

Readers' thoughts on science and religion

As a retired physics professor who has made the occasional foray¹ into the topic of science and religion, I thank Tom McLeish for his civilized and hopefully civilizing approach to the discussion ("Thinking differently about science and religion," *PHYSICS TODAY*, February 2018, page 10). Center stage is too often dominated by militant atheists, willfully ignorant antiscience religionists, and cynical politicians who feed on the fears of a badly educated segment of the public. McLeish eloquently catalogs the harm done by the rabid nondialog from those groups.

I believe there is a silent minority—at least—of capable academics who could bring their expert views to provide a much-needed elevation of the science and religion discussion. The task is daunting for those professionally involved in a single discipline, be it physics, biology, philosophy, theology, or other, but we need to step outside our comfort zone and take back the center ground of discourse on this important topic.

Reference

1. G. L. Baker, *Religion and Science: From Swedenborg to Chaotic Dynamics*, Solomon Press (1992).

Gregory L. Baker
(gbaker@brynthyn.edu)
Huntingdon Valley, Pennsylvania

I am a committed student of science and have been a member of the American Physical Society for 40 years. As a practicing applied physicist, I enjoy reading *PHYSICS TODAY* and the weekly email alerts. I am also a practicing Christian, like William Newsome of Stanford Uni-

versity and Tom McLeish of Durham University.

I have always claimed that if *PHYSICS TODAY* is to remain open-minded to worldviews other than the ontological naturalist approach,¹ it needs to consider other views such as those of Newsome, McLeish, and John Polkinghorne. Those scientists adhere to a Judeo-Christian worldview in the tradition of Michael Faraday, Johannes Kepler, James Clerk Maxwell, and others.

You have finally done it. Thank you very much for publishing McLeish's commentary "Thinking differently about science and religion" in your February 2018 issue.

Reference

1. See, for example, L. M. Krauss, "Cosmic humility," *APS News* (April 2017), p. 8.

Kenell J. Touryan
(kenell@comcast.net)
Indian Hills, Colorado

With some interest I read the commentary by Tom McLeish regarding the influence of Christianity on the works of Isaac Newton, Michael Faraday, and other figures in the development of modern science. I'm certain that those men were engaged in the critical issues of their time, and theology was one of them. But let's remember also the distinction between theology and science: Theology is sacrosanct; science is fluid. Theology resists innovative ideas; science thrives on new data.

Let's also remember the influence of the Inquisition: Nicolaus Copernicus did not publish his findings until he lay on his deathbed and could no longer be subject to the Church's wrath; Galileo Galilei was nearly deemed a heretic and confined to his home for the last years of his life; Giordano Bruno did not believe that man was the center of the universe, one of the reasons he was burned at the stake; and Isaac Newton's theological work was not published until well after his death, because his beliefs were at odds with the Church of England.

I'm not trying to drive "an unhistori-

cal and unrealistic wedge between science and religion," but I think it's important to recognize our differences. In the pursuit of our common work of bettering the human condition, scientists welcome the support of religious organizations, but we must also remember that theology cannot be made into science, and science is not meant to test theology.

Ray Stefanski
(ray.stefanski@gmail.com)
Naperville, Illinois

To underline a common thread that connects the scientific and spiritual realms, it is necessary to first examine the scientific method and process from historical and modern perspectives.

At the foundation of the scientific method is the principle that every claim or hypothesis must be proven by experimentation and data. Fortunately, most scientists understand that claims or assumptions not backed by experimental observations can be discarded as patently false or as an impetus to revise the starting hypothesis. However, when Greek philosophers held sway, they widely believed that facts could be discovered simply based on reason.

