

A Proposal of Process Theology and its Implications for Science and Religion

Adam Pave

Abstract

Science tells us that we live in an uncertain world. Christianity, through faith in God, belief in his Word, and arguably divine revelation, establishes order and consistency to human endeavors. Yet, as history shows us, scientists in the Western world were originally theologians practicing science within the structure of the Church. It seems that scientists pursued empirical data in complete harmony with biblical truth. Along the way, however, Science and the Church diverged. It was as if Religion or Science filed for divorce citing irreconcilable differences. Which one? That is a subject of another discussion. Unification is our current dilemma, and Process Theology is a possible vehicle for uniting these two divergent fields. I briefly examine the ideas of Alfred North Whitehead, Charles Hartshorne, John Polkinghorne and others, to see how close together Process Theology can bring Science and Religion.

Throughout the paper, I briefly discuss the concept of "Truth" and/or "truths" in Science and Religion, hoping to unify the language within the two fields. In the end, I admit that Process Theology, as a concept, lacks the ability to understand what faith means for the individual Christian believer. Faith, as belief in the Truth of God, taken to the heart of the Christian, cannot be just a provable theory. I also argue that the changeable, malleable concept of God in Process Theology is a point of divergence for the Christian. Although Process Theology does offer hope and insight in beginning a dialogue, I hold that it cannot maintain a complete unification in the face of these objections.

Biography

As a 1997 graduate of DeSales University, BA English, in Center Valley, PA, Adam Pave began working in banking and retail sales. In August of 2002, he left the workforce to pursue an MA in Philosophy at West Chester University, which he will complete in 2004. With a BA in English and an MA in Philosophy, it is his goal to further attain a PhD in Philosophy and teach at the college level. His philosophical interests include Philosophy of Religion, Comparative Philosophy, and Ethics. Pave presented a paper at both Fall and Spring EPPA (Eastern Pennsylvania Philosophical Association) Conferences. Respectively, the presentations were: "The Concepts of Repression and Action in the Bhagavad-Gita" at Bloomsburg University and "Buddhist and Christian Thoughts on the Concept of Self and No-Self" at Mansfield University. His current work on a Master's thesis involves a comparison of Christian and Buddhist thoughts on "self" hood as they relate to ethical theory.

Introductory Remarks

I will postulate that the goal of science and the goal of religion (Christianity, in this case) is to get closer to the truth. The important first question: Is the truth of science and the truth of Christianity the same absolute unchanging truth? Christians may argue that all truth is God's Truth. Scientists may not agree on the certitude of Truth, only on the possibility that truths may be found within the world through theories.

Science is a social endeavor. Scientists work within a specific area of study and push toward a common goal: truth. In any field of science, observations are made, theories are devised, and experiments are conducted. This information is not kept hidden, but shared in journals, books and even television and the Internet. People want to know what scientists are doing. What is the latest idea? How can science better my life? The pursuit of this goal of truth, however, is sometimes highly limited by our technological and possibly, cognitive abilities.

Does defining truth as absolute Truth or as truths within the world play a crucial role in determining the compatibility of science and Christianity? I will answer that question with a tentative no, in hopes of finding a solution later in the discussion. But I will hold that truth, in some form, does exist and scientists and theologians are striving toward that goal. If it is the same goal, in the same language, is open for our debate.

Does the non-existence of Truth disprove any need for the further study of science? A scientist must hold that some form of truth must exist in order to continue his or her research. Why would one scientist refute a line of argument, or interpretation of an experiment's results? He or she would refute them because of the belief that something

is not true. Even if a philosopher of pure relativism would enter in to the discussion at this point, he or she would admit that historical truths exist. Something has to be true at some time. It is true that at 5:00pm, a car was at this point; at 5:01 a different point, and so on. But at that moment, a truth existed. So at that moment, a Truth had to exist. It is past, yet experimentally verifiable.

