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SCIENCE WORKS WITH FACTS:
FULLER SEMINARY ONLY HAS FAITH

by Walter Ray

Christianity is founded on believing the unbelievable and therefore must debase the three heads of Cerberus: Philosophy, Reason and Science!

Is this really the attitude of Christianity? One might easily think so upon examining some of the things said and done in the name of Christianity. Soren Kierkegaard said, "Christianity does not lend itself to objective observation." Religious leaders of Galileo's time suppressed his teachings concerning the earth's rotation because these teachings undermined the basis of religion. Many Christians today are quick to criticize Science for being unscientific in its attitude toward Christianity, when in actual fact one of the guiltiest parties in the alienation of Science from Christianity is: CHRISTIANITY!

Thomas Huxley was led by the Church to believe that faith is "The power of saying you believe things which are incredible." We can sympathize with him when he recoils at this type of teaching. On June 22, 1633, Galileo was forced in the name of Christianity to reject his conviction that the sun was the center of our system and again embrace the obvious teaching of the Bible that the sun goes around the earth. Who can blame Bertrand Russell for being influenced by such incidents as these to the position that not only is there a conflict between Science and Religion but that it is a conflict of free thought versus bigotry!

In the arena of man's natural accomplishments today, Science occupies the dominant position. The Twentieth Century is the Age of Science. One of the basic precepts of Science is that an intelligent and logical evaluation of the objective evidence will determine the truth. It is at this point that Christianity has aggravated Science. A major complaint of Science is that Christianity is unreasonable, illogical, and unattractive to the thinking man. Fuel is fed to the fire by men like Kierkegaard. Science is repelled by Kierkegaard's dictum that "The absurd is precisely by its objective repulsion the measure of the intensity of faith in inwardness." If we were to follow this logic, then the unfortunate person who happens to believe that Christianity is objectively attractive would best show the intensity of his faith by committing an objectively repulsive act, and therefore he should Reject Christianity!

Christianity has been the source of much of Science's dislike for Christianity. Of course, there has been some bigotry on the part of Science also, but let us here follow the Scriptural teaching, "Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye? First take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's eye."

WALTER RAY graduated from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1958 and is presently a senior at F.T.S.
WHY AND WHAT FOR

The beginning of the school year is perhaps the best time to ask ourselves why we are attending Fuller Theological Seminary. If asked why we came to Fuller, we would offer a variety of reasons. Some have come in quest of theological knowledge while others have come to obtain a degree that would allow us to enter a particular vocation. Some have come to learn more about our personal faith while others have come seeking an encounter and meaning for life. For some there are only vague and elusive reasons while for others there is the strong compulsion of the Holy Spirit. Indeed there are varieties and combinations of reasons for our presence here.

But what will we receive? The most important thing we will gain from our seminary education is not a greater accumulation of knowledge in our minds (or in our notebooks). Nor is it a theological degree. The most important thing we will receive from our seminary education is a changed life. Our minds will be inspired by classroom discussion to new, exciting thoughts. Our ideas and our actions will be challenged by other students. We will be changed in the course of dialogue. We will search deeply in our own minds and souls for clarity and consistency and meaning; changed lives may result. This change may be positive or negative; and in many cases we ourselves will not know which alternative we have chosen. But if we remain open to the possibility of something new, if before condemning we critically examine the presuppositions and actions of others, we may trust God to lead us to greater spiritual maturity. Our life at seminary is not simply preparation for something later. It is to be a life of love and serving now ad magnum Dei gloriam.

WAP

SCIENCE (con't.)

Many people today think that Science deals only with facts. This is, however, a debatable topic. Albert Einstein, a colossus among scientists, stressed the gap between the data of sense and concepts of thought. Einstein contended that there is a gulf, logically unbridgeable, which separates the world of sensory experiences from the realm of concepts and conceptual relations which constitute propositions.

In many important areas today, Science operates on the concept of faith. One such case is that of the electron. The industry of Electronics is founded on the basis of the existence and operation of the electron, yet no scientist has ever seen an electron. Nor does any scientist today really know what an electron is! Yet Science has a profound conviction about the existence of the electron. In fact, Science realizes that it will never (barring some completely unforeseen development) see an electron. For the resolving power of light depends on the relative atomic dimensions of the light wave and of the object which is being observed; and the atomic dimensions of an electron are smaller than the dimension of the resolving power of the light wave with which our eye can see!

