

# SCIENCE AND RELIGION: A PHILOSOPHICAL REFLECTION

Ikechukwu P Ogugua & I. C Ogugua

## Abstract

This paper fully aware of the fact that some scholars think that both concepts are anti each other; holds that both are views or perspectives in life; for reality is one and argues for a synthesis of both concepts, for the betterment of man and advancement of human knowledge.

## Introduction:

This topic is weighty and requires adequate attention. The vastness of its domain suggests areas from which one could approach it. One could come from the area of origin, conflict, usefulness, etc. We want to focus our attention mainly towards the area of synthesis; essaying our best possible to bring both concepts in marriage and real union.

After the Copernican revolution which changed the view of the universe from the geocentric to the heliocentric view, some scientists thought and essayed their best to upturn (religious or biblical) truths. The postulation of Nietzsche that 'God is dead'; Marx, that God is not merely the being who does not exist, but the being who ought not to exist; Sartre, that God is more hellish as he obstructs the individual's freedom as he had earlier posited that the other is hell;

Proudhon claims that God is evil and the first duty of any intelligent and free man is to eliminate the idea of God from his consciousness incessantly and systematically. For Albert Camus, the absence of God is a necessary condition of human freedom. These and many others in the same garb have influenced and poisoned the modern and contemporary man, as he thought though wrongly that he will come of age only when God has been banished or he has vanished God. This is the atheistic culture he has built.

In 1914, Vieprich Bonhoeffer (n.d) remarked that man was proceeding towards an era or a time of no religion at all. (p.322) It is not surprising that the Occidents thought that colonialism (with its methods of alienation, marginalization and consequences) will be properly rooted on our soil if every bit of our religious beliefs (cum traditional beliefs) are raged and destroyed according to Northcote (1913). If scientific enterprise is not interested in attacking religious beliefs, why the alarmingly increasing rate of secularization in our modern world?

The bringing together of these duo concepts for discussion reminded me of the positions of two great scientists Newton and Laplace. While Newton in his Opticks BK III argued for the existence and presence, and even authority of God, as he talked about absolute space being the 'sensorium' of God, Laplace in Rouse Ball History of Mathematics made it open that he had no need of God's hypothesis. For William Paley (n.d) whose works Evidences; and Natural Theology influenced many Cambridge people, he opted that God should be given a place. He said:

In every nature and in every portion of nature which we can decry, we find attention bestowed upon even the minutest parts ... the hinges in the wings of an earwig and the joints of

its antennae are as highly wrought, as if the creator had nothing else to finish,

From the above one could easily discern that a scientist could be religious too: For Ian Ramsey(1964) "so much in the universe registers and is evidence for the purposive hand of God'.(p.4)

Charles Darwin instead of following the trend above, did not see the intricate arrangement in the world, the progress and development as the work of God, he brought in the idea of the survival of the fittest. The flood tide from Darwin and other like-minded scientists carried God away. This posture introduced some questions:

- (a) Does religion disappear with the progress in science?
- (b) Are both not different visions on life?
- (c) Is there no possibility of building a bridge between them?

The response to question (a) is that up till now science has been progressing and yet religion has not disappeared. Even many people are today becoming more religious; and some scientists are embracing religion. In the words of Ramsey (1964):

Religious themes, on this first view, might possibly provide convenient currency for uncharted scientific eras. Religion might provide convenient labels for temporary scientific ignorance. But sooner or later these religious labels' would become, on this view superfluous (pp. 4-5)

The response to question (b) is that both are different visions, different perspectives of viewing reality. It is within this sphere that conflicts tend to spring up and for some, rock the boat. Conflicts between science and religion are around the issues of:

- (a) Creationism or evolutionism (whichever one, man remains a late comer in the world)
- (b) Whether human problems are only within the physical or if they have something or some connections beyond the physical?
- (c) Whether matter is matter alone or has it any spiritual element? Or is it connected or associated with spirit?