If we could record all data, all movements, every possible piece of action and inaction over a period of time, and then travel back in time to the beginning of that specified time period, we would know every movement and know what to expect. Of course, our appearance would have to be masked, so that our presence would not disrupt the chain of events. In effect, we would know the Truth. One might argue here that we still do not know the metaphysical “why” these events happened, but this is only the interpretation of the already occurred physical events. The point is that Truth exists in the past, even in the near past. Sometimes immediately after an action, we know the results. Pick up a hammer, strike a nail. If you connect solidly with the nail, it will travel in through the wood. If you connect sideways, the nail will bend. If you miss completely and hit your thumb, you know the result. In all cases, you will know the result, and have the truth of this action. It is pointless to ask why you picked up the hammer and struck the nail. A house or barn may be being built or a new roof on your home. The “why” here is self-evident. In more complicated experimentation, the results may take longer to arrive and the need for interpretation and reliance on theories will come into play. In any case it seems we can gain knowledge and move forward within science by experimental means.

But here is our first divergence. Science is moving toward truth, possibly more of

a relative nature, where religion has attained some moral absolutes and while acknowledging the benefits and need for scientific study, I am not certain whether most Christian believers would be open to the idea of a relative and historical truth-system. Even if that system of truth did not pertain to the morals of a Christian society, this relativity would imply that absolutes of any kind should and even must be called into question because of a scientifically uncertain world.

A Conceptual Map

The “I” in our discussion will soon fade away and return only in my concluding remarks. I will attempt to give a concise discussion of our uncertain world and its scientific and religious implications. Then we will move into a proposed answer: process theology. After establishing its foundation, we will refer to some philosopher-theologians who have different points to offer on process theology and its assumptions about the world and implications for the Christian faith. All throughout, I hope to keep a philosophical questioning voice asking that nagging question: can we translate religion and science into one single coherent language, which proceeds in a hopeful and direct path to truth?

A Solution is Needed and a Discussion of Uncertainty

One approach to the seemingly difficult task of finding a solution to the numerous discrepancies between science and religion is to find a common language. When we do

this, one of the two must be adjusted. Scientists' findings in recent years, especially the movement of evolutionist theory and new concepts in the science of physics, have provided us with new knowledge and new insight into how the world operates. When we see the world through the eyes of science, it is more chaotic and less organized and structured than originally believed in traditional religious thought. Newton's Laws, although still in use, are in decline, and modern physics and a more approximative quantum theory has taken the reigns of many of the new movements within science. Simply, the world is an uncertain place. Ian Barbour lists the sides of the argument of why there is uncertainty in the world:

1. Uncertainty may be attributed to *temporary human ignorance*. Exact laws will eventually be discovered.
2. Uncertainty may be attributed to *inherent experimental or conceptual limitations*. For example: The atom itself is forever inaccessible to us.
3. Uncertainty may be attributed to *indeterminacy in nature*. There are alternative possibilities in the atomic world. (Barbour 171)

In all three cases, we start with the "given" of nature's uncertainty. This is a basic, yet vital concept within science. We don't know everything! And if we ever can, or will, is up for debate.

Taking this uncertainty into account, unless we completely reject all of science, a religious believer's view of the world must change. The ordered existence within Christian thought has dominated the Western, Christian thought process for many years,

and as stated, the certainty of the world and universe in which it rests has been called into question.

If we hold either 2 or 3 to be correct, God's role is questionable in science. There is uncertainty inherent within nature and because God created nature (in Christian thought) God may no longer be unchangeable and absolute. Now if we are simply temporarily ignorant as human scientists, then we may turn to God for revelatory power. In either case, the historical truth of the day is that we live in an uncertain and indeterminate world. Does God hold a blueprint? Or do we need to resign ourselves to using relatively truthful maps and models to allow us as fallible beings to gain further insights into a relative reality?

