Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

Science and Religion - A New Movement of Thought?

Is science and religion beginning to take on the character of a new movement of thought? Clearly, it is not an ideology, it is far too varied in its content and orientations for that. However, is it possible to see in its wide-ranging ensemble of studies and activities, in its growing momentum, an articulation and convergence of deep interests and concerns that are now rising to prominence?

One reason for thinking that it does represent a gathering movement is its extraordinarily interdisciplinary character. It is attracting distinguished historians. The literature by professional scientists, particularly physicists, biologists and psychologists, on science and religion is growing at a remarkable rate, and constantly becoming more sophisticated. Theologians are no less productive. Philosophers of science and philosophers of ethics are making striking contributions to the field. And, as we see from the excerpts on insert page vi from a recent article published in the *Los Angeles Times*, sociologists are now taking a great deal of interest in the impact of religion on society.

There is a growing number of institutions and conferences, local, national and international, devoted to science and religion; an increasing number of graduate students working in the field; a veritable flood of literature, and support from foundations, even from professional and government institutions. One has a sense of a gathering confidence among scientists and other academic professionals to declare an interest in science and religion. At its margins eccentric studies may be going on, but the bulk of the research, conferences and publications are now of a good and even high scholarly quality. This movement is now so broad, and is institutionalising itself so effectively, that it is difficult to view it as a passing fashion.

Is it possible to identify some of the stimulating conditions behind this burgeoning of interest? These are very difficult to recognise and require considerable knowledge and discernment of developments at many levels in our society. Undoubtedly, much of the stimulus is so deep in western consciousness that it is invisible for the present. One can, nevertheless, wonder. Could there be a subtle change in the climate of thought among western scholars to religion? Not so very long ago it was possible to write a book about Newton which hardly touched upon his religion. Now it has become an issue of central importance in Newtonian studies. Is this simply a matter of the professional history of science gradually expanding its range of interests, or has the historiography of science acquired a kind of maturity and tolerance which now grants to religion the importance it has always had in science?

There is, of course, and always has been, an apologetic impetus to the study of science and religion by theologians. One has a sense, however, that this is rapidly becoming a thing of the past for serious theological scholarship in science and religion. The need for apologetics seems to have been overtaken by a critical study by theologians of history, methodology, epistemology and language - of both science and theology - which has taken the discussion far beyond the point where theologians feel the need to defend faith against scientific doctrines.

Turning to the growing number of professional scientists active in science and religion, it almost seems like yesterday when one generally equated being a scientist with being an atheist, even a scornful and aggressive atheist. Although never generally true, this seems to have been the public perception. Scientists loyal to their discipline and with faith commitments have been quietly getting together over the past fifty years or so and, perhaps to their growing surprise, have found that a scholarly analysis of the foundations of their science and of theology reveals that many of the apparently insurmountable incompatibilities between science and religion seem to dissolve away under careful and well-informed thought. Some have even found that their religious beliefs have prompted them to question the foundation in evidence for certain scientific theories, a debate which - if carried through rigorously - can be of benefit to science. Another possible reason for the growing confidence of this group may be the recognition that their interdisciplinary studies have given them literary, forensic and discursive skills and knowledge which not all of their scientific colleagues may possess. Paradoxically, perhaps, science itself has stimulated, and continues to stimulate, considerable research into issues of science and religion.

Quantum indeterminacy, the Big Bang theory, the discovery of so much fine-tuning in nature (which is being added to continuously), the debate over free-will and neurophysiology and the concept of a self-regulating biosphere contrasted with the scientific perception of an impending environmental catastrophe are, perhaps, the most prominent issues. Increasingly, philosophers of biology approach their discipline from an ethically concerned analytical perspective, rather than from the formalist and rather theory-laden approach of so much of the philosophy of physics. This means that all influences at work in the formation of biological theories and environmental values are treated equally seriously and this is giving rise to a very interesting examination of the religious influences that have been at work over the centuries in shaping biological thought.

One is also tempted to wonder whether the serious study of science and religion provides a welcome scholarly outlet for many, religious or otherwise, who are disturbed by an image of the cosmos and of the biosphere painted by some scientists which makes it purely materialistic, bleak, purposeless, and selfish, and governed by chance and impersonal laws. This view, which not only banishes the spiritual from nature, seems to threaten the meaningfulness of ethics and artistic endeavours as well.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

A Working Model for the Engagement of Religion & Science: Some Theses

Jitse M. van der Meer. The Pascal Centre. Redeemer College, Ontario. Email: jmvdm@redmer.on.ca

---

1. In my working model the engagement of religion and science has four main characteristics. It is anthropological, metaphorical, bi-directional and hermeneutical. I state the reasons for these characteristics in theses 2, 4, 6 and 8, and develop some implications in the remaining theses.

2. The relationships between religious belief and scientific knowledge of natural phenomena are mediated via the person because it is a person who stands in relationship to God and nature[1].