The pivotal question is, how do we draw implications from one or both of these concepts so as to have significant relation with the other? Every attempt to respond to the above question should not overlook the remarkable posture of experimental verification of deductions from hypothesis, for it is the thing that make both distinct and different.

This paper takes the position that the conflicts between science and religion are apparent. These conflicts disappear when one gazes at them with proper insight and wisdom. It goes on to uphold that reality is one, not physical, and not spiritual but both. And at the same time to underscore that the spiritual is an anchorage for the physical, for thoughts are things (thoughts are seedlings of realities). Or else why do we say that ideas rule the world? So there is a spiritual logic( s) behind every physical or scientific fact.

In order to do any meaningful work on this project, we have to examine even if briefly, our operative concepts: science and religion; look at their features, and then try to build a bridge between them; of course by bringing in the role played in science by intuition and disclosures among other things.



observation and are conceived in different ways by different peoples.(p.13)

Again, the fact that this phenomenon interests a lot of professionals and each sees it from its own angle is equally problematic. A pivotal question here is, what is religion? Etymologically speaking, it is derived from 'religando' meaning binding back, suggesting a situation where God now binds man to himself. He (God) throws his weight around to do this. 'Religendo'- meaning to re-read; equally suggesting man's involvement in and effort to meditate on the Divine or divine things. 'Re-elegere' meaning re- election, suggesting the move of God to re-establish the link He had with man after the fall of man.

Religion attracts many nuances of meaning because of its elusive nature. It could mean for Haring in Obiefuna (1978) community with God, worship to God, a community of worshippers, or a religious order, community or society.(p.8) To hold the reductionist view that religion is anything one believes strongly in, is not sound. To equate religion with morality is sickly too. Religion is a bi-polar phenomenon, every sound definition of religion .must reflect this. There is no doubt too that the concept of God is essential in any right definition of religion.

Religion studies or concerns itself with these objects: God, the world and man. Religion could be defined subjectively and objectively, the former deals with dependence on an Absolute or transcendental Being. Little wonder, Schleiermacher(1963) sees it as a "feeling of absolute dependence on God.(p.12) A.C.Bouquet(1941) sees it as: a fixed relationship between the human self and some non-human entity, the sacred, the supernatural, the self existent, the absolute or simply, God.(p.16)

But the questions are, is man passive in this encounter? What of the aspect of belief, is it essential in religion?

For Arinze(1970), religion could be defined objectively as a complex of truths, laws and rites by which man is subordinated to the transcendent being.(p.8)

Metuh (1987) citing Jean Brothers states that: Religion comprises an institutionalized system of symbols, beliefs, values and practices focused (sic) on questions of ultimate meaning.(p.14)

Definitions abound as there are scholars. Dupre Louis in Philosophy of Religion presented forty-eight different definitions of religion; and in his article in Encyclopaedia of Philosophy he gave twelve definitions of this concept. For Matthew Arnold, it is ethics heightened.

We need to stress that usually family resemblance definition is seen as better than defining through 'genus ad differentiam' in order to include some religions which do not talk of God.

### **Science and Religion: Efforts at Getting at the Truth**

Philosophy has objects: good, the true and beauty. Here, we are concerned more with the true - truth. Reality is one, in spite of this, there are alternate realities, this has something to do with the problem of one and many, appearance and reality in philosophy. Philosophy is "scientia

rerum per ultimas causas"- knowledge of things through their ultimate causes. It is the attempt to get at reality with the sole aid of human reason.

The apparent conflicts between science and religion will be sent to flight if we understand that there are different modes of being, and each mode has its own domain and there it remains its own mistress and is in command. We have the physical, transpsychic, mythic, mystical, religious, etc modes. Each has force and appeals to the aspect of nature it is connected with. Apprehension of reality therefore necessitates and requires right training, right attitude, preparedness, and adequate spirit of inquiry in order to get the truth possible in a particular sphere of life and with a particular method.

