
Script, receipt, show, poem, and toe.

Hear me say, devoid of trickery,
Daughter, laughter, and Terpsichore,
Typhoid, measles, topsails, aisles,
Exiles, similes and reviles;
Scholar, vicar, and cigar.
Solar, mica, war and far;
One, anemone, Balmoral
Kitchen, lichen, laundry, laurel;
Gertrude, German, wind and mind,
Scene, Melpomene, mankind.

Billet does not rhyme with ballet,
Bouquet, wallet, mallet, chalet.
Blood and flood are not like food,
Nor is mould like should and would.
Viscous, viscount, load and broad,
Toward, to forward, to reward.
And your pronunciation's OK
When you correctly say croquet,
Rounded, wounded, grieve and sieve,
Friend and fiend, alive and live.

Ivy, privy, famous; clamor
And enamour rhyme with hammer.
River, rival, tomb, bomb, comb,
Doll and droll and some and home.
Stranger does not rhyme with anger,
Neither does devour with clangor.
Soul but foul, haunt but aunt,
Font, front, wont, want, grand, and grant,
Shoes, goes, does. Now first say finger,
And then singer, ginger, linger,
Real, zeal, mauve, gauze, gouge and gauge,
Marriage, foliage, mirage, and age.

Query does not rhyme with very,
Nor does fury sound like bury.
Dost, lost, post and doth, cloth, loth.
Job, knob, bosom, transom, oath.
Through the differences seem little,
We say actual, but also victual.
Refer does not rhyme with deafer.
Foefter does, and zephyr, heifer.
Mint, pint, senate and sedate;
Dull, bull, and George ate late.
Scenic, Arabic, Pacific,
Science, Conscience, scientific.

Liberty, library, heave and heaven,
Rachel, ache, moustache, eleven.
We say hallowed, but allowed,
People, leopard, towed, but vowed.
Mark the differences, moreover,
Between mover, cover, clover;
Leeches, breeches, wise, precise,
Chalice, but police and lice;
Camel, constable, unstable,
Principle, disciple, label.

Petal, panel, and canal,
Wait, surprise, plait, promise, pal.
Worm and storm, chaise, chaos, chair,
Senator, spectator, mayor.
Tour, but our and succor, four.
Gas, alas, and Arkansas.
Sea, idea, Korea, area,
Psalm, Maria, but malaria.
Youth, south, southern, cleanse and clean.
Doctrine, turpentine, marine.

Compare alien with Italian,
Dandelion and battalion.
Sally with ally, yea, ye.
Eye, I, ay, aye, whey, and key.
Say aver, but ever, fever,
Neither, leisure, skein, deceiver.
Heron, granary, canary.
Crevice and device and aerie.

Face, but preface, not efface.
Phlegm, phlegmatic, brass, glass, bass.
Large, but target, gin, give, verging.
Ought, out, joust and scour, scouring.
Ear, but earn and wear and tear
Do not rhyme with here, but ere.
Seven is right, but so is even,
Hyphen, roughen, nephew Stephen,
Monkey, donkey, Turk and jerk,
Ask, grasp, wasp, and cork and work.

Pronunciation - think of Psyche!
Is it paling, stout and spiky?
Won't it make you lose your wits,
Writing groats and saying grits?
It's a dark abyss or tunnel:
Strewn with stones, stowed, solace, gunwale,
Islington and Isle of Wight,
Housewife, verdict and indict.

Finally, which rhymes with enough -
Though, through, plough, or dough, or cough?
Hiccough has the sound of cup.
My advice is to give it up!!!

NEWS BRIEFS (From the Internet)

- * Are fathers becoming obsolete?
- * Craft launched to test Einstein's theory
- * Domestication of cats pushed back
- * Sedna's behaviour stumps astronomers
- * Building up rather than breaking down a cell
- * South African fashion of 75 000 years ago
- * A single gene pivotal for human evolution
- * The end of a law in computer science?
- * If Greenland goes ...
- * Who or what is belching methane on Mars?

* Are fathers becoming obsolete?