3. This anthropological view of the relationship employs a concept of knowledge that is wider than logical, propositional knowledge. The logical approach admits only of logical relations between propositions about God and nature. This view leaves the knower out of the picture or, more precisely, reduces the knower to a logical machine. Therefore, the logical approach sees the relationships as existing between two bodies of knowledge: religious and scientific knowledge. As a result this view accommodates only logical relationships. When the logical view is part of a modernist world view, it does not acknowledge the possibility of religious propositions which means that no relationship between religion and science is possible at all. In contrast, the relationship of knowing God and nature in which the person stands has many aspects because people are many-sided. These aspects include love, trust, imagination and logic. Michael Polanyi called it knowing by acquaintance. I will exemplify the importance of one of these dimensions, namely that of the imagination or creativity.

4. When we face the unknown, we tend to think about it in terms of what we know. For instance, we can think about organisms in terms of what we know about machines. We use the machine as a metaphor for the organism. The metaphor transfers knowledge about machines into the domain of knowledge about organisms. This transfer can occur between any two domains of knowledge, for instance, between sociology and biology. Malthus' view of selection in human society was transferred to the domain of biology by Darwin. Transfer of meaning may involve any religious belief, because making creative comparisons is a characteristic of general cognition and imagination, and not simply of religious cognition and imagination. All it requires is similarities between nature and a deity.

5. I work on the mediating role of metaphor between religion and science. The metaphor of the machine has been a common vehicle for the merger of beliefs about nature and a designer-God. Many allusions about organisms can be made under this metaphor. Machines are designed (i) by intelligent creatures, (ii) for a purpose (iii) that is particular, (iv) and imposed from the outside, (v) therefore, intelligible only in terms of external causes, (vi) requiring coordination of parts and of structure and function, (vii) and operating automatically once set in motion. Georges Cuvier's conception of purpose is formulated by thinking about organisms in terms of machines, particularly in terms of (ii-vi). Given that things similar in some respects may be expected to be similar in other respects, organisms were seen as designed by intelligent creatures for particular purposes.

   The distinguished French zoologist Georges Cuvier (1769-1832) plays a particularly important role in my model. His most important contribution to biology was that he drew attention to the organization and complexity of organisms as something requiring explanation. Other major accomplishments are the revamping of biological classification and the creation of comparative anatomy as a subdiscipline in biology. He saw nature as divine creation. Specifically, he thought about animals in terms of what he knew about God, particularly that God creates things for a purpose. This religious belief was translated into the metaphysical concept of the correlation of parts with which he refered to the idea that relations between organs and organisms are purposefull and flexible only within strict boundaries. This exemplifies a cognitive effect of religious beliefs in the zoology of Georges Cuvier. Such cognitive effects of religion in science are a special case of a wider range of cognitive effects from other sources and are due to the natural metaphoricity of human cognition.

6. Metaphoricity is often thought of as a characteristic of language, and this it is. However, it is in the first place a characteristic of cognition and creativity. When meaning is transferred between God and nature, scientific concepts are used with religious meaning, and religious concepts with scientific meaning. That is, meaning is located in the user rather than in the properties of scientific language[2]. This establishes conditions for the existence of logical relations between religion and science. Logical relations are possible only among conceptual beliefs, for instance, between conceptual beliefs about God and about nature, and then only if the two beliefs are mutually relevant. For instance, the belief that God is holy is not relevant to the belief that nature is deterministic. Or, the belief that nature is discontinuous seems to have no implications for the belief that God is patient. Mutual relevance exists when people think about God in terms of nature, such as in natural theology. It exists also when people think about nature in terms of God, such as in the belief that nature is deterministic because God does not play dice. Finally, mutual relevance exists when God reveals himself in terms of nature such as in a pillar of fire or in the wind or as God the Father or the Shepherd. I suggest, that as a result, religious concepts used with natural meaning can entail conclusions about nature. Likewise, nature concepts used with religious meaning can entail conclusions about God[3].

7. Metaphoric transfer of meaning and knowledge is in both directions. One can think about God in terms of what is known about nature, but also one can think about nature in terms of what is known about God. This is why I see the engagement between religious belief and scientific knowledge as bi-directional.

8. The metaphoric transfer of knowledge between domains makes the understanding in each domain a hermeneutical affair. This is obvious in the case of the interpretation of sacred texts. However, the understanding of nature in science is also hermeneutical because the links which exist between the theories and explanations of science and religious beliefs are indirect and involve judgement. Simplified, I envision such links as connecting several levels of generality moving down from world views via beliefs about the nature of reality to specific theories. At each level a particular belief or theory is

embedded in a network of other beliefs and theories. The vertical links are not entailment relations. This is so because scientific explanation is arrived at by combining beliefs of high level generality with auxiliary hypotheses. Choosing the latter is a matter of interpretive judgment and this means there are no necessary links between metaphor and scientific explanation[4]. Choosing a metaphor is also a matter of interpretive judgment and the choice is guided by the particular way in which one sees reality.