The fact that science studies the world and man, and not God, spirits, etc show that religion which studies or has as its objects of study the world, man and God, spirits, etc has a broader sphere of operation than science. Herein lie in a nutshell the points of convergence and divergence between the two. Science is more limited than religion in its aspiration to acquire knowledge and reveal reality. It anchors on the principle of induction, which no doubt does not allow one to make instant conclusion which will ever remain valid at all times, but allows one to make a more or a less probable kind of conclusion. Science operates with facts which are experienced or can be experienced. It is not surprising why positivism thrived mostly during the 'summer time' of science and the positivists maintaining that only things which are verifiable using their verifiability principle/ criterion is meaningful and real. Radical empiricists, and positivists, and scientists were sceptically strict in doubting the veracity and relevance (of reason in acquisition of knowledge or of any other means of getting at the knowledge of reality", Religion takes into account both the experienceable and the non-experienceable.

The facts available to the scientist through the method of science depend on the premises of the scientist, his starting point, the context and the cultural and intellectual trend of the period. This leads to a lack in the vision of science, this over reliance on outer facts makes science fragmentary and incomplete, not wholistic; there is room every time for expansion of the frontiers of knowledge, change of positions, etc, while religion due to its intuitive nature and character is more complete and comprehensive. It is borne from the experience of man's universality, universality of the world, oneness of man, the world and oneness of God.

Science is the attempt of man to conquer and dominate his environment, that is to have a leap beyond the natural, while religion is man's attempt to understand himself, grow beyond himself and move beyond the physical in the bid to get at the invisible; immanent and transcendent being who is the source of reality.

The method of science is observation, hypothesis, experimentation, generalization, etc; science (it) springs from reflection. The method of religion is not observation, rather meditation, and reflection though reflection alone cannot create a religion. The attitude essential for springing up of religion is devotion. Devotion alone cannot create a science. Science is a means to an end and not an end in itself. Religion is not merely a means to an end; but is an end in itself; for it carries meaning as life does.

Lama Anagarika Govinda (1977) writes: Indeed, religion is a spiritual form of life, an individual intensification of consciousness on a

general human, if not cosmic, foundation. It is the nature of religion to release the individual from his sense of separatedness, convert him into a social being, and raise him into a state of universal awareness. (p. 219).

The practice of religion is older than the practice of science, for people of every age irrespective of how native and primitive had recourse to worship some being (something) in awe while real scientific progress started just a couple of centuries ago. The pomposity of science makes it view 'unscientific' phenomena as irrelevant. Lama Govinda laments:

It is indeed strange that what poets, thinkers and artists- the actual creators of western Culture- have expressed in their greatest works is looked upon as primitive superstition when it is practiced and made into a living expression of religious faith by people who are still in close touch with nature.(p.220).

Science is 'sensory' guided to a point because it uses instruments to elongate or expand the ability of the senses in its quest to get at the truth about reality. Religion (is not 'sensory' guided, rather it) is based on intuition, derived from psychic experience, as it is inwardly directed, unlike science which is outwardly directed. Each has its own sets of laws which it obeys. Science follows scientific laws while religion(s) follows religious or spiritual laws.

The truth of science does not depend on religion and vice versa, though each need not contradict the other, for the idea of complementarity holds here if we are going to know more wholistic visions of the truth. Aristotle posted that truth is like a proverbial door which no one gets at completely or misses entirely. Truths of (or from) different disciplines will complement each other.

The aim of science is explicative, while the aim of religion is for life and meaningful existence. This is why Lama Govinda (1977) holds:

The function of religion is not to produce certain beliefs, ideas and conventional morality, it is a spontaneous psychic tendency, inborn in man, a centrifugal spiritual force that acts as a counter weight and a balance against the natural centripetal force of egoism.(p.219)

Be it as it may, though both concepts cannot be amalgamated to mean the same thing as there are areas of differences, these differences do not in any way make it impossible for us to think of a synthesis of both concepts as they both strive to get at the truth of reality. Science and religion can exist side by side, in harmony without contradicting or impeding each other. Let us now see how this synthesis could be struck.