Japanese scientists have cajoled mouse eggs to develop into mice without first being fertilised by sperm. No male played any part in the reproduction. Since each mouse developed from its own egg it was genetically unique and not a clone. Since no male contributed a Y-chromosome, each mouse was female. This is not a problem now that females can reproduce without males. The report did not mention the gender of the scientists.

<http://snipurl.com/5vki>

* Craft launched to test Einstein's theory

Einstein's General Theory of Relativity predicts that the earth and other

astronomical objects bend space and time with their gravity. The prediction is a consequence of his view that gravity is an aspect of the structure of the cosmos and not a mysterious attraction between objects. Last month a probe was launched successfully that will spend a year testing the theory. The mission has taken 40 years of preparation at a cost of \$700 million. The craft is largely a three-ton container of liquid helium and will orbit the earth at about twice the altitude of space shuttles.

<http://snipurl.com/5ts3>

* Domestication of cats pushed back

Archaeologists have discovered the remains of a cat apparently buried next to its owner on the island of Cyprus. From the evidence of the tombs of Pharaohs, it was originally thought that the Egyptians were the first to domesticate cats as long ago as 2000 BC. This find pushes the date back thousands of years still. The report does not consider the possibility that it was humans that were domesticated by the cats.

<http://snipurl.com/5lsg>

* Sedna's behaviour stumps astronomers

The most distant known object in the solar system, Sedna, seems to make one rotation in about 30 earth days. This is so slow that astronomers presumed it had a moon. However, all efforts to find it have been futile. There are only two possibilities, according to Michael Brown of the California Institute of Technology. Either the moon is there with the Hubble Telescope missing it or it is not and scientists are deceived with Sedna actually rotating rapidly. What about the possibility that Sedna has recently lost its moon?

<http://snipurl.com/5q6o>

* Building up rather than breaking down a cell

Biologists have long studied the cell by breaking it down. Now, a group of scientists want to build a living one using non-living molecules from the bottom up. They are confident that it will happen even though the technology to do it will probably take more than a decade to perfect. The programme is expected to generate new approaches to distinguishing between life and nonlife.

<http://snipurl.com/5gs7>

* South African fashion of 75 000 years ago

It is still very controversial, but snail shells found along South Africa's coast may be the world's oldest jewelry. If the shells represent beads, at 75 000 years old, they push back the earliest date for the manufacture of human accessories by 30 000 years. According to Christopher Henshilwood, the significance of the find is that it supports the view that language and symbolic thought arose among modern humans long before they spread into Europe and Asia.

<http://snipurl.com/5r1r>

* A single gene pivotal in human evolution

Jaw muscles that took up too much room in the skull limited the intelligence of early hominids. Scientists have discovered that a single mutation in just one gene, two and a half million years ago, can account for the change in the shape of the jaw muscles that opened up space in the skull for a larger brain. The discovery was made by biologists at the University of Pennsylvania and the children's hospital of Philadelphia.

<http://snipurl.com/5b1s>

* The end of a law in computer science?

Since the invention of computers, the write/read speed of their storage devices has speeded up apparently inexorably. Is this an inviolable law? No. Scientists say they have discovered there is a limit to how fast the bits of the storage data can be magnetised in one direction or the other. The bad news is that this limit is only 1000 times faster than the best storage devices of today. Only 1000 times faster. Surely, this should be enough? But remember that Bill Gates once thought that 640K would be enough RAM for most computer users.

<http://snipurl.com/5vlu>

* If Greenland goes ...

If trends in carbon dioxide emissions continue then Greenland's ice sheet would melt in less than a millenium according to European researchers. All that is needed is an average year-round increase in temperature of just 3 degrees Celsius. And if Greenland goes...? The Netherlands, Bangladesh, New York and other coastal regions would be inundated by seven metres of ocean.

<http://snipurl.com/5kzt>

* Who or what is belching methane on Mars?

Scientists are puzzled by the discovery of methane in the Martian atmosphere. Living organisms, volcanoes or comets produce methane. While the amounts discovered are very

small (10 parts per billion), the excitement it has created among researchers has been huge. The rovers Spirit and Opportunity have already been successful in discovering physical evidence that liquid water was once present on Mars. Perhaps there are or were primitive Martians living on the planet after all.