9. If both the metaphors and the auxiliary hypotheses that turn metaphors into theories are informed by a religious world view, there is an hermeneutical circle in which explanation presupposes a way of seeing reality. However, the circle is open for conceptual and empirical input. Physicists deal with physical reality, and physical reality is what physicists deal with, but this circle is open to checks for correspondences with the real world. It is the openness of the circle that ensures that a science informed by religious beliefs can remain a public affair. Science is not threatened by subjectivity, religious or otherwise, but is possible because of it.

10. Any metaphor selects an aspect of a known domain of knowledge. Therefore, any metaphor provides a limited view of the unknown domain into which it is imported. This raises the question how one can decide whether or not a scientific explanation is complete without taking a metaphysical or religious position? An understanding of the cognitive role of religious beliefs in science is relevant in understanding decisions as to whether an explanation of natural phenomena is complete. In reductive physicalism explanation is seen as complete when phenomena are understood as the result of physical causes because reality is seen as physical reality. In non-reductive physicalism such explanation is considered as incomplete because reality is seen as a multi-level system including higher-level phenomena occurring according to their own rules of cause and effect. It has been argued that for a description and explanation of psychological experience to be complete an explanation in terms of brain language needs to be complemented by one in mind language. Likewise, an explanation of religious experience in order to be complete requires two complementary explanations, a mind story and a religious story. In such arguments an explanation is assessed to be complete in light of a view of reality that is informed by metaphysical and religious beliefs.

11. I focus on one direction, the cognitive effect of religious beliefs in scientific knowledge because it is neglected[5]. The cognitive role of the machine metaphor is evident, for instance, in Cuvier's belief that “every animal may be considered as a particular machine, having certain fixed relations to all other machines that together form the universe”.[6] For Cuvier, the correlations between parts of an organism as well as between organisms are as fixed as the relations between machines. This is a constitutive effect of the machine metaphor on the content of his theory of the correlation of parts. A similar - and earlier - transfer of meaning occurred when Descartes derived the inertial law and the idea of conservation of the quantity of motion from the constancy of God.

1. Van der Meer, J. M. (1997) “The Concept of Human Nature in Science and Theology”. In *Studies in Science and Theology* 3: 187-192 (1995), eds. Gregersen, N.H., Parsons, M.W.) (Labor et Fides: Geneva); also: Van der Meer, J.M. (2000) “The Actor in the Interaction of Science and Religion. An Application of Dooyeweerd's Anthropology to the Study of Religion and Science Relations”. In: D.F.M. Strauss (editor). *Contemporary Reflections on the Philosophy of Herman Dooyeweerd*. (The Edwin Mellin Press: Lewiston), 179-190.
2. Soskice, J. M. (1985) *Metaphor and Religious Language*. (OUP: Oxford).
3. Jonas, H. (1984) *The Imperative of Responsibility. In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age* (U Chicago Press: Chicago), 44.
4. There is also a pre-theoretical way involving perception of the natural world and the manner in which this perception has been shaped by our home-culture including religion: Heelan, P. A. (1998) “The

emergence of new perspective practice in Vincent Van Gogh." Acta Polytechnica Scandinavica, Mathematics, Computing and Management Series. 91, pp. 315-324, Eds. George Farre, Tarkko Oksala Espoo. Finnish Academy of Technology, p. 318.
5. Van der Meer, J.M. (1999) "The Role of Metaphysical & Religious Beliefs in Science". In: *Studies in Science and Theology* 5: 247-256 (1997), eds. N.H. Gregersen, M.W. Parsons (Labor et Fides: Geneva). Van der Meer, J.M. (2000) "The Engagement of Religion and Biology: A Case Study in the Mediating Role of Metaphor in the Sociobiology of Lumsden and Wilson". *Biology and Philosophy* (Forthcoming).
6. Cuvier (1800) p. 19 quoted from Lenoir, Timothy (1982) *The Strategy of life: teleology and mechanics in nineteenth century German biology*. (Reidel: Dordrecht. Boston, London), 63.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

CCCU News

Oxford Seminar Steering Committee meets at CCCU

As we go to press, the John Templeton Oxford Seminar Steering Committee is convening in at the CCCU headquarters in Washington, DC (January 13). The steering committee is comprised of a dozen leading scholars drawn from the field of Religion and Science, many of whom have also served as lecturers during the summer seminar. New to the Steering Committee is **Randy Maddox**, who will bring his fresh perspective as a current member of the Seminar Program. Alister McGrath chairs this group, which works to advise the Program Team of McGrath and John Roche, along with CCCU VP for Professional Development, Ron Mahurin, concerning the current and future directions of the Templeton Oxford Seminar Program.

