

Well, although this is a coherent and cogent presentation concerning the faith system which IS science, Davies does not present a philosophic criticism, that is, he does not go deeper to the contradictions which science basis its “truths” upon.

First of all, scientists, being human beings exhibit just as much need for and trust in basic faith as does any other human being, given the fact that whatever we know results from our common sense perceptions, so THAT a world exists is the human basic act of faith which has no antecedent “knowledge” than the facts which human touch provide us, whether from physical hand touch or aural sound touch or rod and cone sight touch and so forth. Aristotle and Aquinas stated simply: whatever is in the intellect comes some how or other through sense perception, so if a person is blind from birth, that person has no perception and thus knowledge of color. Therefore, such basic belief or faith THAT a physical world reality exists is common to each human being, whether a religious person, a scientist or a street person.

Secondly, every human being basis his or her life upon a basic belief THAT this physical world reality will continue in an organized way, not arbitrarily and capriciously, so all presume THAT order exists in this physical world reality, more particularly, within our biological organism, we call a body and our intellectual “organism” we call our mind; thus, each person has a common sense awareness of what has come to be called “natural law.”

Thirdly, a scientist’s knowledge is not qualitatively different in its formation from the knowledge of a religious or street person, that is all human conceptual knowledge content results from a given person’s composite kind of knowledge and experiences, so no human person can lay claim to any so-called “objective” knowledge. Therefore, any given person’s conceptual knowledge, that is, knowledge our intellect conceives has human experiential and technical knowledge content and, consequently is subjective; thus, all human knowledge is subjective.

Consequently, although a scientist and religious person might approach the real world with a specifically different attitude, the scientist presumably, after Francis Bacon and his *Novum Organon* with a

mathematical attitude, the religious person with an *Old Testament*, *New Testament* and/or *Qur'an* viewpoint, these are but attitude differences, not necessarily “faith” differences. Of course, one’s faith does provide a specific kind of attitude difference, namely, a mathematically framed, *New Testament* framed, *Qur'an* framed attitude, yet, the basic human faith mind-set is common to all.

Therefore, every given person’s knowledge is subjective in at least two ways, through the unique knowledge and experience one accumulates and through the so-called denominational religious belief to which one adheres.

Thus, the significant difference between and among various persons’ knowledge is that person’s fundamental attitude, so, a scientist might have more trust in mathematics, whereas a religious person might have more trust in his or her religious text. Of course, this “more trust” surely will result in different starting points and different conclusions, but does not necessarily in any contradictions.

OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

Taking Science on Faith

By PAUL DAVIES

Published: November 24, 2007

Tempe, Ariz.

SCIENCE, we are repeatedly told, is the most reliable form of knowledge about the world because it is based on testable hypotheses. Religion, by contrast, is based on faith. The term “doubting Thomas” well illustrates the difference. In science, a healthy skepticism is a professional necessity, whereas in religion, having belief without evidence is regarded as a virtue. The problem with this neat separation into “non-overlapping magisteria,” as Stephen Jay Gould described science and religion, is that science has its own faith-based belief system. All science proceeds on the assumption that nature is ordered in a rational and intelligible way. You couldn’t be a scientist if you thought the universe was a meaningless jumble of odds and ends haphazardly juxtaposed. When physicists probe to a deeper level of subatomic structure, or astronomers extend the reach of their instruments, they expect to encounter additional elegant mathematical order. And so far this faith has been justified.

The most refined expression of the rational intelligibility of the cosmos is found in the laws of physics, the fundamental rules on which nature runs. The laws of gravitation and electromagnetism, the laws that regulate the world within the atom, the laws of motion — all are expressed as tidy mathematical relationships. But where do these laws come from? And why do they have the form that they do? When I was a student, the laws of physics were regarded as completely off limits. The job of the scientist, we were told, is to discover the laws and apply them, not inquire into their provenance. The laws were treated as “given” — imprinted on the universe like a maker’s mark at the moment of cosmic birth — and fixed forevermore. Therefore, to be a scientist, you had to have faith that the universe is governed by dependable, immutable, absolute, universal, mathematical laws of an unspecified origin. You’ve got to believe that these laws won’t fail, that we won’t wake up tomorrow to find heat flowing from cold to hot, or the speed of light changing by the hour.