<http://snipurl.com/5gs6>

Spot the Fallacy

DISSECTING DILEMMAS OR HOW MANY KINDS OF PEOPLE ARE THERE IN THE WORLD?

Mike L Anderson

"I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him;

'I am ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept His claim to be God.' That

is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus

said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic - on a level of the man who

says he is a poached egg - or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either

this man was and is, the Son of God; or else a madman or something worse. You can shut him up for a

fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord

and God. But let us not come with any patronising nonsense about His being a great human teacher.

He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to"(1).

This is how C.S. Lewis summarises his celebrated Lord-or-liar-or-lunatic trilemma. Sometimes such

trichotomous (or dichotomous) thinking is valid - you are either a minor or you are not, you are

either happy or nonhappy (2). You either have a driver's license, a learner's license or no

license. At other times such arguments are fallacious. Logician Trudy Govier explains that we

commit the fallacy called "faulty dilemma" when we falsely "classify ideas and situations in terms

of an either-or. ...Thinking that everything is either good or evil is a false dichotomy; it

polarizes our thinking by leading us to a false division of the world, one that ignores

complexities, neutral situations and situations not open to moral evaluation at all" (3). A joke

doing the rounds on the Internet illustrates the fallacy: "There are two kinds of people in the

world: those who think in binary terms, and those who do not." There are other categories. There

are the lucid that tend to think in binary terms when it is appropriate and who avoid thinking in

binary terms when it is inappropriate. And there are the woolly-minded that tend to think in binary

terms when it is inappropriate and avoid binary thinking when it is appropriate.

Was C.S. Lewis lucid or woolly-minded?

The Tichborne Claimant

It may be helpful to dissect another, theologically neutral, case. In 1854 Sir Roger Tichborne, heir to a fortune, disappeared with the ship Bella and was presumed drowned. Sir Roger's mother, Lady Tichborne could never accept her son's death. Then, a decade or so later an Arthur Orton from Australia sent her a letter in which he claimed to be her son. She believed him and gave him a dowry of 1000 pounds per year. The Tichborne claimant, as he came to be called, began a legal action asserting the title and the inheritance of the family estate (4). Are Orton's character and identity wholly separate issues? Well, no.

If Orton was wrong about being the heir, all sorts of things follow about his character. If he genuinely thought he was Sir Roger then he is mad. If he knew he was not Sir Roger then he is a liar. He is also a thief because he came to his money fraudulently and a scoundrel because he took advantage of the grief of an old woman. The moment Orton professed to be Sir Roger, his identity and character became inextricably entwined. To say Orton was wrong about being Sir Roger but a nice gentleman is ridiculous and an evidence of being a woolly-minded kind of person. The absurdity is compounded by the details of the case. Sir Roger was pale and slight with straight, dark hair and a tattoo on his left arm. Orton was ruddy, 145 kg with wavy, fair hair and no tattoo. Sir Roger spoke fluent French. Orton did not understand a word. The "largest and most ludicrous imposter of all time" (5) lost his suit and was immediately tried and convicted of perjury. Evidently the courts saw a connection between Orton's identity and character.

Similarly, once Jesus claimed deity, His teachings and indeed, character, become inextricably entwined. Jesus claimed to be God and acted as God. As a consequence of this claim Lewis argues that Jesus is either Lord, liar or lunatic.

Not everyone finds the argument cogent. Philosopher John Beversluis declares that it is "perfectly legitimate to suggest that Jesus was a great moral teacher even though he was not God. Because of the manner in which it denies this obvious fact, the Lord-or-lunatic dilemma is the most objectionable of Lewis's many attempts to confront us with false dilemmas and to formulate non-exhaustive sets of options in emotionally inflammatory ways (6). "Lewis failed to realise that the question of whether Jesus' factual claims about himself are true is wholly separate from the question of whether his teachings are sound" (7).

Is Beversluis right? Let us do some dissecting again. It all depends on what Jesus actually taught. What answer did He give to timeless moral and spiritual questions? Did He locate the answers in some doctrine external to Himself or in Himself? Did Jesus say 'this is the truth' or did He say 'I am the truth.' Did he say 'this is the door' or did he say 'I am the door.' If Jesus says 'I am the door' when he is actually not then both His claim about Himself and His teaching are false. It is that simple. What did Jesus actually teach? Let us hear from Him.