CCCU hosts Second Forum on Christian Higher Education

On February 7-9, 2001, The CCCU hosts its second Forum on Christian Higher Education in Orlando, Florida. Over 800 people are expected in attendance, to celebrate twenty-five years of a faithful past, and to look forward and consider the future challenges for Christian higher education. Among the plenary speakers and workshop presenters will be Charles Colson, winner of the 1993 Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion, as well as Dr. James Fowler, who has pioneered work in spiritual formation and faith development. **For more information about the Forum, go to the CCCU website: (http://www.cccu.org/events/forum/default.htm)**

Summer Disciplinary Workshops Offered

This summer, the CCCU will offer four disciplinary workshops in Theology, Sociology, English and History. Workshop conveners include Robert Webber, Wheaton College, (Theology), Christian Smith, UNC, Chapel Hill, (Sociology), Susan Van Zanten Gallagher, Seattle Pacific University (English) and George Marsden, University of Notre Dame (History). These workshops are designed to help CCCU faculty in a given field of study to focus on Christian perspectives for teaching and study within their discipline, and to provide a forum for sharing ideas about promising practices for teaching and scholar ship. For additional information on these and other upcoming CCCU workshops, go to www.cccu.org/projects.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

The John Templeton Oxford Seminars Summer 2000

There was a significant change of tone in the seminars held in Oxford from 16 July to 12 August 2000. The first seminars, 17 July – 13 August 1999, had brought together the same 31 faculty from North America and Europe to embark on a study and research project the goals of which included the launching of a substantial number of science faculty into interdisciplinary research in science and religion and the creation of high scholarly standards in this field. It was a learning experience for everyone, organisers and participants alike. We needed to discover best practices in the field -- in terms of methods of investigation: who were the senior scholars, what were the current issues and unexplored areas, how to assess the quality and extent of the literature and other resources available, and what were the publication and dissemination outlets? Again, we were uncertain at first about the structure and format we had chosen for the seminars. Were the lectures too long or too short? Was there enough time for discussion? Were there sufficient opportunities for the participants to interact with the lecturers and other senior scholars whom we had invited to participate? Was there enough time for study? Had we given the participants sufficient opportunities to present their projects and obtain feedback?

Few of the participants knew each other. They did not know how their colleagues would respond to their ideas: would there be tolerance, or amusement or even hostility? Who were the experts among them and who were the novices? Was it realistic to attempt to transform novices in science and religion into scholars in three years? Furthermore, how would these studies fit into the scholarly methos of Oxford: would they be welcomed, would there be hostility and would this enterprise even be noticed?

As the participants arrived at Wycliffe Hall for the second seminar series this summer, I immediately recognised that the mood was different. I was struck by the increased confidence and warmth they showed toward each other. They seemed at home in Oxford, much clearer about their objectives and very keen to begin working. As time went on, I became aware of more subtle changes. Personalities somehow seemed stronger and more sharply defined and yet the group was clearly working together much better as a team. There was a keener critique during discussions, yet this was combined with an atmosphere of high good humour. Lecturers were treated with courtesy and respect but in no sense were they placed on a pedestal: they were welcomed as part of a very confident team which was willing at any moment to lighten the atmosphere with humourous comments. The energy of the debate and the atmosphere of heightened engagement during workshops and during discussions was so intense that many of us felt drained and mentally exhausted at the end of each week.

As in the previous year we had very distinguished guest lecturers including, John Barrow, John Hedley Brooke, Mary Midgley, Ernan McMullin, Nancey Murphy, William Shea, Howard Van Till and Alister McGrath. This year I felt that the participants benefited much more from the expertise of the visitors and were far more active in arranging scholarly discussions with them. Once again, the lecturers made themselves available for tutorials or mentoring sessions. They participated in our workshops, sat with us at meals and sat in on evening lectures. Many of the lecturers indicated to me that they were struck by the liveliness and commitment of the group.

This year saw much more input from the participants themselves in delivering lectures and organising workshops. We had a series of lectures on philosophy and a second series on biology. We also had lectures from participants on various topics including Biblical exegesis and natural theology. Each day two participants organised a discussion workshop which followed that morning's lecture. This involved considerable reading beforehand and consultation with the guest lecturer. Several participants also volunteered to act as a consulting team to plan next year's seminars. All felt that this year they had made far better use of each other as resources in the field of science and religion. Indeed, it became clear during the seminars just how much expertise in the field was now shared collectively by this group, and how much they were benefiting from close interaction with each other.

The variety of viewpoints emerging from our participants on science and religion represents my most outstanding memory of the seminars. What I also found remarkable and highly encouraging is that our participants were willing to listen to arguments and points of view which might cut across deeply held convictions; nevertheless, there was hardly a moment of friction during four weeks of intense debate. All were committed Christians, mostly from evangelical traditions, yet listening to them the old oppositions between science and religion simply evaporated. I realised that public perceptions are increasingly out of touch with what is actually happening on the ground. I listened to biologists who fully accept a naturalistic theory of evolution, and who were just as hostile to the intelligent design argument as any secular biologist might be. However, they found no threat in this to their Christian beliefs. The majority might disagree with their interpretations, and yet the analysis was conducted in a tolerant, restrained and highly scholarly manner. I listened to psychologists and philosophers who might emphasise behaviourism, but they found them compatible with their faith, indeed with a deeply pious and traditional faith. I began to realise what an extraordinary degree of freedom a deeply held faith leaves to a refined scientific and theological enquiry. From their research presentations it also became clear how active our cohorts were in running courses, study groups, in giving public lectures, and in publishing in the field. Indeed, it turned out that about 15 of our 31 participants were writing books on various specialised aspects of science and religion! They quickly settled in to work routines at Oxford. The afternoons were given over to research in the Bodleian or theology faculty library and other faculty libraries, or in writing up research papers. For many this was the best time of the year to carry out research – away from the innumerable demands of their normal working lives.

