

## CREATION : A SCIENCE FANTASY.

### CHAPTER 5.

#### A LIMITED AWARENESS.

When science investigates Creation, it inevitably adopts an attitude of mind limited to what it is studying; in other words its attitude is limited to the created world. Furthermore in order to make sense of what it is studying, science leaves out of account any spiritual element that there may be in the matter it is investigating. It is hardly surprising therefore that the “explanations” that science offers are mechanical, when the whole discipline of the investigation is organised to produce that result. Put simply: the whole business of science is to produce a mechanical account of the universe it is investigating; and one should not complain when it does exactly that. But that does not qualify scientists to pontificate on matters, which they have not even been investigating.

If you limit your attitude of mind to the created world, it means you have ruled out of your mind that it might have been created, in order to investigate how the created world works. Creation is the best evidence of a Creator, as St. Thomas Aquinas sensibly recognised. But in order to see the force of this argument, you have to allow your mind to have a wider attitude than that of the scientific investigator. You have to envisage the possibility that there was a Creator, in order to see if the evidence points in that direction, or not. When a scientist announces that his scientific work shows that there was no creator, it simply demonstrates that he has no understanding of what he has been doing. It is like a lab assistant taking over a piece of research, and because he does not understand much about the subject, he announces that the research is not leading anywhere.

In order to be able to assess realistically whether there was a Creator, or not, you have to allow your attitude of mind to embrace the whole created and uncreated Universe. But since you yourself are part of Creation, that is impossible unless there is insight into eternity, if it exists outside space and

## CREATION : A SCIENCE FANTASY.

time. Goethe thought this was possible by looking into the mind (look within!), and Goethe was usually right. But I doubt if it is possible for ordinary people like myself, unless that person believes he has an indwelling with the Creator; and if he believes he has, that answers the question for him. So we reach the general view that there is no possibility for most people of any proof that God does, or does not, exist. You simply have to make up your mind intellectually, or allow your experience of the numinous to convince you emotionally.

It is little good saying that if you believe in a Creator, the world makes far more sense, than if you exclude the idea of a creator from your mind, because those who do not believe there is a creator cannot view the Universe with a creator sufficiently vividly to compare the two situations. So there is no valid comparison in their minds to enable them to form a rational view. You can only make a valid comparison in practice, if you believe there was a Creator; and if you do, then you have the answer to your own question.

Many people think that mind and matter are two aspects of the fundamental stuff of the universe. They are “complementary” aspects of it, to borrow the metaphor coined by Niels Bohr to describe features of atomic physics. Indeed Professor Stout, professor of logic and religious exegesis at St. Andrews in the 1920s, gave his Gifford Lectures on this very topic; and he argued that the reason why nobody had ever found the relationship between mind and matter was simply that they were aspects of the same thing. I agree. So to assume, in addition to the two basic assumptions of science, that you can safely disregard any spiritual content in the matter you are investigating may be to introduce the greatest error into your investigation. It will not invalidate the results of your titration experiments in inorganic chemistry; but where life is involved it may emasculate your results. When you **will** to get up out of a chair, I understand that the brain sends a message to the muscles, by means of an electric current. But where did this current come from? Is not this **creation out of nothing**? This awareness does not enable one to feed 5000 with five barley loaves and two small fishes; but it could be a first step in understanding New

## CREATION : A SCIENCE FANTASY.

Testament style healings. The German theologian David Friedrich Strauss was execrated for saying the Gospel healings are legend: that they never happened. He preached that the God-Man relationship was available to us all. Wonderful stuff. But he could not stop there! He was imprisoned by the success of 19<sup>th</sup> century science. He could not accept events that seemed to breach the laws of science; nor see these healings as events within the laws of an enlarged Nature. His understanding of science was too limited. By performing healings outside everyday experience, you could say Jesus ennobled Nature's Evolution, so that it became God's Evolution. He did not revoke or defy the rules of Nature's Evolution. And Harry Edwards, the healer well known in Surrey in the 1950s & 60s, felt able to end his book on Spiritual Healing by saying that 2000 years had to elapse before we could appreciate that the Gospel healings manifested the same power of healing that we are witnessing today. He clearly accepted the Gospel healings as genuine. Jesus was able to do it by his extraordinary strength of character and knowledge of human nature; we have to be more pedestrian and more humble. But Strauss was as wrong as anyone could be!