"Remain in me, and I will remain in you. No branch can bear fruit by itself; it must remain in the vine. Neither can you bear fruit unless you remain in me" (8).

What is the key to morality? Jesus.

"I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me." (9).

How do we gain access to God. Jesus.

Then Jesus declared, "I am the bread of life. He who comes to me will never go hungry, and he who believes in me will never be thirsty" (10).

How do we have our spiritual hunger and thirst satisfied? Jesus.

"I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in me will live, even though he dies; and whoever lives and believes in me will never die" (11).

How do we obtain eternal life? Jesus.

"I told you that you would die in your sins; if you do not believe that I am the one I claim to be, you will indeed die in your sins" (12).

How do we avoid dying in our sins? Jesus.

Could Rabbi Jesus Christ have taught about Himself more plainly? He, himself is the means to moral and spiritual life. His teaching and His identity go together and must be accepted or rejected together. He cannot be just a nice, moral gentleman-teacher. It is that simple. Those who claim otherwise are being obscurantist.

Far from being faulty, C.S. Lewis's trilemma is a particularly forceful instance of lucid thinking.

Ironically, while Beversluis rejects Lewis's appropriate binary thinking, he falls into binary thinking when it is inappropriate. He writes of "the predicament of the orthodox believer caught between the indefensibility of traditional natural theology on the one hand and the failure of contemporary fideism to preserve the content of faith on the other"(14). However, where he sees a toggle switch, traditional theologians actually see a volume control (to use a

modern metaphor!) In a review of the traditional view, Alan Richardson writes (15) that this "natural knowledge of God, it was held, does not give to man all that he needs to know, it is not saving knowledge, and it cannot satisfy the craving of the human soul for that measure of truth which is beyond the natural capacity of the human mind."

If there is anyone justified in validly thinking in binary terms it is the Father. We are all so vile compared to His Holy Majesty that He cannot tolerate us in His presence. "You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live"(16). This is why the ancients were so terrified to get close to God (17). They knew well that the "Lord our God is holy" (18), whereas "all [humans] have sinned and fall short of the glory of God"(19). There is a divide between the category "Holy" and the category "sinful" that leads to our spiritual death. "For the wages of sin is death"(20). Yet, He did not set us apart from Himself as irredeemably wicked. In His genius and grace, He created a new category - "the ransomed" (21). God paid the price Himself with the death of His only beloved Son. Those who believe in the One whose claims, character and commands match perfectly, become a new kind of person- the redeemed.

Notes

1. Lewis, C.S. (1944) Mere Christianity William Collins Sons & Company, Ltd. p. 52
2. Notice that nonhappy is not the same as unhappy. Happy versus nonhappy is a valid dichotomy. Happy versus unhappy is not because it is possible to be neutral - neither happy or unhappy.
3. Govier, T. (1997) A Practical Study of Argument. Wadsworth Publishing Company, p. 223.
4. Blundell, N. (1982) The World's Greatest Crooks and Conmen and other Mischievous Malefactors. Octopus Books, Ltd., London, p. 154-155.
5. Ibid. p. 154
6. Beversluis, J. (1985) C.S. Lewis and the Search for Rational Religion. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, p. 57.
7. Ibid. p. p. 55
8. John 15:4.
9. John 14:6.
10. John 6:35.
11. John 11:25-26.

12. John 8:24.
13. Hebrews 1:2.
14. Beversluis, J. (1985) p. 166.
15. Richardson, A. (1947) Christian Apologetics. S.C.M. Press, Ltd., pp. 110-111.
16. Exodus 33:20.
17. Judges 13:22.
18. Psalm 99:9.
19. Romans 3:23.
20. Romans 6:23
21. Mark 10:45

 * Feature article *

Science and Religion

H. R. L. Sheppard

THE VERY REV H. R. L. SHEPPARD

Dean of Canterbury

I represent nothing higher than the untutored intelligence of the average man. That doubtless is why I was invited to address you. Most of the speakers in this Course have been distinguished and reverent-minded scientists. Though they differ from one another in their outlook and beliefs, they are alike in this-that scientific study is their primary interest.