Personalities emerged. Henry Tillinghast obligingly fell into the river during our punting picnic. Fortunately, it was a warm sunny day. Karl Giberson and Donald Yerxa were busily interviewing our lecturers and taking photographs for the new Templeton research magazine. Wycliffe Hall became a hive of production for the first issue. John Bloom was much in demand to help with computer problems. He will also be immortalised for his contribution to the lighter side of the seminars. His McPoem defends the virtues of the 'Arch and Clown' establishments now to be found everywhere in England against traditional English pubs, the superior merits of which were so warmly promoted by out field trip guide, Alun Thornton Jones. Thomas Lindell issued an elaborate Certificate of Excellence for Outstanding Performance to those lecturers who had accompanied the “choir” to “choir practice” in the evenings following late lectures.

From the reaction of our participants, it seemed to me that the field trips this summer were more immediately relevant to the issues we were discussing than our field trips last summer. The visit to St. Paul's Cathedral,

where so many distinguished scientists are commemorated, brought us closer to the personalities we had been discussing rather abstractly. The various exhibits at the Natural History Museum brought a greater realism to our discussions of evolution and of the role of providence in nature. The visit to Downs House, Darwin's home, was particularly interesting. The grounds were extensive and beautiful and there was much to see. We learned to respect Darwin's work disciplines, appreciate the courage required to overcome a life of ill health and admire his intellectual honesty. However, the exhibits were rather spoiled for many of us by a rather triumphalist interpretation of the Huxley-Wilberforce debate which seems to have been totally unaffected by recent historical scholarship. The field trips also fulfilled the important function of allowing the participants to meet the wives and children of those colleagues who were able to bring along their families. This is a support to the families, helps to strengthen the sense of community and is a healthy alternative to long and intense abstract discussions.

Through the kindness of the Reverend Robert Harnish, Chaplain and Dean of Divinity at new College and inspired by Dr Charlotte Kroeker (who was present on a research grant from The Association for Religion and Intellectual Life), we had a concert by candle light in New College chapel performed by Robert Harnish, Charlotte Kroeker, Helena Newsome and Mary Ellen Sutton. The recital included a memorable and very moving piano piece by Olivier Messiaen, canticles by Benjamin Britten and organ choral preludes by Johann Sebastian Bach. The intention of the concert was to demonstrate how sacred music can be a vehicle of deep religious experience. Many of the participants reported that they had been profoundly moved by the occasion. From the written evaluations, this Summer's seminars seem to have worked very well indeed. Now we must see how we can cap the experience in 2001.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

Back to Table of Contents, QUAERENS Vol. 5.

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

McPoem: Ode to McDonald's

John A. Bloom *for Alun Thornton Jones*

Fish and chips may be the grub
That one can fetch within a pub
But 'two all-beef patties, special sauce, lettuce,
cheese, pickles, onions on a sesame seed bun,'
Harken from a fairer place under the sun.

The source, you ask, of such a burger?
You do not know? Why go on further?
Why they abound in every town!
I'm speaking of the Arch and Clown.

Their subtle sameness soothes the souls
They slake the thirst of Slavs and Poles.
In suburb or urban decay,
'You deserve a break today.'

They've found their way to England's shores!
They beckon with their open doors.
Speak I of the Rose and Crown?
Nay, only of the Arch and Clown.

It is the package 'happy meal'
On which they place their golden seal
That lights the eyes of girls and boys,
Since it includes their favorite toys.

Now, of course, I'll not be fractious
'Bout where we go for choir practice.

For a big mac’s not the goal
At 9:00 pm, when bells do toll.

What inspires this silly zeal?
How can such a place appeal?
From the States? The land fantastic,
Where everything is made of plastic.

Cans't not compare the shake with ale,
It does not foam, it is not stale.
It 'tis not warm, with waste of yeast endued,
Shake's sweetness just cannot be brewed.

The Arch and Clown serves coke and chips
And their staff expect no tips
But what makes it the place to go?
The beverages that therein flow!

It has one drink the world doth crave
The best one finds before the grave
The one that took Americans to make
None other than the chocolate shake.