Over the years I have often asked my physicist colleagues why the laws of physics are what they are. The answers vary from “that’s not a scientific question” to “nobody knows.” The favorite reply is, “There is no reason they are what they are — they just are.” The idea that the laws exist reasonlessly is deeply anti-rational. After all, the very essence of a scientific explanation of some phenomenon is that the world is ordered logically and that there are reasons things are as they are. If one traces these reasons all the way down to the bedrock of reality — the laws of physics — only to find that reason then deserts us, it makes a mockery of science. Can the mighty edifice of physical order we perceive in the world about us ultimately be rooted in reasonless absurdity? If so, then nature is a fiendishly clever bit of trickery: meaninglessness and absurdity somehow masquerading as ingenious order and rationality.

Although scientists have long had an inclination to shrug aside such questions concerning the source of the laws of physics, the mood has now shifted considerably. Part of the reason is the growing acceptance that the emergence of life in the universe, and hence the existence of observers like ourselves, depends rather sensitively on the form of the laws. If the laws of physics were just any old ragbag of rules, life would almost certainly not exist.

A second reason that the laws of physics have now been brought within the scope of scientific inquiry is the realization that what we long regarded as

absolute and universal laws might not be truly fundamental at all, but more like local bylaws. They could vary from place to place on a mega-cosmic scale. A God's-eye view might reveal a vast patchwork quilt of universes, each with its own distinctive set of bylaws. In this "multiverse," life will arise only in those patches with bio-friendly bylaws, so it is no surprise that we find ourselves in a Goldilocks universe — one that is just right for life. We have selected it by our very existence. The multiverse theory is increasingly popular, but it doesn't so much explain the laws of physics as dodge the whole issue. There has to be a physical mechanism to make all those universes and bestow bylaws on them. This process will require its own laws, or meta-laws. Where do they come from? The problem has simply been shifted up a level from the laws of the universe to the meta-laws of the multiverse. Clearly, then, both religion and science are founded on faith — namely, on belief in the existence of something outside the universe, like an unexplained God or an unexplained set of physical laws, maybe even a huge ensemble of unseen universes, too. For that reason, both monotheistic religion and orthodox science fail to provide a complete account of physical existence.

This shared failing is no surprise, because the very notion of physical law is a theological one in the first place, a fact that makes many scientists squirm. Isaac Newton first got the idea of absolute, universal, perfect, immutable laws from the Christian doctrine that God created the world and ordered it in a rational way. Christians envisage God as upholding the natural order from beyond the universe, while physicists think of their laws as inhabiting an abstract transcendent realm of perfect mathematical relationships.

And just as Christians claim that the world depends utterly on God for its existence, while the converse is not the case, so physicists declare a similar asymmetry: the universe is governed by eternal laws (or meta-laws), but the laws are completely impervious to what happens in the universe.

It seems to me there is no hope of ever explaining why the physical universe is as it is so long as we are fixated on immutable laws or meta-laws that exist reasonlessly or are imposed by divine providence. The alternative is to regard the laws of physics and the universe they govern as part and parcel of a unitary system, and to be incorporated together within a common explanatory scheme.

In other words, the laws should have an explanation from within the

universe and not involve appealing to an external agency. The specifics of that explanation are a matter for future research. But until science comes up with a testable theory of the laws of the universe, its claim to be free of faith is manifestly bogus.

0. « **PREVIOUS PAGE** 1 **2**

Paul Davies is the director of Beyond, a research center at Arizona State University, and the author of “Cosmic Jackpot: Why Our Universe Is Just Right for Life.”