There is hope for a bridge here between science and faith if we adjust our view of absolutes and possibly visualize the non-need for *perfect* understanding and accept the functionally reliable concept of *excellence*. Next, we will discuss the concept of transcendent excellence as opposed to a more traditional concept of divine perfection. This has positive implications for finding a language for the unification of science and religion.

Process Theology as a Solution

Process theology proposes an ongoing "evolution" of the Christian faith. Within the chapter, "Science and the future of theology," in Arthur Peacocke's book, Paths From Science Towards God, he begins by postulating, "the human quest for meaning cannot be satisfied without concurrently pursuing that for intelligibility" (Peacocke 18). Then he

suggests, “it would be wise for us to examine what resources and methods have proved to be suitable for the scientific quest and to what extent they might be suitable to the theological one” (18). Before continuing, we need illumination on what “meanings” we are seeking, what is meant by “intelligibility” and the varying definitions of suitability.

Unfortunately, the meaning of “meanings” within science can rapidly transfer itself from the physical and empirical to the metaphysical and seemingly transcendent. This may be why scientists were originally theologians practicing science within the structure of the church. Science pursued the empirical data in complete harmony with biblical truth. Along the way, Science and the Church, diverged. It was as if one filed for divorce citing irreconcilable differences. A school of thought influenced by Alfred North Whitehead, began with the concept called Process Theology. Now, as Peacocke, Keith Ward, and others advocate, the door has reopened and Process Theology holds the key.

Before fully exploring process theology and its implications, let us elaborate on the concepts of suitability and intelligibility. Intelligibility would seem to refer to something rational and understandable with little or no large and difficult explanations. Science seeks to provide intelligible insight into the physical world, and in order to do that we need models that are understandable to the naked eye. These models, which are not certain fact, allow the scientist to further explain his or her position and, in turn, explore further into a certain field of study. Intelligibility is a referent to the physical and tangible world. “Suitability” may also provide a referent to what a scientist is seeking to explain or explore in the physical and the suitability of the proposed method. Without launching into a discussion of scientific subjectivity and its implications, we may just

suggest that scientists may have a particular bias or subjective opinion on their particular methods.

Process theology, beginning with Whitehead, provides a unification path for Science and God. The method of process theology is more philosophically than biblically or traditionally based, although many of its concepts use process thought as a contemporary way of expressing traditional Christian thought and values. This method emphasizes the importance of science in the formulation of theology. One might say that in mediaeval theology, the concept of science grew from the Church's teachings; here, the theologian, or more appropriately, the scientist-theologian, begins with empirical science, which provides insight into the nature of theology and more specifically, God.

In arguing for the existence of God, Whitehead holds that without eternal objects there would be no definite rational possibilities or values to be actualized, and yet only the actual is able to affect actual entities. Therefore, there must be one actual entity that grasps all other actual entities and acts as a transcendent source for order and value in the world. That "transcendent source" is necessarily God. For Whitehead, without God the cosmic process would not be an orderly creative process, but only chaos. God, "by his primordial nature, acts as the 'principle of limitation' or 'concretion,' enabling the world to become concretely determinate by aiming at certain values within divinely given limits of freedom" (Whitehead 104). So here we see that God, according to Whitehead's proposal, can determine outcomes within science. He is an active participant in the scientist's study, and yet transcends the entire study of science.

Charles Hartshorne pushes the concept further, suggesting that even though God transcends science, he has an active role and is therefore changeable in some sense.

According to Hartshorne, God's perfection should not be seen exclusively in terms of "absoluteness, necessity, independence or infinity." Reliability is God's highest attribute, and to be reliable does not mean God has to be absolute. Yet this reliability, for Hartshorne, implies a relativity:

The properly constituted man does not want to 'rely' upon God to arrange all things, including our decisions, in accordance with a plan of all events which fixes every least detail with reference to every other that ever has happened or ever 'is to' happen. How many atheists must have been needlessly produced by insistence upon this arbitrary notion . . . We shall see that the really usable meaning of divine reliability is quite different and is entirely compatible with a profound relativity of God to conditions and to change (Hartshorne 24).