Is there not a kinship here with what the Christian does? The Twentieth Century Christian has never seen God in Person, nor could the Christian completely define and explain God. Yet the Christian has a firm conviction that God exists. He can pragmatically confirm the existence of God just as surely as the scientist confirms the existence of the electron. If the scientist will perform certain experiments in the
laboratory, the evidence will convince him beyond the shadow of a doubt that such a thing as an electron exists. It must exist because the effects of its presence can be clearly discerned.

If the scientist would conscientiously submit himself to Jesus Christ in the manner described in the Bible, he would know that God exists. God would give him some personal evidence. This is why a man like Brunner can say, "I myself know, in my faith, that Jesus Christ is my Lord...I know it myself, just as certainly as I know, two and two make four." Of course, this analogy breaks down in at least one sense because a supernatural revelation of God is what enables the Christian to know, while the scientists' conviction about the electron is not the result of a supernatural intervention.

At this point the scientist will object that the Christian must start with the presuppositions that the Bible is correct in what it teaches about Christ and that this presupposition is not logically justifiable. But the Christian may reply to the scientist with the same line of thought. The scientist also must start with a presupposition. In conducting an experiment to determine the existence of the electron, he obviously is starting with the presupposition that something like an electron exists. If not, then it would be senseless to enter the laboratory to make tests about something which he does not believe exists! He is also making the further presupposition that this electron will behave in accordance with some laws of nature. It is by faith that he assumes the existence of these laws of nature.

But the scientist will then say that his presuppositions are founded on observable and demonstrable evidence, and in this he is entirely correct. The Christian, however, can also say that his presupposition about the Bible and Christ is founded on observable and demonstrable evidence. Dr. Carnell has aptly defined faith as "a resting of the mind in the sufficiency of the evidences."

But what about the teaching of Scripture that the Gospel is folly? Must not there be something objectionable about the Gospel? Yes, there is an objectionable element; but it is not to be our presentation of the Gospel. We are not to present Christianity to Science as a faith which is objectively repulsive and which is not founded on any facts! The Bible says that the stumbling block of Christianity is Christ crucified; it does not say that the stumbling block is to be our presentation of Christianity or that Christianity should be presented as an irrational and non-factual religion. Let us not be guilty of erecting any false stumbling blocks to Science. Let us present to Science a Christ crucified, and if they reject Christ then let the stumbling-block be Christ and the fact that they do not wish to serve Him as Lord. May the stumbling block never be our presentation of Christianity.

What can Christianity do about the attitude of Science? If we adopt Kierkegaard's view, then Science is justified in criticizing Christianity for being irrational and unscientific. Paul Tillich's solution to the tension between Christianity and Science is one adopted by many today: Science and Religion are two different areas. Let Religion go its way, and let Science go its way. Tillich says, "Scientific truth and the truth of faith do not belong to the same dimension of meaning. Science has no right and no power to interfere with faith and faith has no power to interfere with science."

As Kierkegaard placed one stumbling block before science, Tillich would erect another! When Christianity dictates to Science: you go your way, and we will go our way, the scientist cannot help but suspect that Christianity is scared of something—that Christianity is fearful of being unveiled by Science. Christianity is scared that Science will discover something which will once and for all disprove
Christianity in the eyes of the world. It is this attitude of Tillich which has caused so much friction. As Julian Huxley said, "The conflict between Science and Religion has come chiefly from the fact that religion has often been afraid of the new knowledge provided by science." Let us believe Huxley when he says that to the man of Science "truth is sacred." It is true that above all else, Science is the pursuit of truth, and no true scientist would hold any other view of his profession. This being the case, what can Christianity possibly have to fear from Science! Did not Jesus say, "You will know the truth, and the truth will make you free." Of course, Christ was not referring primarily to scientific or physical truth here; but certainly the Christian must not oppose the uncovering of the truth in any realm, or at any time.

CONCLUSION:

Science has been given reason to class Christianity as an unreasonable and unscientific practice. Yet there is a faith involved in science which in every epistemological sense of the word is akin to the faith which is involved in Christianity. Today Christianity must remove some of the stumbling blocks it has put before Science: the stumbling block of Kierkegaard's "Believing the unbelievable," Tillich's stumbling block that Science should not interfere with Religion, and the stumbling block of a hyperorthodoxy which castigates Science. We must take Science at its word when it says it is primarily interested in the search for truth. Christianity should show a friendly attitude toward Science and not impute to it a dishonesty and unwillingness to consider honestly Christianity. Of course, the Christian must oppose the scientist who seeks to replace Christianity with Science.