Cold, and thick, and brownish-pale
In frosted cup, it trumps all ale.
The taste that came from Venus' paps,
Cannot compare with that from taps.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

Participant's News

John Hart was interviewed in September by the *New York Times* regarding his work on religion and ecology for the Catholic bishops of Canada and the United States. His work as the Project Writer for the bishops' bioregional environmental pastoral letter was cited in a news story, “Saving Souls and Salmon”, in the Sunday, 22 October edition of the *Times*' “Week in Review” section. The bishops' letter focuses on ethical, economic and ecological issues in the Columbia River Watershed, and is the first bioregional and first international bishops' letter. Bishops from Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington and British Columbia are authoring the pastoral letter. The website for the Columbia River Pastoral Letter Project is www.columbiariver.org.

Hart was the keynote speaker at the 77th Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, held in St. Paul, Minnesota on 10-11 November. His presentation focused on the biblical Jubilee and its contemporary implications for caring for creation and promoting economic justice.

On 13 December, he spoke on the relationship between spirituality and ecology at a Montana Committee for the Humanities presenta tion in Bozeman, Montana.

On Friday, 27 October, he was notified that he was selected to be the representative of the Catholic bishops' Columbia River Watershed environmental pastoral letter project to receive an award for his work on the project in Kathmandu, Nepal. The honor is from the “Sacred Gifts Program” of the Alliance of Religions and Conservation (ARC), in conjunction with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF); the bishops' developing pastoral letter is considered by ARC as a “Sacred Gift”. The program will include workshops on topics such as “Sacred Spaces,” “Toxics,” “Climate Change” and “Forests.” Partnerships will be formed for joint efforts around the world by faith-based environmental groups.

On 15 November HRH Prince Philip presented the awards in Katmandu to representatives of eleven religions working on environmental issues in different regions of the world. The ceremony featured a prayer (some sung, some spoken, some danced) from each religion. The King and Queen of Nepal were present for the ceremony.

Arie Leegwater gave a lecture course on “Science and Religion in Historical Perspective” for the West Yorkshire School of Christian Studies at Outwood House, Horsforth, Leeds from January to March 2000. The aim of the course was to help locate the development and influence of modern science within a biblical

worldview and to understand what biblical faith can mean for the world of science.

He also conducted a seminar in Leeds University on Thursday 16 March 2000 on the subject of his Templeton Oxford research project, “Charles A. Coulson: mixing Methodism and quantum chemistry?” It was sponsored by Professor Geoffrey Cantor of the Centre for the Study of Science and Religion.

This fall he also made some presentations on his Coulson research in the United States at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI and at Calvin College. He is now in the process of redrafting two articles.

On October 9 **Randy Maddox** presented his annual lecture for his endowed chair (Paul T. Walls) at Seattle Pacific University. The title of the lecture was “John Wesley: Holistic Healer.” A central portion of the lecture places Wesley's ventures in providing medical care for the Methodist movement, including publishing a best-selling book of “home remedies,” in the context of current 18th century developments in science and medicine (for example, pointing out a very similar list of remedies produced earlier by Robert Boyle). As such, the lecture presents this aspect of Wesley's ministry as an 18th century example of self-conscious engagement of science and religion—challenging the stereotype of Wesley as concerned only with “saving souls.”

James Christopher Peterson recently published an update on last year's developments in genetics for *Perspectives in Science and Christian Faith* and a piece on genetic testing and employment for *Sojourners*.

He also gave a session on cloning for the Presbyterian Church USA's national conference on genetics.

Peterson is working through the galleys for his book due out shortly, *Genetic Turning Points: The Ethics of Human Genetic Intervention* (Eerdmans).

Dean Overman and Hubert Yockey have completed a draft of a book and an article entitled, “Genetic Information: its unknowable origin and ethical use.” Hubert Yockey is the author of *Information Theory and Molecular Biology* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Stephen J. Pope has two books in process related to the field of science and religion, *Christian Ethics and Evolutionary Theory* (Cambridge University Press) and *Essays on the Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas*, editor (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press).

His forthcoming articles include:

“The Biological 'Roots' of Personhood and Morality,” *Josephinum Journal of Theology*; “The Ordering of Love: Self, Others, and Sacrifice,” for Stephen G. Post, ed., *Empathy, Altruism, and Agape: Perspectives on Science and Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); “Natural Law and Christian Ethics,” for the *Cambridge Companion to Christian Ethics*, ed. Robin Gill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press); “How Did and Does the Person Emerge?” for Conference Proceedings: *Identity, Formation, Dignity: The Impacts of Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science upon Jewish and Christian Understandings of Personhood* held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 30 April 1998; “The Evolutionary Roots of Morality in Theological Perspective,” *Journal of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science*; “Evolutionary Theory and the New Teleology: 'Purposes' in Nature and Ethics,” with Prof. Anthony Annunziato, for *God and the World of the Sciences*, ed. Charles Hefling; “Overview of the Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas,” in *Essays on the Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas*, edited by Stephen J. Pope.

He also has an article in progress on “Primatology and Natural Law”, for the American Association for the Advancement of Science conference on *Primatology and Morality*, Emory University, held on 28 April 2000.