### **Science and Religion a Move for a Synthesis**

To remain a diehard skeptic is foolishness. To be a partial sceptic is appreciable, at least Descartes was one. To be sceptically very strict in doubting the veracity of experience is to leap without looking, remaining blind to reality and could lead one to the point of illness of the mind or disease; or behaving like a mad man who continually washes away the presumed dirt to clean his hands, when the dirt is no longer there. It is being stuffed with naivety and unreal of phenomena which are outside experience could lead one to the reductionistic prejudice and bias. Ogugua (2000) asked the students, the four storey-building outside there and the idea of this building in the mind of the architect before he drew it on the paper, and the drawing on the paper

which one is more real than the other?

Religion is not in the clouds unlike philosophy; it deals with the affairs of men, so it is practiced by men and lived by men. It has to do with beliefs, convictions and commitment. Even among philosophers who peddle 'ideas that seem to remain distanced from the affairs of men; 'for Santayana only Spinoza among the modern writers is altogether a philosopher. Others possible don't believe hook, line and sinker what they postulate. Their philosophies are not their lives. What Santayana said of philosophy could be applied to religion in our context here though not without caution. Although philosophers look for ultimate grounds of reality in their minds, they do not live or assume seriously that these things around them do not exist when they are not perceived. He (n.d) states: We are not asked to abolish our conception of the natural world, nor even, in our daily life, to cease to believe in it; we are to be idealists only north-North West, or transcendently; when the wind is southerly, we are to remain realists.... I should be ashamed to countenance opinions which, when not arguing, I did not believe. It would seem to me dishonest and cowardly to militate under other colors than these under which I live. (pp.192,298,305&308)

Religion cannot comfortably discard every experiential truth and hope to thrive; this was the undoing of religion in the past when some church leaders in the past thought they were being smart and doing religion a favor, denounced some specific discoveries made by science. One of the features of truth and maturity is openness. Truth remains even if suppressed for ages it will surely rise at a point in time. The fact remains that scientific truths and religions truths are not at the same level; hence could be interpreted differently.

Let us cautiously move in our question for science and religion closing ranks. There is a role to be played by reason; as man is the agent of both science and religion and this man is a rational animal, he is no less rational in his religious experiences more so, as we are doing a philosophical reflection. There is reason in both science and religion.

Reason in science is not the same as reason in religion; the difference is not of kind but of degree, and objects to which it is applied. Reason is not in contradistinction with emotion or instincts as many might think; rather it is a kind of marriage between ideation and impulse. Without reason man is automatically reduced to a brute. It is a name given to every practical thought and action made by man which is justified by its fruits in consciousness. Santayana(1911) writes: The rational animal is generated by the union of these two monsters. He is constituted by ideas which have ceased to be visionary and actions which have ceased to be vain.

He adds: Reason is; Man's imitation of divinity.(pp.3,6 &17)

You see this idea rhymes with the **Catholic Catechism** which teaches that man resembles God in his soul and spirit or simply put reason.

Science is anchored on common sense, the self evident principles furnished by this sense

supposed to be common, and religion too could be said to be based on common sense. Both reflect on the postulation of common sense and branch off to their respective domains. For Quinton (1967) Knowledge is justified true belief (p.348). And science is seen as a capsule or said to encapsulate all trustworthy knowledge. The life of reason is no doubt based on science, as it could afford to aid us in testing and verifying all our claims - about the world and every reality which science could study.