A man's primary interest in life is in fact his real religion, whether he realises it or not; for religion, as I understand it, is either a manner of life or a mere pretence.

Science is not the primary interest of my life. My main interest is the Christian religion; by which I mean, Jesus Christ, His views about God, and His Sermon on the Mount. Scientific study has never, I am afraid, occupied any great space in my life; but, of course, I recognise that Science has made, and is making, a profound difference to my manner of living every day and every hour, and I am (who isn't ?) increasingly aware of my indebtedness to its triumphs. But especially am I grateful for its profound and thoroughgoing devotion to Truth.

I think I am right in saying that all the great discoveries of science are due to its steadfast pursuit of truth for its own sake. The practical application of science to the

material needs of mankind - however important - is an altogether secondary thing. This devotion to Truth should be an essential part of the adventure of Christianity.

In St John's Gospel are these words ' If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' Scientific truth has indeed set men free, in ever greater measure, from the haunting tyranny of ancient fears and superstitions. It has enlarged, in an amazing way, the boundaries of life. Sometimes when I read Our Lord's words, 'Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you ', I realise how at times it has been the scientist rather than the Christian who has responded.

But not all the blame for the conflict between Religion and Science rests upon those who profess and call themselves Christians - not all scientists, in the past or in the present, have shown either the interest in religion, which so many leading scientists are displaying to-day, or such readiness to acknowledge the limits of science as some of those who have lectured in this series have done. Indeed, for some years now, it has seemed that the leading minds in the religious world have appreciated the scientist's point of view a good deal better than the scientists have appreciated theirs.

It cannot be denied by anyone who has tried to understand the controversies between theologians and scientists during the last century, that if the theologians have often tried to defend propositions which have little to be said for them, beyond the fact that for centuries they have been traditionally received, the scientists have often extended mechanistic theory, which has proved fruitful in their own proper field of scientific research, to fields outside their province, and have tried by this means to explain away religion and to reduce life to a meaningless resultant of purely mechanical forces. If theologians are often far too slow to incorporate into the body of their thought and teaching the new discoveries of truth made by science, it ought to be remembered that amongst scientists themselves new theories rightly enough take considerable time to win anything like universal acceptance, and until they have won such acceptance it is impossible for theologians, who from the point of view of science are mere laymen, to accept this as part of established truth. When upon scientific questions the doctors (of science) differ, how shall the mere theologian decide which of them is right? Of course the enlightened theologian would rightly agree with Professor Huxley, that 'religion on its theological side should continue to take account of the changes and expansions of the picture of the universe which science is

drawing', but how is he to do so decidedly while different scientists are changing and expanding the picture in different, and sometimes mutually contradictory ways? For it is still true that the conclusions of different scientists are influenced very often by the particular philosophy which consciously or unconsciously colours most of their thinking.

Again, when a distinguished biologist speaks to me about the proper subjects of his science, I am more than ready to acknowledge and to submit to his authority; but when, ceasing for the time being to speak as a scientist and adopting the role of an amateur theologian, he tells me that he has reached the conclusion that there is no God and proceeds to give me singularly inadequate reasons for his belief, or should I say unbelief, he can hardly expect me to embody his conclusions in my theology, just because he happens to be an authority on biology.

My first business, it seems to me, as a learner, a student and a teacher of the Christian religion, is to continue seeking more and more earnestly to know, and to interpret to others, the mind of Christ; and even in this task I gladly and gratefully admit that, if not directly yet indirectly, science has helped me enormously, and will continue to help. Yet I expect I shall continue to feel as I have often felt in the past, that when pure intellect has shot its bolt, much remains to be said, which is not the less true because it requires for its expression the language of the poet rather than the sage. 'Not all men of science,' said Professor Malinowski last week, 'are satisfied with reason and the results of reason.'