Alhazen (Ibn al-Haytham) of Iraq, the great polymath who lived from circa 965 to 1040, was the first among scientists to insist that every claim must be proven by critical examination. Alhazen stated, "The duty of man who investigates the writings of scientists, if learning the truth is his goal, is to make himself an enemy of all that he reads and . . . attack it from every side. He should also suspect himself as he performs his critical examination of it, so that he may avoid falling into either prejudice or leniency."¹

Tom Kibble and Frank Berkshire, two notable physicists, have offered a modern perspective on the scientific process: "Every scientific theory starts from a set of hypotheses, which are suggested by our observations, but represent an idealization of them. The theory is then tested by checking the predictions deduced from these hypotheses against experiment. When persistent discrepancies are

**CONTACT
PHYSICS
TODAY**

Letters and commentary are encouraged and should be sent by email to ptletters@aip.org (using your surname as the Subject line), or by standard mail to Letters, *PHYSICS TODAY*, American Center for Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3842. Please

include your name, work affiliation, mailing address, email address, and daytime phone number on your letter and attachments. You can also contact us online at <http://contact.physicstoday.org>. We reserve the right to edit submissions.

found, we try to modify the hypotheses to restore the agreement with observation. If many such tests are made and no serious disagreement emerges, then the hypotheses gradually acquire the status of 'laws of nature.'"²

The "set of hypotheses," then, is the starting point, the initial thought process, of any scientific effort. That starting point is based on a blind trust that a given set of observations is amenable to being understood in terms of principles, laws, or theories that may emerge.

Having briefly explained the scientific process, we now consider the spiritual world. The Holy Qur'an states that an essential quality of a believer is to "believe in the unseen" (2:4), implying the belief in an all-capable yet unseen God. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad (1835–1908), prophet and founder of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Community, explained the importance of belief in the unseen: "When upon seeing smoke from a distance a man reckons that there must be a fire where there is smoke—at that stage his state of knowing is only a conjecture—unless he advances in the direction of that smoke and puts his hand in those flames, until that time his knowledge cannot acquire the character of detailed and certain knowing. In fact the condition of such knowledge is what is referred to as faith."³

Herein lies the similarity between the scientific process and the pursuit of spiritual enlightenment—that the very genesis of each hinges on a belief in the unseen. The unseen in the scientific process includes, for example, the unknown workings of a cell or the way in which the gravitational force unites with three other forces in nature. Challenges arise in both scientific and spiritual realms in the quest to understand the unseen. Just as our understanding of biology and medicine have not shut the door on death or produced treatments that never fail, similarly the pursuit of spiritual progress can be met with setbacks, such as the misuse of religion or one's inability to completely understand his or her connection with God.

Rather than a conflict between science and religion, I see a shared intellectual tradition that underpins both spiritual and scientific pursuits.


References

1. A. Alkhateeb, "Science has outgrown the human mind and its limited capacities," *Aeon* (24 April 2017).

MBE Solutions for Topological Insulators

M Series Evaporation System

'Our system will be used for University research, growing thin films for surface analysis. The MBE sources will be used to grow thin film topological insulators, such as Bi_2Se_3 and Bi_2Te_3 .'



We design and build innovative and versatile MBE systems for a wide range of applications.....What's yours?



Designed for Unrivalled Performance

sales@mantis-sigma.com
www.mantisdeposition.com



2. T. W. B. Kibble, F. H. Berkshire, *Classical Mechanics*, 5th ed., Imperial College Press (2004), p. 1.
3. W. A. Sayed, "Faith in Science," www.alislam.org/library/articles/Faith-in-Science-201002.pdf, p. 6, and ref. 2 therein.

Abdul Naseer Malmi Kakkada

(naseermk@utexas.edu)

University of Texas at Austin



As I see it, the most fundamental split—an irreparable one—between science and religion is that religion embraces a supernatural order and genuine science, as opposed to pseudoscience, does not.

From a scientific and objective standpoint, there is simply no way that any purportedly supernatural entity or order can be demonstrated or proven. No scientific methodologies for such exist, nor any credible instruments or measuring techniques. The rejoinder that those things can't be measured merely reinforces the argument that they are no more fit for scientific inquiry than the astrologer's claim of "malefic" influences of Mars at an infant's birth.

Because a supernatural domain cannot be approached in any scientific or objective way, then by my reckoning it doesn't exist. One need not even deny its existence because to all intents the supernatural entity becomes logically unnecessary or redundant. It doesn't help us make scientific predictions or explain natural phenomena—say, coronal mass ejections or auroral substorms. Any doubt about the possibility of knowing something must be vastly multiplied for the supernatural domain.