Science too is precarious, as reason on which it is based to an extent is precarious. (We do not suggest or mean that experience is no longer important in science, but the data from experience are dead save as reflected upon, and reason does this job of animating the data so collected). Science recognizes it could err or be in error, or else why the reversion from geocentric nature of the universe to heliocentric nature of the universe; revision of some scientific laws, etc. In a very strict sense, we have regularities among observed phenomena and not necessarily laws. In spite of the handicaps of science, we cling unto it as it has proved itself reliable to an extent. Santayana (1906) testified that "faith in the intellect ... is the only faith yet sanctioned by its fruits,(p.318)

It is this reason in science when heightened that could lead the scientist to know and appreciate the need for the divine in the world if the world will ever be a home, and comfortable, as that leap alone will inject the relevance of value in the human society. (This is irrespective of what scholars who think morality could be totally removed from religion hold) Scientists have come to realize too that they can only observe physical facts, they neither discover the human mind if they search the human brain with a microscope, nor discover God with their telescope. Durant Will (1953) asked:

And if consciousness has no efficacy, why was it evolved, so slowly and so painfully, and why does it survive in a world in which useless things so soon succumb? Consciousness is an organ of judgement as well as a vehicle of delight; its vital function is the rehearsal of response and the coordination of reaction. It is because of it that we are men.(p.496).

Religion has to do with faith; this is why philosophy is said to be the handmaid of theology- 'philosophiae ancillae theologiae'. In spite of it, there is room for reason in religion. Since time immemorial man had one religion or the other; he has never lived devoid of religion. So it is a very difficult and arduous task if not an impossible one to strive to understand man without understanding religion, for this is one phenomenon in life that moulds man, and he more often than not lives it. Religion does not find itself in the cognitive domain as such it is rather located within the affective and psychomotor domains, more centrally in the former as it has to do with affection, emotion, feeling, life itself. It is when we think of outpouring of this experience and life that we think of prayer, worship, rites, etc., and these belong to the psychomotor domain.

Many scholars have worked tirelessly to show-case the scientific ineptitude of religion, having filled their sceptical pages with sadness and unbelief, can they wholistically avoid religion? According to Santayana (1913): Such studies would bring the sceptic face toface with the mystery and pathos of mortal existence. They would make him understand why religion is so profoundly moving and in a sense so profoundly just.(p.4).

Every age and every race of men appreciates the necessity of religion and its relevance. Ogugua appreciates it thus when he stated that the African is 'religiously religious' and for Mbiti the African is notoriously religious. There is reason for this insight and consent of mankind with regard to religion.

For some people with the caste of mind of Lucretius fear made the gods. The tendency is for man to intimidate the weak and fear or reverence the powerful. To have thought of reverence to the forces beyond the natural sphere is to have consented to their powerlessness and superiority. Durant (1953) attests: Add to fear, imagination: man is an incorrigible animist, and interprets all things anthropomorphically; he personifies and dramatizes nature, and fills it with a cloud of deities (p.498).

Do you know there is a part worldview plays in a religion? Reason will tell us this. Most religions were couched in myths, poetry, and all the like. Have you ever asked yourself, why Jesus made use of parables? The old testament for instance has Jewish origin, it was couched in myths, metaphor, poetry and not as such in prose and when it was received by the less poetic, less mythic, less imaginative Occident's, they mistook them for scientific postulations. Religion is an experience of man, which is interpreted by man with the aid of his imagination as the objects of religion are not always visible to the eyes. Some of these objects are transcendental; hence religion can only contain a symbolic, mythical, metaphorical and poetic representation of life and truth, and not a literal representation of these. According to Santayana (1896): Whoever entertains ... (that religion contains a literal representation of truth, life and reality) has not come within the region of profitable philosophizing on that subject.... Matters of religion should never be matters of controversy (p.189).

We are still on the move to build a bridge between (them) science and religion to show that the apparent conflicts lie in our perception and appreciation of reality and the diverse modes of being.

Experience has taught us that there are facts which are beyond the scope of science. To doubt that without science that living in this 'friendly and hostile universe would have been this easy will be playing to the gallery or just to doubt for doubting sake. Many barriers and obstacles have been removed courtesy of science. It is not an overstatement to hold that most societies today depend greatly on science. With the wind of globalization, which blows everywhere like the Holy Spirit, no one in his right state of mind will doubt the relevance and importance of science. Despite these achievements, only a fool will get stuck so much to science and not look outside science or else where; as science has not solved every human problem or answered every question in life. The truth is that it can neither answer every question in life nor solve every problem in life.