So here, God is not a perfect changeless absolute being. In fact, Hartshorne argues that God cannot be unchanging, for if he were, his perfection would be fleeting. God appears to change as man grows, gains knowledge and progresses in the sciences. This is, of course, assuming that one believes man does progress in the sciences. As he explains further, "God's love for man which supposedly involves God in history, yet in no way makes him relative to or dependent on man" (Hartshorne). God is not a mere observer; he is active and therefore able to be influenced by the actions and cares of man. Therefore, God is dependent, possibly by his own choice, upon the free decisions of man. Also, there is no need for us to hold to the concept of "divine perfection" because God here is intimately entwined in human existence, allowing us to be a part of His "divine excellence" (Hartshorne 42).

In probing deeper within the movement of process theology, we must turn to Alfred North Whitehead. He is believed to have influenced the entire foundation of this movement. Continuing in our discussion of the relativity of God, Whitehead proposes: “The purpose of God is the attainment of value in the temporal world. An active purpose is the adjustment of the present for the sake of adjustment of value in the future, immediately or remotely” (Whitehead 100). God is active and through this action, we can truly conceive of God’s purpose: an adjustment of the present for the future’s sake and man’s sake, as well. Whitehead is proposing more than a statement showing that God cares for us and our future happiness. God’s actual existence depends upon us. Whitehead reaches farther by stating that the actual, scientific and tangible world exists due to some hidden metaphysical presence. “The ordering entity is a necessary element in the metaphysical situation presented by the actual world” (Whitehead 104). This ordering entity is our Divine Being, God. Whitehead tips his hat to Kant, “This line of thought extends Kant’s argument. He saw the necessity for God in the moral order” (Whitehead 104). Not only does Whitehead see the “proof” for the existence of God in a moral order, but also in the scientific order. This transcendence of God who guides through insightful scientific thoughts and theories provides a clear concept of a God who is not completely outside the historical concept of human thinking and development. Whitehead’s proposal gives us a firm grip on this concept of Hartshorne’s “Divine Relativity.” God is ever present, yet restricted by human capacity. It is as if God only stays a couple steps ahead of mortal man. Does this proposal merely put human constraints on a divine being? We will have to investigate further!

Keith Ward offers us some more process-theological insights into our divine

being. Ward's God, A Guide For The Perplexed provides upfront answers to the questions regarding the temporal nature of God and the relativity of God's attributes. In proposing God's "timeless nature" we see a proposal for an easy solution to the question of how God knows the future:

When it is 1000 CE, God does not have to wait to see what is going to happen in 1001 CE. God makes 1001 at the same time as making 1000. In fact, God makes every time at the same time or, technically, in the same non-temporal act. That means that God does not 'foreknow or foretell the future. God actually knows it in every detail, since God makes it at the same time as the past. Nothing is either past or future for God. It is as if God sees the whole of time spread out in one 'timeless present' (Ward 134)

Ward is discussing an "Augustinian" solution to the question of God's ability to predict or force the future. He seems to accept or at least promote this proposal as a foundation for the discussion of what God can do, and how He (an apology to those who do not consider God as 'He,' but it allows us to use a pronoun instead of repeating "God" all the time) exists and engages in the divine act of creating outside our human concept of time. Further, a statement combining free will and determinism, "To see God would be to see that what is must be, even though it is the creation of a wholly perfect and all-powerful creator. In that vision, freedom and necessity coincide. Our truest freedom ... lies in the acceptance of necessity" (Ward 135).