Jitse Van de Meer is happy to report that his select bibliography on Science and Christian Theology is now available on-line. A link to the bibliography is on the webpage at the CCCU site: http://www.cccu.org/projects/templeton/jtsreligion.htm. The bibliography is being sited in the meta-library of Counterbalance to make revisions most accessible and because Adrian Wyard was willing to lend his expertise in putting it into such a convenient format. Feel free to use this in your classes, syllabi, etc.

Recent lectures on science and religion by Jitse include “The Body in the Bible: Some Questions in Biblical Hermeneutics Raised by the Natural Sciences.” For the Institute for Theological Encounters with Science and Technology: Workshop on a Theology of the Human Body. 20-22 October 2000, held in the Mercy Center, Saint Louis. Missouri “Reading the Two Books Interactively: Some Questions in Biblical hermeneutics Raised by the Natural Sciences.” Presented at the Consultation with The British and Foreign Bible Society and Cheltenham & Gloucester College of Higher Education. Held at Redeemer University College, 16-19 August 2000.

Jitse delivered the closing lecture for the “Faith and Science: Millennium Series 2000” of Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Canada, 26 October 2000, on the “Crucible of Creativity: Knowing God and Nature in a Postmodern World.” Following are some of the key issues that he raised:

The immediate context for this topic is the engagement of science and religion. He focused on the faculties of human-kind that are involved in the engagement of religious beliefs and the explanation of natural phenomena. “Obviously this involves the faculties of believing and knowing. Ever since St. Augustine, i.e., for two millennia, the question has been how faith and reason are related. Strangely, up to a decade ago most of what was said and written about religion and science ignored the person in whom knowing and believing are combined. The questions that were asked were questions about the relationships between two bodies of knowledge or belief. For instance, science was sometimes seen as a collection of propositions about nature and religion as a collection of feelings about God. Since cognition and emotion are utterly different faculties no relationship between them seemed to be possible. Others took both science and religion as bodies of knowledge thereby limiting their interaction to logical relations. In either case, the person with her faculties and responsibilities was not in the picture. The person is an appropriate focus for the new millennium because it is a fundamental shift away from the rationalistic framework in terms of which religion and science were seen to be interacting for the past two thousand years. My key point will be that the faculties of believing and knowing are related via a third faculty, that of the imagination. Together, these faculties are a crucible of creativity as it were.”

Donald Yerxa has been writing this Fall for the new Templeton monthly newspaper, *Research News & Opportunities in Science and Theology*, edited by his colleague at Eastern Nazarene College, Karl Giberson. He works directly with the Templeton Foundation to write feature stories for each issue.

He continues to be a regular contributor to *Books & Culture*, which published his essay 'First-Person Shooter' (a look at the current state of military history) in the September/October 2000 issue and an interview of historian John Lukacs in the July/August 2000 issue.

He has also written four book reviews for *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* and as well as a piece for *Historically Speaking*. He is working on several additional essays and interviews for *Fides et Historia* and *Books & Culture*.

Yerxa and Giberson hope to complete their book on the “origins” debate in the Autumn of 2001.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

Science and Religion News

John Hedley Brooke delivered his inaugural lecture as Andreas Idreos Professor of Science and Religion in the examination schools, Oxford on Tuesday 21 November 2000. The title of the lecture was “Of scientists and their gods.” He delivered the lecture to a crowded room which seemed to include just about everyone in Oxford interested in science and religion - including Richard Dawkins.

Calvin College Seminars

The Seminars in Christian Scholarship program at Calvin College is hosting a seminar next summer about science and religion. It is entitled, “Biology and Purpose: Altruism, Morality, and Human Nature in Evolutionary Theory” and will be led by Philip Clayton from Sonoma State University and Jeffrey Schloss from Westmont College. This seminar is being funded by the John Templeton Foundation.

Seminar Participant Edits Templeton Newspaper
by Donald A Yerxa, Professor of history at Eastern Nazarene College, Massachussetts
Seminar participant **Karl Giberson**, a professor of physics at Eastern Nazarene College, has become editor of *Research News & Opportunities in Science and Theology*, a new monthly newspaper underwritten by the John Templeton Foundation. As editor, Giberson works with editor-in-chief, Harold Koenig, associate professor of psychiatry and associate professor of medicine at the Duke University Medical Center, and Pamela Thompson, director of communications for the Templeton Foundation. Giberson is in charge of the content, layout and design of the paper, which is produced at Eastern Nazarene College and “out-sourced” for printing.

Broadly understood, *Research News* is the first monthly newspaper devoted to reporting on the expanding world of science and religion. It is an integral part of the overall Templeton Foundation strategy of bringing scientists, philosophers, researchers, psychologists and theologians together. But the paper is much more than simply a newsletter about Templeton activities. While that is an important part of this field, there is much going on that is not supported by the Templeton Foundation. As the field has expanded in the past several years, many groups and individuals are unaware of what others are doing. *Research News* was created to facilitate communication among the various groups working in science and religion in order to reduce duplication of effort as well as to build on what others are doing.