A look into the sphere of electromagnetism and Kinetic theory of matter will show immediately a 'spiritualized' science. For in these areas scientists talk of force, flux and energy, these are not physical.

There is 'cold hot plate' now, which can fry an egg in a frying dish, while the dish and the source of energy will remain cold. According to Dennis Gordon Lindsay (1990): This is induction

heating, a method in which heating of material takes place by means of an electric current that is caused to flow through the material or its container by electromagnetic induction.(p.245-246).

We can see that experienciability, verifiability and perceptibility principles cannot always attest that something is real.

So the term flux which Faraday used is still used today and its nature is still not known; so posited Wenham, et al(1978). Life and experience have taught us that every force has an implication(s). In the Bible, God said, let there be and there were things. The force of magnetism has implications likewise that of electric flux; still up till now science in its summer time and apogee has not discovered the physical link between the point of detecting this force and its source. Again with regard to Kinetic theory of matter, Chizota states(2004) "there is no suitable theory for the transducer, which is responsible for converting ... heat energy to mechanical motion?"(p.5)

Are the effects of the use of charm; oil, bones, features of Ichakpa (bush baby); barks of Anunu-ebe tree, etc. not show that there are facts which are beyond science? Or do you think there is no logic in these generations? There is. When a mystic, a 'dibia Afa' 'dibia Aja', etc.. makes a pronouncement and things happen, where is the physical link between the utterance and the action? Science is not capable of explaining the whole of reality.

Reality is not limited to availability to the senses, the capacity of being perceived. Reality extends to the level of existence as well; something could be conceptually real- i.e. ideas; and should not be limited to the physical expression of an invisible body of logic (ideas). For Chizota (2004), proof is required to establish reality and not existence. But I hold that proof is not necessary in this sphere (issues above) as there is no need to prove self- evident facts. Extensive reasoning in the direction we are going will show that there is a spiritual and physical angle to every reality. Every thing is as a result of an expression of an idea, and this idea is spiritual.

### **Convergence of Thought**

The aim of this section of this paper is to highlight in a nutshell the convergence of thoughts with regards to the disciplines we are discussing. Both disciplines make use of language. The language of science is not the same as that of religion; the difference is only that of pattern of usage. You can use English, German, Italian, Igbo language, etc to express scientific and religious truths or facts. Science does not even make use of common language as such it makes use of scientific language, as religion makes use of religious language which is termed odd. Ramsey (1964) states: religious language is grounded in the personal, and we have now seen that the personal is not only a category which is never wholly reducible to scientific terms but that (more positively) it interlocks with all the diverse languages of science to unite them as a common presupposition.(p76).

The impression is not that science could expand and develop its language to deal with matters of religion. There is an experiential.basis for every religious discourse.

When the scientist in the bid of observing phenomena and the relation between or among these, he generalizes based on elements of similarities and repeatability. Although this generalization is impossible without the observables, these observables give rise to a 'disclosure'. The disclosure

included the observables and at the same time transcends them. In the words of Gill (1976): Science concerns itself with physical behaviour which can be described in object language, while religion is concerned with personal and moral experience which cannot be so described (p.110).

Science does not concern itself with observation alone or else common sense could replace it. It concerns itself with hypothesis, transformation of the original 'perceptions' observations about reality hence the point of generalization. Disclosure is involved as the scientist throws insight around his work and this is expressed in non-literal, mathematical or metaphysical terms as the case may be.

Although science focuses on the physical phenomenon or phenomena, and religion focuses on the personal experience(s) of man; both employ and combine language derived from the observational level and one from more - than the observational level. They use model terms and quantifier terms respectively.