When large masses of material are heaped up together, as in great architecture, or on a larger scale in Nature, it is obvious that an atmosphere is created by matter. Even more so with experiments on living material is it illegitimate to rule out any spiritual element. All living creatures seem to want to live; and to that end, when injured try their best to heal themselves. And what this indicates is that your assumption may be invalid, and your vision distorted.

Expressing the same thought in practical, professional terms; I found as an advocate that often you could only see how to conduct a prosecution so that it would result in a conviction, if you had the morale to believe that victory was possible. Otherwise you failed! It is a phenomenon that it affects us all.

We all have to limit our vision to do our jobs properly. But you want to be able to recover the wider vision in between times. So how is this flexibility to be achieved? If you want to view "things" in as true a perspective as possible, in my opinion, you must try to view things through the eyes of a creator, so far as

## CREATION : A SCIENCE FANTASY.

this is possible. And if you want to have this flexibility of being able to view things in the short term, and in the long term, without being trapped in either, then surely you need an indwelling with the Creator? He is never trapped.

Even if it was legitimate at Nicaea to describe God as uniting the three persons of the Trinity, in practice and in popular imagination, it robs the Creator of His majesty, and replaces this with the wonderful image of Jesus, loving even unto death. It glosses over the fact that this same Jesus washed his hands entirely of the need to organise society and maintain Law and Order. Bearing in mind that Rome regarded these matters as being entirely within its prerogative, I do not think Jesus had any alternative; but these are matters which we most certainly have to attend to. And to refuse to recognise their crucial importance is to lack all public spirit. Times have changed since those days. Jesus may have led us out of Plato's cave of shadows into the bright sunlight of the world outside, but a different type of character and a different type of intelligence are needed to build a decent, just society in the sunlight, from those needed in the hero who led us out. Symbols are useful, but never entirely satisfying. Whether you call Jesus "the Word" of God, or the "Hero" who led us out of the cave of shadows, it is only a parable and indicative of who he was, and what he did. Neither symbol encapsulates the whole truth.

It might be thought unintelligent to continue to try to solve a problem, the proper relationship between Church and State, by repeating what had failed in the past. And in considering the problems of creation, that is assuming we were created, it might seem better to go to the Creator, and ask Him for suggestions. His answer was the Incarnation. And we should take the incarnation seriously, consider whether it includes all of us, and the dangers it inevitably invokes.

I think the chief danger is hubris, which may seem strange when we are all faced with the danger of atomic extinction. But there is a poignancy in the view that in the church's insistence on trying to arrest the evolution of the human spirit in one moment of divine revelation of the Son of God nailed to a cross, the churches had failed themselves, civilisation, and the religious urge

## CREATION : A SCIENCE FANTASY.

they professed to serve. Yet the idea that the Church may have utterly failed society never seems to occur to the clergy. So they perpetuate that failure, and swell their congregations with a little arm-waving and the singing of choruses, and leave the welfare of society severely alone. They limit their vision to their parish affairs, and never ask whether they should consider the welfare of society and the nation. I have laboured the point that sense of perspective is everything, but few agree. And hubris is a very real danger in congregations that predominantly think of themselves.

When Catherine says in *Wuthering Heights*, “I am Heathcliff”, we all understand what she meant. She did not mean she was physically the same as Heathcliff. I doubt if she meant they shared the same spirit, because she was ashamed to marry him. She meant he was part of her being. One is reminded of the Greek, pre-Christian, prayer, “O God in whom we live and move and have our being.” And if the son-ship mentioned in the opening verses of John’s Gospel and in St.Paul’s letter to Galatians is more than the flattery of name, then it means that Jesus is only the first among equals. And if God’s being enters into the man, and the man is to be more than a puppet in the hands of God, then the man’s being must enter into God. And the doctrine of the Trinity is torn into little shreds. So yes, hubris is the greatest danger.

“God became Man, so that men might become God” is a saying usually attributed to Augustine, but which I think goes back to Athanasius. This is strange, because he was a fierce upholder of orthodoxy and the equality but separateness of the Persons of the Trinity. He never seems to have had the courage to draw the proper conclusion from his own aphorism.