So God appears to have retained some "absolute" or timeless quality here, but that is not really what is being stressed. If God exists outside of time and we, as humans,

exist in time, then where does Ward propose we go in the discussion of how God relates to man? In a section aptly titled “The Rejection of Platonism”, Ward briefly refers to “Kenotic Christology,” which denotes the idea that when God became man, in the form of Jesus Christ, He “emptied himself of some of the divine attributes – omnipotence and omniscience, for example – when becoming human” (Ward 144). Of course, we can immediately see the “process theology-like” thought here. God changed! In traditional Christian thought when the “Word became flesh,” Jesus was not the same being as his father God who remained in heaven. Yet, Jesus was God and man. Without launching into a fevered Christological debate, we can simply say, as Ward says, “God either temporarily loses, or perhaps suppresses, some divine attributes” (Ward 145). So God, on some level, changed, and is therefore changeable. God’s metaphorical “Form” in the Platonic sense of the word has been questioned by the unraveling of human history. If God entered into human history, shared human suffering and responded and continues to respond to the prayers of man, then is not God open and able to change?

Ward discussed the topic of the intentionality of prayer at a guest lecture at Harris Manchester College of Oxford in August of 2002. God wants interaction with his people. People have thoughts and experiences and God will therefore be affected. God, as Ward explains, “will be different,” as in the fact that he knows different things after our actions. Knowing different things will affect what God does in answering prayer. He then stated that within prayer, humans “live by the sword and die by the sword,” referring to the judgments that God makes on a person’s intentions before He answers prayer. So God changes through time, gaining knowledge and responding to man’s intentions, requests and actions. Yet God remains good, simply because he is God and is unable to become

evil.

Now the question is that if human prayer affects and possibly redirects God, would that mean that he is a temporal being, restricted by time? How can God be timeless and yet affected by something that a temporal being does? It seems as if we have to choose: God as timeless and we are just “rats in a maze” (to use a crude metaphor) or God is within time, bound by constraints of temporal existence, very much like a human being. Yet as we have discussed and assessed, process theology promotes this dipolar portrait of God. What a mystery!

Pressing On!

So God is timeless, involved in time, changed by human actions, and still completely divinely transcendent. There seem to be many paradoxes within Ward’s thoughts and Process Theology as a whole. But let us press on. Ward’s statement that “God is in control, yet people are partly responsible” makes sense, until we investigate this fundamental thread of Process Theology: God is changeable. God is changed by man! Man’s actions affect God! Why is there this need for a God at all if merely mortal men and women can affect this Divine Being who only created this world and is thereafter indebted to its creature’s actions and desires? This surely is not the God of a Christian faith that professes “Praise be to the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ who has blessed us in the heavenly realms with every spiritual blessing in Christ. For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight” (Ephesians 1:3-4, NIV). If divine at all, this is a God who created the world, possibly

formulated some laws, moral, natural or otherwise and simply let the world go! Possibly, it is just a Deist argument at best, and a salute to atheism at worst. Any aspect of Christianity outside the “social” attributes of the faith appear to be lost in the shuffle for ‘high-flown’ theological insight based on humanity’s scientific progress.

Scientific Implications

Before we subject ourselves to further discussion of God’s attributes, let us return to some implications within Science. God, as discussed, has an ever-changing nature. He is affected by scientific query and human progress (We, however briefly, define progress as the increasing ability of scientific theory to explain and/or predict particular events). In returning to the subjectivity of science, here we see that a divine influence of a subjectively influenced God can provide a kind of “divine subjectivity” to the study of science. God, here, is no longer unchangeable, but able to grow and change. God is ever present and transcendent, a powerful being, with seemingly ever increasing perfection. But how can perfection increase? On a human level, we grow individually and collectively. The progress of science reaches further and gains more understanding, insight and predictable prowess. Humans are the main component of that progress. But God in the model of process theology is just that, a model. It is human nature to create an understandable model or process to relate to something we cannot see. But have process theologians simply reduced an understanding God to a being who provides us with subjective and fleeting knowledge?