It is the attempt to unify the language of science by converting different hypotheses into a theory and/or law; that science moves across its barrier and enters into a sphere that does not belong to it. For to get at any language map capable of unifying all language levels and diverse fields of study must automatically involve personal experience, and as such the language of science will then be discarded and the language of metaphysics and / or religion used. Without the application of the 'I' one cannot rightly do justice to the 'crude' facts of human experience, and without the use of other similar terms like God, spirit, mind, etc, one cannot appreciate the depth of human experience. Is this not why Ramsey(1974 &1961) opted that though the languages of science and religion are logically distinct, that they must be related to each other in a functional manner.(p.157-158&p.90-91)).

Both spheres give room for confirmation of facts or truths; though at different levels. The procedure of confirmation is more precise in science as the terms and concepts used could be controlled easily than the terms and concepts used in religion, hence making confirmation much more imprecise and unable to yield to strict predications as in science. All the same, for Gill (1976): The key terms of religion, however, like those of 'chastened' metaphysics, function as integrators, and unifiers in relationship to the languages of the sciences, by way of providing an overall language map.(p.112).

Ramsey(1964) pointed out:

We thus have the vision of a compact language map wherein all the diverse languages of science are harmonised, without confounding type differences, and without committing category blunders. It is a map on which assertions incorporating the word "God" - of whose logical behaviour "I" provides some kind of reflection - occupy a central, presiding position being entailed by, but themselves entailing none of these assertions of natural science; and the whole map is anchored in, and finds its empirical basis in a cosmic disclosure. .(p. 80).

Do you know that there is a structure to religious experience as there is to scientific experience? For Butler (n.d), religious experience has two features which are salient. There is an awareness

of a dimension which is significant arising out of ordinary experience, and a depth to human experience beyond any sensory description". This points to the reality of situations which are not only spatio-temporal but more than that. This is the subjective aspect of a disclosure. Again, there is in religious experience a response of total commitment to what is disclosed in the very depth of human experience. This is beyond the ordinary sensory experience although it arises from this ordinary experience.

According to Ramsey disclosure - commitment situations are varied: linguistic, perceptual, theoretic, moral, personal, and cosmic. Irrespective of the seeming and apparent conflicts or differences, religious disclosures cannot be meditated or discussed in the abstract, they must be linked to and mediated through ordinary empirical situations, and experiences. Gill (1976) writes in support of this: disclosures of what may be called 'the divine dimension' do not occur in an experiential vacuum, but rather arise out of perceptual, conceptual, moral, and personal disclosures, which in turn arise out of empirical settings.(p.58).

It is equally by means of common disclosures that spirits and even God could be talked about in any meaningful manner. One's awareness of God, spirit, being, person is the same as one's awareness of objects, though these other awareness are not as common as that of objects. For when one talks of experiencing God he calls attention to a discernment in which a cosmic dimension of reality has been disclosed to one by means of common disclosures ordinary arising from experiential situations. By implication, religious disclosures though flowing from ordinary experience is more than empirical fact based.

It is equally a truism that in every kind of experience irrespective of the level, there is a kind of commitment. It is through one's thoughts more precisely actions that one's commitments are known, and through one's commitments too that one's disclosures are known. There is no gain saying that disclosures give rise to attitudinal and behavioural commitments which match the very thing disclosed.

On account of the uniqueness of religious or cosmic commitment one can hold that it has a deeper depth or carries more depth than other commitment as it is more comprehensive, that is totalistic and wholistic, For Ramsey (1963) there are two kinds of discernment commitment; mathematical, and personal or quasi-personal commitment. Religious commitment embraces both as it is a 'commitment suited to the whole job of living' and just suited to building houses, or studying inter-planetary motion; or even one suited to our own families, and no more. (p.39.)

In the same vein, the relevance of the number three in science and religion is pronounced. In the science of architecture the number three is associated with the strongest form. Is it surprising then to see that a triangle protrudes from three points? In religion, Christianity associates the number three with God the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit (Trinity). What is the purpose of Jesus Christ dying between two thieves? His cross made up the three crosses at Calvary then and there. What of his death through crucifixion at 3.p.m? What of his being in the grave for three days? Why is it that the sun during equinox lies as if crucified between the equator and one of the latitudes? etc. A critical look at the Bible presents many scientific challenges, no scientific mistakes, natural laws parallel spiritual laws, etc.