A number of Oxford connections have played important roles in the first few issues. John Hedley Brooke was a

front cover feature for the first issue; Alister McGrath for the second; Arthur Peacocke for the third; and Fraser Watts for the fifth issue. These were all contacts that Giberson made while participating in the Oxford Seminars.

The paper is designed to give readers a monthly snapshot of the broad world of science and religion, enabling them to sense the pulse of the field. *Research News* features news stories, opinion pieces, interviews, conference reports, book notices, grant and funding information and a monthly calendar of events and lectures. According to Koenig, *Research News* hopes to become “a definitive source for information on science and theology, serving to accelerate research, funding, and education while building community among those working in the field.” Giberson adds: “The response from readers has been extremely encouraging. Many have noted that there is much more going on in this field than they had imagined. This was precisely Sir John's original idea - to centralise the dissemination of news. *Research News* has the flavour of a very large newsletter, bringing to readers news that was previously only available through a collection of newsletters.”

According to Giberson, launching this paper has been “an exciting adventure, in the best sense of that word.” He notes that while the work load has been overwhelming at times, it is so stimulating that it rarely seems like work. “Everyone who works on the paper is, in some sense, an 'amateur', and we have learned new things with each issue. But the people who work with me are uniformly wonderful folk.” As *Research News* has expanded from sixteen pages in the first issue to its current size of thirty-six pages, Giberson considers that his primary challenge is “to streamline the process so that I can give appropriate time to my teaching. Even though I am now teaching part-time, that is important to me. And I don't want to give up the stimulation of teaching, or the satisfaction of working with students."

Giberson, who holds a PhD in Physics from Rice University, has been active in the science and religion field for over a decade now. In 1993, he wrote *Worlds Apart: the unholy war between religion and science* and has taught courses in science and religion on a regular basis. In 1998, he became a contributing editor of *Books & Culture*. His interviews and essays have become a regular feature of that Christian review. Currently, he is working on a volume, tentatively entitled *Species of Origins*, for Rowman & Littlefield's American Intellectual Culture Series. His work in *Books & Culture* and other venues has fuelled a growing desire in him to write, particularly to an informed public on matters related to faith and science. Editing *Research News* has been a natural outgrowth of these interests.

The Oxford Seminars have provided wonderful opportunities for Giberson, in his new capacity as editor, to interact with colleagues, solicit work and to conduct interviews. His role in the young newspaper will no doubt help to strengthen the connections established at Wycliffe Hall long after the first Seminars end.

Editors: Alister McGrath and John Roche

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

Seminars for 2001 15 July - 11 August

Following several evaluations and discussions with our participants we have decided to modify the format for 2001 in several respects. The lecture, discussion, workshop and programme this summer was felt to be particularly intense, and many felt they would like to have more time to carry out research, with a view to completing their projects next summer. Rather than lectures in the third year, most felt that discussion seminars led by a distinguished scholar and based on a reading list issued well in advance, would be more helpful. They also felt that more focused group discussion of their own research projects would be helpful.

The following scholars have agreed to contribute to our seminars next summer:

Week 1. Theology and the physical sciences:

James Cushing (University of Notre Dame), on Quantum theory
Ernan McMullin (University of Notre Dame), Philosophy of science
Keith Ward (Oxford University), Theology of nature (Public lecture in Harris Manchester College)

Week 2. Theology and the life sciences I:
John Haught (Georgetown University), Process theology
William Dembski (Baylor University), Intelligent design
John Polkinghorne (Cambridge University), Theology and science in the 21st century (Public Lecture)

Week 3. Theology and the life sciences II:
Holmes Rolston (Colorado State University), Genes, Genesis and God (selected themes)
Stuart Judge (Oxford University), Neurophysiology and religion
Christian De Duve, (De Duve Institute, Belgium), The origins of microbiological life (Public Lecure)

Week 4. Ethics and social issues:
Ted Peters, (CTNS), Ethics and the human genome project
Kristin Shrader-Frechette (University of Notre Dame), Issues in environmental ethics
Roger Penrose (Oxford University), Artificial intelligence (Public Lecture)

Quaerens
Newsletter of The John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity

John Templeton Oxford Seminars on Science and Christianity
Volume No. 5, January 2001

Website News

Three new resources available on the website of the John Templeton Oxford Seminars in Science and Christianity:

1. A Speakers' Bureau, listing seminar participants who are available to lecture on particular topics within the science and religion dialogue to both lay and scholarly organizations, including the Christian higher education community.

2. A Templeton award syllabi collection, providing full text of award-winning interdisciplinary course syllabi from CCCU schools along with related curricular resources in science and religion and in the biological and physical sciences.

3. A major online bibliography prepared by Professor Randy Maddox (Paul T. Wells Professor of Wesleyan Theology at Seattle Pacific University) and covering multiple aspects of the natural sciences and Christian theology.

All pages have been refurbished and reorganized this past Autumn.