Polkinghorne's Proposal and More Scientific and Theological Implications

Let us turn to John Polkinghorne. Polkinghorne labels himself among the “critical realist” cast. Within critical realism, in regards to science, one would assert science as a true social endeavor. According to the critical realist, theories and their explanations cannot give exact, verifiable truth about every aspect within science. However, scientists seek to attain a closer grip on truth, and in good faith, share their information. Polkinghorne further asserts the critical realist claim within the realm of Christian theology. “Scientists and theologians of a realist cast of mind, have one important commitment in common: they both believe that there is a truth to be found or, more realistically, to be approximated to” he says (Polkinghorne 45). Polkinghorne heads in a direction away from process theology and appears to have an attachment to the idea of a more absolute “truth.” It is definitely not in the Platonic sense of truth, but Polkinghorne pushes for an attainment of a “developing understanding” of truth.

Within his work, Belief in God in an Age of Science, Polkinghorne states two assumptions about human activity. First, that it is “exercised with a certain degree of freedom,” and secondly, that humans are not a “dual separable combination of flesh and spirit” (Polkinghorne 49). Humans are free beings with exercisable wills. We are also, in this view, unified beings with one unified thought process. Certainly we can be swayed by emotions and mixed feelings, but simply, we are not “a soul imprisoned in a body” as Plato would have said. In this theory, scientists who operate in this are asserting their own ideas and conducting experiments in order to gain a clearer understanding of how the world works. And further, they work in a hope to remain unrestricted by the bounds

of a historical influence, which may detract from their arrival at what is true or at least correct in the best approximation of truth.

Polkinghorne discusses the need for metaphysical decisions in science. In a pre-emptive strike on process theology, we see this:

There is no logically inevitable way to proceed from epistemology to ontology, from what we can know about entities to what they are actually like. However, unless we believe ourselves to be lost in a Kantian fog – that is, unless we are condemned to groping encounter with phenomena (appearance) and we totally lack any grasp of noumena (reality) – we must suppose there to be some connection between the two. What that connection should be is a central question for philosophy and, perhaps the central question for the philosophy of science. It can be resolved only by an act of metaphysical decision (Polkinghorne 53).

Scientists do not simply plod along, having encounter after encounter with experiment after experiment which provides insight after insight into the inevitable, methodical progress of science, and yet with no real conclusion as to its meaning or purpose.

Pushing farther (possibly even more than Polkinghorne does on this particular point) it could be argued that this “fog” may blind scientists into a subjectivist world that slides down a slippery slope in which it is believed that there is no correlation between experimental processes. And there is no connection of what we experiment on and what happens outside the control of our experiment. Science becomes a truth-less activity with no real need to “know” anything in the tangible, real world.

To return to Polkinghorne, he then wants to discuss some inadequacies (in his

opinion) in process theology. He points out that process thought, “permits divine interaction by way of a ‘lure’ towards a particular outcome” (55). This permission implies supremacy of humanity over the divine. The divine being merely persuades the outcome, and “there is a divine participation in each event but, in the end, the event itself leads to its own completion” (56). He also states that science does not progress in the “processed” manner of continual forward progress. For example, “Quantum physics involves both continuous development and occasional sharp discontinuities” (56). So God is not just a persuasive observer who can be dismissed at the whims of scientists (or any other human being). Also, science itself, is not just a coherent body of evidence pointing to the process by which humanity’s science progresses. Another error is the implication that the divine being simply stays one step ahead of the game. As Polkinghorne says in a plea for the need for revision of process thought: “I think this places God too much at the margins of the world, with a diminished role, inadequate to the One who is believed to care providentially for creation and to be its ultimate hope of fulfillment” (56). The word “providentially” implies the divergence from an attitude of free-will for Polkinghorne. Does God select our future? Does he know it perfectly? So we are back to the dipolar God, who is within time and is influenced by our actions and prayers and yet divinely transcendent, knowing and possibly directing and creating all of history outside of the human concept of time. Polkinghorne seems to lean toward the second notion of God. But is this just as restrictive? Now every human is reduced to that proverbial rat in the maze. Crude and degrading, but possibly applicable!