All said and done, it is the position of this paper that proper reconciliation between science and religion is very possible and would be enriching for both are attempts to get at the truth about reality just like the six blind men of Hindustan who went to 'observe' an elephant and each came back with contradictory report; yet true to a point. So the idea of complementarity is advocated. Ramsey (1961) states: Science and religion may find a synthesis in their methods. But the cost to each is great. The theologian must admit a tentative theology; the scientist must admit key words which cannot (and it is a logical cannot) be given straight scientific verification. (p.91).

### **Conclusion**

Having come this far we have essayed our best to show that both science and religion are not really in conflict with each other, that both use different methods to approach and study reality, so the most one can do to aid man is to urge both areas of learning to assist each other in pursuit of knowledge; this entails going for synthesis.

## References

1. Arinze, F.A. Sacrifice in Ibo Religion. Ibadan: University Press, 1970.
2. Barber Bernard Science and the Social Order. N.Y: Collier Books, 1962
3. Bonhoeffer, V. Prisoner of God.
4. Bouquet, A. C. Comparative Religion. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1941
5. Butler, J. The Analogy of Religion. Introduction nd part 1.
6. Chizota Amaechi Philosophical Analyses and Conflict of Science and Religious Truths. A paper delivered at the Philosophical Fellowship Week of the Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, UNIZIK, Awka on 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2004.
  
7. Durpe Louis The Other Dimension.
8. Durant, W. The Story of Philosophy. N.Y: Washington Square Press, 1953.
9. Eboh B.O. Basic Issues in the Theory of Knowledge. Nigeria.
10. Gill, J.H. To Speak Responsibly of God London:George Allen Unwin Ltd, 1976
11. Govinda Anagarika Creative Meditation and Multidimensional Consciousness. London: George Allen & Unwin Pub Ltd, 1977
12. Karl Popper Objective knowledge 19<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
13. Lindsay, G.D. Harmony of Science and Scripture. Vo1.2. (Creationism Series) Texas: Christ For The Nations Inc, 1990.
14. Northcote Thomans Anthropological Report on the Ibo Speaking Peoples of Nigeria. London: Harrison and Son, 1913.
15. Norman Campbell What is Science? N.Y: Dover Publications inc,1953.
16. Obiefuna, A.K. "The Decalogue" citing Haring. Unpublished Notes (Lectures) Enugu: Bigard Memorial Seminary, 1978.
17. Ogugua, P. I. Lectures on Philosophy of Religion. Awka: Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2000.
18. Ogugua, P.I.N Philosophy for Beginners Vol III Nigeria: Double Pee Communications, 2002,
19. Procter Paul The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary

- English. London: Longman Group Ltd 1979,
20. Quentin Gibson The Logic of Social Enquiry. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.
21. Quinton, A. "Knowledge and Belief" in Edwards, P. The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Vol.4. N.Y: Macmillian Pub, Co Inc, 1967.
22. Ramsey, I. T. Religious Language N.Y.: 1963
23. Ramsey, I.T Religion & Science: Conflict & Synthesis London: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd, 1964
24. Ramsey, I. T. Christian Empiricism. London:' Sheldon Press 1974
25. Santayana The Sense of Beauty. N.Y: 1896.
26. Santayana Reason in Science. N.Y. 1906.
- 27 Santayana Reason in Common Sense. N.Y.1911,
28. Santayana Scepticism and Animal Faith.,
29. Schleiermacher, F.D. The Christian Faith N.'Y: Harper & Row, 1963.
- 30.Wenham, E.J; Dorling , G.W Physics:Concepts and Models London: (The English Language Book Society and Addison Wesley Publishers) 1978
31. William Paley Natural Theology