

because Christianity is the most anthropocentric of the great religions. We have discussed possible ways in which the Christian theologian might react to this sort of challenge. However, in their conception of paradise popular forms of Islam would also appear to suffer from a crudely anthropocentric cosmology. The difficulties with respect to immortality apply to Judaism and Islam as well as to Christianity. Hinduism and Buddhism are easier to reconcile with science inasmuch as they do not give man a special place in the world and still less a place outside the purely natural order. In the case of Buddhism and some popular forms of Hinduism problems arise over the notion of reincarnation, which is contrary to the spirit of modern biology and psychology. Esoteric (Advaita) Hinduism is probably immune from scientific criticism, since its doctrine is on such a transcendental metaphysical level that it has no contact at all with the empirical level. However, such a form of Hinduism is perhaps more a form of metaphysics than of religion. In taking part in religious observances the devotee must abandon his austere metaphysics of nonduality in favor of a pluralism of god or gods and worshippers. In other words, he must return to the phenomenal level of māyā (illusion).

Finally, a critic of religious belief and practice might argue that any religion must inevitably conflict with science. This is because any religion, correctly so-called, relies heavily on the authority of tradition and ancient writings and perhaps of a priesthood. There will therefore be a tension in the mind of one who has leanings toward both science and religion. As a scientist he has scant respect for tradition or for the authority of old writings, and he is used to seeing the scientific theories of one generation rejected by the next. This is not to say that such tension is necessarily unsupportable, since there have always been devout men who have also been eminent scientists. Nevertheless, the tension is likely always to exist in the background, and in view of the great successes of science it may tend to bring about a progressive weakening of religious attitudes.

#### Bibliography

The history of religious opposition to scientific innovation is well told in J. W. Draper, *The Conflict between Religion and Science* (London, 1876), and A. D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896; New York, 1960). A. W. Benn, *The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1962), was first published in 1906. Many of T. H. Huxley's essays in his *Collected Essays*, 9 vols. (London, 1894-1897), are concerned with polemics against the religious apologists of his time and provide convincing evidence of the fury with which battle was apt to be fought in those days. Lively and important critiques of religious belief in regard to its relation to science are to be found in Bertrand Russell, *Religion and Science* (Oxford, 1960), and in some of the essays in Russell's *Why I Am Not a Christian* (New York, 1957). See also H. Feigl, "Philosophical Tangents of Science," in H. Feigl and G. Maxwell, eds., *Current Issues in the Philosophy of Science* (New York, 1961). Much of Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, translated by W. D. Robson-Scott (London, 1934), and of "A Philosophy of Life," Lecture XXXV of Freud's *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, translated by W. J. H. Sprott (London, 1933), consists of general philosophical argument and is largely independent of the tenets of psychoanalytic theory.

C. D. Broad's article "The Present Relations of Science and Religion," in *Philosophy*, Vol. 14 (1939), 131-154, evoked a reply

by L. J. Walker, S.J., "The Logical Basis and Structure of Religious Belief," in the same volume of the journal (387-409). Broad's article has been reprinted in his *Religion, Philosophy and Psychological Research* (London, 1953). The Catholic attitude toward evolutionary theory was defined by Pius XII in the encyclical *Humani Generis* (1950). This was translated for the *London Tablet*, Sept. 2, 1950, by Ronald A. Knox, and an extract is reprinted in Anne Fremantle, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals in Their Historical Context* (New York, 1956).

The Anglican Theologian E. L. Mascall's *Christian Theology and Natural Science* (New York, 1957) is a noteworthy effort to face some of the chief difficulties which modern science presents to the theologian. Another book of interest by an Anglican priest is A. F. Smethurst, *Modern Science and Christian Belief* (London, 1955). A very readable book on the same theme is the biologist Roger Pilkington's *World Without End* (London, 1960). A very solid work, which incidentally contains much excellent exposition of modern scientific ideas, is E. W. Barnes, *Scientific Theory and Religion* (Cambridge, 1933). Barnes, a modernist Anglican theologian and late bishop of Birmingham, was also a first-rate mathematician, and parts of his book contain some very difficult mathematics. Another book that includes mathematics is the cosmologist E. A. Milne's *Modern Cosmology and the Christian Idea of God* (Oxford, 1952). See also two books by the famous astronomer A. S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World* (New York, 1929) and *The Philosophy of Physical Science* (Cambridge, 1939). Non-cognitivist accounts of religious belief are given by R. B. Braithwaite, *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief* (Cambridge, 1955), and by T. R. Miles, *Religion and the Scientific Outlook* (London, 1959). Criticisms of Braithwaite's views may be found in J. A. Passmore, "Christianity and Positivism," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 35 (1957), 125-136, and in Chapter 2 of C. B. Martin, *Religious Belief* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1959). (Chapter 6 of Martin's book contains a valuable discussion of the problem of life after death.) A well-known attempt to construe religious belief as nonempirical is John Wisdom, "Gods," in Antony Flew, ed., *Essays in Logic and Language, First Series* (Oxford, 1951). This article is discussed in Chapter 2 of Martin's book, mentioned above. In this connection also should be mentioned the symposium by Antony Flew, R. M. Hare, Basil Mitchell, and I. M. Crombie, "Theology and Falsification," in A. Flew and A. MacIntyre, eds., *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* (London, 1955). An attempt to reconcile physicalist and religious approaches to the nature of man is given by D. M. Mackay, who is professionally concerned with research in cybernetics and information theory. His idea depends on a notion of "complementarity" whereby science and religion can both give complete but nevertheless complementary accounts of the same things. For references to some of his articles, see his note "Complementary Descriptions," in *Mind*, Vol. 66 (1957), 390-394, which is a reply to a critique of his views by P. Alexander, "Complementary Descriptions," in *Mind*, Vol. 65 (1956), 145-165. R. N. Smart's inaugural lecture, *Theology, Philosophy and the Natural Sciences* (Birmingham, England, 1962), relates the philosophy of religion to both the philosophy of science and the comparative study of religions.

J. J. C. SMART

**RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE, ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.** Arguments from Religious Experience show remarkable diversity, (a) in the sorts of experience taken as data for the argument, (b) in the structure of the inference itself, and (c) in the alleged conclusion, whether to a vague Presence, an Infinite Being, or the God of traditional Christianity.

The following exemplify some versions of the argument:

"At very different times and places great numbers of men have claimed to experience God; it would be unreasonable to suppose that they must all have been deluded."

"The real argument to God is the individual believer's sense of God's presence, the awareness of God's will in

iences,  
ay. For  
erience  
to the  
out of

to an  
nthyolo-  
es long.  
ess than  
er catch  
are facts

help to  
ve been  
ic agnos-  
l expect  
religious  
t of way,  
ly to be  
ibility of  
hat there  
know of  
on other

orality as  
e art and  
d recom-  
acts, they  
o the om-  
vity. The  
tain that  
explicitly  
rward by  
t, by T. R.  
tive, then,  
flict with  
tent from  
y as a col-  
sed to in-  
vour," as  
ief can be  
e no logi-  
ce. (There  
atibility, if  
ught-forms  
a religion  
us people  
us creed is  
Christians  
the dead,  
foreover, if  
lem of how  
and Islam.  
re to assert  
or aesthetic

argued that  
drawn from  
branches of  
ons. This is