However much controversy between science and theology must continue, there is not, and I do not think there can be, any controversy between science and Jesus Christ. Science deals with objective, concrete facts, and deals with them by a method of abstraction, which usually seems (to me) to leave out of its conclusions just the things that matter most to humanity; but, on the other hand, Jesus gives me precisely that scale of values which, as Professor Huxley for instance admits, science because of its necessarily limited outlook and methods can never give. Science certainly can and does help us to live a fuller and healthier life, physically and mentally, than we could otherwise attain to; but just as certainly there are whole realms of light, emotional, artistic, and religious, which are altogether outside its legitimate sphere.

As man needs bread but cannot live, in any true and full sense of the word, by bread alone, so I am persuaded that he needs science - organised, systematic knowledge of the world in which he lives, and of Nature of which he is himself the crown - but that he cannot live in the fullest, widest, and

noblest sense of the word, by science alone for, as the late Poet Laureate said
In The Testament of
Beauty: ' In truth " spiritual animal" was a term for man nearer than
"rational" to define his
genus; Faith being the humaniser of his brutal passions, the clarifier of
folly, and medicine of
care, the clue of reality, and the driving motive of that self- knowledge which
teacheth the ethic
of life.' ' Thou, oh God, hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts know no
rest until they rest in
Thee.' The old words of St Augustine remain as true for man in the modern world
as they were for
him who first uttered them.

It is through the practices of religion, prayer, meditation, and worship that
the spirit of man
rises above the flux, the distractions and disunities of this world of time
and space, and that
unchangeable law of unalterable sequences, which science has revealed, and
which is to the believer
only the most striking evidence of the steadfastness of the mind of God, into
that eternal world
where one in spirit with the author and sustainer of his life, he finds the
peace which, while in
very truth it passeth understanding, is none the less the most priceless (and
most practical) of
all experiences that mortal man can have.

Whoso hath felt the Spirit of the Highest
Cannot confound nor doubt Him, nor deny;
Yea, with one voice, O world, tho' thou deniest,
Stand thou on that side, for on this am I.

These well known words which Frederic Myers put into the mouth of St Paul have
found and will, I am
persuaded, continue to find an echo in the heart and mind of hundreds of
thousands of believers, and
it is for this reason amongst others that I have not the slightest fear that
science or scientists
can ever explain away religion, or destroy its basic truths, among which I
include the passionate
conviction, which alone satisfies a man's intellect as well as his heart, that
man can and often
does enter into personal communion with his Creator.

Would you listen to words written by the late Lord Balfour (Arthur James
Balfour) in his
Autobiography? He is paying tribute to his mother. Speaking of the
intellectual difficulties of
his youth, and of her attitude towards them and him, he writes: ' She saw that
the difficulties to
which I have adverted were of a kind which each man must deal with for himself,
and in his own way.
She was never tempted to discourage scientific study; she never treated it as
dangerous to the
higher life; she never took refuge in bad science when good science appeared to
raise awkward
problems. On the other hand, she never surrendered her own convictions as to
the inestimable value
of her central religious beliefs. This point of view, if I rightly represent
it, may have lacked

theoretic finish but it appealed to me in 1866, and after more than sixty years' reflection, it appeals to me still ' (1928).

This is the opinion of a very wise man, and I quote it for the encouragement of some who are listening. I do not think you and I need apologise if we hold on to our beliefs as simply and, let me hasten to add, as surely.

I could never subscribe to the plea that we are not meant to use our intellect with the utmost freedom in matters of religion. Each of us must be a free thinker, in the right sense of that word; but I do believe that intuition or inward vision can often take us out beyond mere logic, to the land where faith raises its head. 'Whereas I was blind, now I see', is not the expression of merely foolish credulity. When a man has reached inward certainty, he is not afraid of criticism.

Let me remind you of what Dr Cairns has written in a book which is not new but is well worthy of your attention, *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*. The author says that the following story about the late Lord Kelvin was told him by Principal Lindsay. Lord Kelvin said that he had never reasoned his way quite up to any one of his great scientific discoveries. He brooded over all the facts which seemed to him relevant to his problem, until there came a moment when his mind took a life-or-death leap away out into the unknown. He felt, in the very marrow of his being, the conviction that the solution lay just there, and it did. Dr Cairns declares that when he heard that story, he thought, 'How wonderfully like this is to faith- the spiritual in man that goeth out, not knowing whither it goeth, because it desireth a better country, even a heavenly'.