Confronting the Non-confrontational and a Modern Divergence

Polkinghorne gives us a statement describing the discrepancies in the languages spoken in science and religion. “ Science investigates a physical world that is open to the manipulative investigation of our experimental enquiry. Theology seeks to speak of the God who is to encountered in awe and obedience, and who is not available to be subjected to our testing interrogation” (37). In considering this comment, which comes early in this particular book, he never resolves the issue, except to say that it is a metaphysical decision. Otherwise: a leap of faith! Yes, Polkinghorne speculates, as all of us need to do, to sometimes justify our faith in science and God at the same time. But within science, we cannot ask God, “why.” In faith we do not propose that we fully understand God’s actions or reasoning. Surely we pray and expect an answer, but prayers (in any real sense of prayer outside of the occurrence of miracles – of which I will not tackle that debate today!) are answered in God’s time and not our own.

The Admission of a Failed Experiment

I must now confess. I entered this debate in hopes of reconciling a scientist’s work within a theological realm. The indeterminacy of nature spurred my hopes in finding a bridge between the God of absolutes and the God of science. Yet our relative, changing God, fails to capture the hope and love and consistency of the bible. As a believer in God, it is difficult to maintain my faith in the face of science’s relativist claims. I would be a fool not to respect the claims of highly reputable scientists and scientist-theologians. Yet something is just not right here.

Arthur Peacocke plainly states that: “One can no longer appeal to what is said in the bible or in the teaching of the church simply by asserting that they are authoritative. Propositions in theology, as in all fields of enquiry, have to be justified in terms of their content and not their source, however eminent or revered” (20). So theology has now admitted itself to be reduced to “a field of enquiry” and not a study backed by faith and all that lies there-in.

When approaching the Christian faith, the bible is of utmost importance. It seems baffling to me that one would dismiss the authority of “the document,” which is supposed to be the “Word of God” and still consider one’s self to be a Christian. I do not mean to profess a fundamentalist viewpoint or preach, because this seems like a basic logical point. Why would one profess a faith and renounce the acceptance of the “source” because of lack of evidence? Is that not the point of faith? To believe in what one cannot see? As Polkinghorne points out, “scientists proceed as much by intuitive leaps as by the painstaking sifting of data” and further “science can also live, if not comfortably at least pragmatically, with serious conceptual questions unresolved” (46). Science is just like faith, at least on one level; a scientist needs to start here, and accept some “given,” some point or issue he or she cannot prove at that given point in time. Otherwise all scientific movement from that point is merely speculation and has no possibility of moving forward. Faith in God means accepting scripture as a faith-based text. It is not just a document; it is a faith document, written by people of faith (whether divinely inspired or providentially written by the hand of God using a person) for people of faith.

I believe process theology has failed because it has tried to rectify faith (that should remain in the unseen) with the empirical world of science. I will finish with a

quote from Paul Feyerabend, known for his strongly held doctrine of subjectivity and relativity. “It is a pity that the church of today, frightened by the universal noise made by the scientific wolves, prefers to howl with them instead of trying to teach them some manners” (Feyerabend 260). Perhaps the church needs to profess faith instead of engaging in the failing act of translating the profession of faith into scientific evidence.

Bibliography

- Barbour, Ian G. Religion and Science. Harper, San Francisco, 1997.
- Feyerabend, Paul. Farewell to Reason. Verso Books, New York, 1996.
- Hartshorne, Charles. The Divine Relativity. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1948.
- Peacocke, Arthur. Paths From Science Towards God. Oneworld, Oxford, England, 2001.
- Polkinghorne, John. Belief in God in an Age of Science. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1998.
- Ward, Keith. God, A Guide for the Perplexed. Oneworld, Oxford, England, 2002.
- Ward, Keith. Guest lecture at Harris Manchester College, Oxford, England, August 6th, 2002.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. Religion in the Making. Macmillan Company, New York, 1960.