Let us present to Science a Gospel unfettered by stumbling blocks, a Gospel which presents the Person and Work of Jesus Christ in a language that the scientist can understand. May the stumbling block of Christianity never be our presentation of Christianity or our inability to present the Gospel in a manner which is meaningful to the scientist.

******

FROM OUR DRAMA CRITIC

Good religious drama is always a welcomed event at Fuller Theological Seminary. One or two plays a year presented by Tri-Theta are usually not enough for those enjoying the theatre. For this reason we are happy to pass on an invitation which crossed our desk. "Great Men of the Word," a unique and absorbing live dramatic presentation will be given by the Drama Group of the Altadena Community Church in Hecher Hall on October 4th at 8:20 p.m. The church is located at 943 East Altadena Drive and it is presented free of charge.

Written by Robert St. Clair, "Great Men of the Word" tells the life stories of Jedediah Smith, Adoniram Judson and William Tyndale. Robert Basson of Spring Banquet fame claims it is one of the best missionary dramatic productions he has seen. Remember, it's free.

******
HOW TO HAVE AN OPINION

by Barbara Smith

Welcome to Fuller, or welcome back as the case may be. The opinion (a student publication) is here to serve you, to voice your opinions. The only way to accomplish this task is for you to take pen in hand and apply it to paper.

Writing for the opinion is not like writing a term paper, a letter home or a textbook. The opinion is a newspaper which is read only if the material within its pages is stimulating and easily readable. Our readership is caught during extracurricular moments and does not expect to "study" the opinion.

Because the above is true there are several things to keep in mind when writing for the opinion:

1. Keep paragraphs brief, a few concise sentences which come to the point quickly and move easily to the next thought.
2. Use simple sentences whenever possible rather than complex or compound ones.
3. Be straightforward, following an outline to make your reasoning obvious.
4. The touch of genius is to have scholarly ideas but to express them in simple language.
5. Illustration and example are often worth tomes of explanation. These may carry your point if used with discretion and sufficiently relative to the topic.

The opinion welcomes letters to the editor. This is the ideal way to respond to an article. You may have something of import to add or wish to supply the opposite side of an issue. In either case a letter is more usable to us than a lengthy article in response.

Articles for the opinion may be solicited on a particular topic of contemporary interest. This is not the usual practice, however. All who are vigorous enough to have an opinion and all who are interested enough to ask keen questions are invited to make use of your campus newspaper. See you in the opinion.

*****

Letters to the Editors...

EVENTIDE AT THE REFECTORY

There are always surprises in store for returning students--some quite pleasant--but some are unfortunately not so pleasant. One of these not-so-pleasant surprises was the change in the evening meal hour.

In former years even the 5:15 to 5:45 time period was difficult for some to make due to work, extracurricular activities, classes, and group therapy sessions. The change to 5:30 to 6 would have been welcomed by the students but we were shocked to find that instead it had been moved back in time.

We hope that this will be rectified in the near future.

Mae Tokunaga
Doug Pearson
NEWS IN SHORT

California is an unusual state. Northern California has the water, Southern California has the agricultural land. The North has the hydro-electric power, the South the industry. The North has seven major seminaries. The South has the people and only three accredited seminaries. But these three are just as progressive as those in the North. Last year we had great fellowship on the athletic fields. This year plans have been made to extend this fellowship to the halls of learning. For the first time in history Claremont, California Baptist and FTS have inaugurated an inter-seminary series of courses. Students at all three schools will now be able to pick the minds of the best professors in the area. This fall quarter will find them studying "Barth's Contribution of Contemporary Theology" with Professors Bromiley, Robinson and Ramm as their tutors. If you are interested in joining this elite group of students, Dr. Daniel Fuller will be very happy to discuss this possibility with you. Act immediately!

The Brooklyn Dodger Fans of yesteryear had nothing over the married men of FTS when they used the expression "Wait 'til next year." Every year the Married Maulers take on the Single Slashers and find themselves on the shorter end of the final score. Whether this can be attributed to the weight gained around the middle due to their wives good cooking or to the sleepless nights walking the baby to sleep science and the Las Vegas odds makers have not been able to discern. This Saturday afternoon at three O'clock in the shadow of the Rose Bowl at Brookside Park the married men have another chance to get rid of their married frustrations. All are invited to play or watch the annual event. Afterwards there will be other games and entertainment and then a picnic supper. See you all at the slaughter.

SUPPORT THE LOYALTY FUND CRUSADE

"You need the school, the school needs you!"

100% participation is this year's goal.
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