It is, after all, not to science but to religion that men turn instinctively in the times of their profound crises, whether national or personal, in great joy or in heartbreaking tragedy. Who will deny that they are right and wise to do so, when it is realised what stores of new faith and hope and courage; what new vitality; what fresh determination to face and turn to good all that life brings, whether of good or evil; what (if I may use an ugly but expressive word) guts have been drawn by multitudes of men from such moments of religious intuition? Since men first learned to see in the tragedy of the Cross and its sequel, in the new faith and courage of the first disciples, that there is no tragedy however apparently inexplicable which love has not the power to turn to greater account, not only for those upon whom its full weight falls, but through them for humanity at large, it has been possible for men at least to carry on, and even for the great-souled to cry 'Oh death, where is thy sting; oh grave, where is thy victory?' 'And

all the astonishing progress of science, so far from making that lesson unnecessary, has only made our need for it the more profound; for if by its discoveries science has done much to mitigate the physical suffering of mankind, and has even given us some hope of the ultimate conquest of disease, it cannot be denied that it has at the same time added much to the tragic side of life. All, or almost all, of its greatest triumphs have been won through incredible pain and suffering. How many martyrs to science have given health and life in the cause of research in Hospitals and Laboratories, as well as in perfecting new inventions which, rightly used, may mean so much to progress of mankind? Indeed, if the faith that removes mountains that persists in believing those things to be possible which the mass of mankind calls impossible; if hope which inspires men to go on and ever on to new experiments, in spite of oft-repeated failures ; if that utter self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice which are the only evidence of true love ; if those great cardinal Christian virtues are, as I believe they are, characteristic of the great pioneers of science-then we who call ourselves Christians ought to reverence these men as amongst the best and noblest of those who are not against us but on our side. They have gained victory because they sought not it but Truth.

I believe that if the leaders of science and religion -each recognising the need of what the other has to give (as I think you will allow each is increasingly ready to do)- would seek to work together in closest harmony for the common good of mankind, that golden age of which scientists have sometimes dreamed, and which Christians are wont to call the 'Kingdom of God on earth', might indeed soon be on its way. At the moment it tarries. Surely we need not less religion or less science, but more religion and more science - and, above all, better religion and better science. Scientists and leaders of religion working together, would, I fancy, be strong enough to ensure amongst other things what neither of them can do while they regard one another with mutual suspicion if not open hostility - that the inventions of science were used, not for the purposes of destruction, but for the benefit of mankind. If, for instance, the leaders of science and religion came together before the nations of the world to proclaim that to use scientific discoveries for the destruction of human life is at once a denial of true religions and the prostitution of science, would it not give an enormous new impetus to the cause of international peace?

I am not asking, or even desiring, that controversy between Scientists and Theologians should cease- it cannot cease. It would, I believe, be a pity if it should cease while science and theology are both so imperfect, and while to attain to a knowledge of ultimate Reality,

advance must proceed
along more than one path; but discussion and controversy between friends who
are seeking the Truth,
cost what it may, and who find that while there is much that they are agreed
upon, there are many
things about which they cannot as yet see eye to eye, may be one of the best
and most fruitful
things in life. It is a very different thing from controversy conducted in a
spirit of mutual
antagonism. We need much more light in our controversies, and much less heat,
than in the past.
Nobody who knows the trend of modern religious thought, and has read recent
statements of Christian
leaders - as, for example, those which were issued on the Doctrine of God from
Lambeth some weeks
ago - will question the progress that has been made since the controversies of
the Victorian days,
in the direction of truths learned from science, and I think the lectures
given by my distinguished
predecessors in this series are sufficient proof that the scientists on their
side have moved
forward to a completely new temper and outlook in regard to religious
questions. May not this fill
us with hope, not only for the future relations between religion and science,
but for the common
service that they may render together to the highest interests of mankind?

The Very Reverend H.R.L. Sheppard was Dean of Canterbury. This essay was taken
from "Science &
Religion: A Symposium": (1931) Gerald Rowe, Ltd., London, pp. 83-92.

=====