Pope Francis, while he acknowledges Darwinian evolution, is still not prepared to accept the wholly naturalistic process dependent on natural selection—mutation. Instead we read, "Evolution in nature is not inconsistent with the notion of creation, because evolution requires the creation of beings that evolve," and "He [God] created human beings and let them develop according to the *internal laws* [emphasis added] that He gave to each one so they would reach fulfillment."¹ However, if the role of random evolutionary forces is neglected and the creation of "souls" is given prominence, then the door of inquiry is left open to supernatural agents.

To a genuine scientist—whether biologist, chemist, or physicist—that ought

to be totally, emphatically unacceptable because it basically thumbs its nose at true scientific inquiry.

In my article "The God factor" in the March 1990 issue of *Astronomy* magazine, I point out that science selectively excludes problems for which no practical method of inquiry exists. The supernatural falls into that category: It is neither measurable nor verifiable. Such an entity is regarded as an "uncaused cause," but as mathematician John Allen Paulos noted, "If everything has a cause, then God must too, and there is no first cause."² Eliminating a first cause—that is, supernatural cause—eliminates the need to posit a realm populated by supernatural beings that can supposedly interact with our world.

What McLeish asks us to do is to look the other way as we embrace a faith-based system, which may occasionally be correct about one scientific discovery or another but nonetheless accepts superstition at its core. Worse, a faith-based system beckons us to give a pass as it upholds a domain for which there isn't a scintilla of evidence, and in which agents and dogmas can be invoked in detrimental ways anytime a religion decides—for example, in condemning artificial birth control or outlawing abortion.

Is it possible for religion and science to coexist? Possibly, but only if religion is diluted to the point that it's devoid of all supernatural memes, agents, and explanations. Otherwise, all bets are off and we are left with embracing glorified superstition, and a deleterious form at that, able to use its fantasy agents to subvert objective human inquiry.

References

1. N. Squires, "Pope Francis says Big Bang theory and evolution 'compatible with divine Creator,'" *Telegraph*, 28 October 2014.
2. J. A. Paulos, *Irreligion*, Hill & Wang Books (2008), p. 43.

Philip A. Stahl

(stahlpa@comcast.net)

Colorado Springs, Colorado



As a physicist who is also trained in history and sociology of science and who has been regularly reading *PHYSICS TODAY* for more than 30 years, I cannot let Tom McLeish's Commentary on science and religion go unanswered.

Far from "thinking differently,"

McLeish rehashes the usual confused discourse on the topic. For example, he never defines the term "religion." As a consequence, the author mixes religion as a social institution with the personal beliefs and convictions of scientists. All natural philosophers from the 17th century to late in the 19th century had a personal belief in a kind of god, creator of the universe. But that is a different matter from the social conflicts that have emerged at different times as religious institutions worked hard to impose what they considered the proper understanding of nature. Those conflicts were many; they involved first astronomy, then geology and biology, and, later, history of religious texts and of the origins of humans.

The second confusion at the root of McLeish's argument is between what is and what should be—that is, between fact and norm. That there should not be conflict between science and religion is what we all may want, but such conflicts have existed in various societies and times, and there is no reason to believe they won't continue. The basic logical and philosophical distinctions between what is and what ought to be have been known at least since John Locke and David Hume, but McLeish still writes that "it is, sadly, possible to invent conflict where none needs to be." It should not have happened that—among many—Nicolaus Copernicus, Johannes Kepler, Galileo Galilei, Bernard de Fontenelle, Francesco Algarotti, and even the priests Henry de Dorlodot, John Zahm, and Dalmace Leroy saw their work censured or put in the Catholic Church's index of prohibited books. And it should not have happened that Alexander Winchell lost his job at Vanderbilt University because of his talks on evolution. But those things did happen.¹

Instead of suggesting that such historical conflicts are "hurting science," we must examine why those events occurred. And to understand them, we must talk about religions as social institutions that have varying amounts of power to limit scientific freedom. Some readers may well agree with McLeish that the literal reading of texts such as Genesis is an "aberration away from orthodox Christianity," but such believers do exist, and they do their best to limit scientific research: Recall President George W. Bush's 2001 decision to limit federally funded research on stem cells.