



Institute For Theological Encounter With Science and Technology

Volume 49 - # 3

Summer 2018 Bulletin

The End of an Era

Really big changes are in store for ITEST. Our Associate Director, Sister Marianne Postiglione, RSM, has decided to retire at the end of 2018. That very significantly affects us all.

Sister Marianne has been the backbone of ITEST for over 30 years, since she first came to St. Louis to work with Fr. Bob Brungs, SJ. Thus began a beautiful and successful partnership in bringing out the unity of faith and science. He depended upon her to manage the operation, and in the past decade I have been even more dependent. Sister Marianne runs ITEST. Most of us have no memory of a day when Sr. Marianne was not the unifying connection with the Church -- the contact, the spokesperson, the public face of ITEST. Every single membership interaction has gone through Sr. Marianne. For the past dozen years, since Fr. Brungs died, Sr. Marianne has been sole Editor of the ITEST Bulletin. Each of us is immensely indebted to her. In particular, she has made me look good, making sure that dozens of essential management tasks occur seamlessly.

By American standards, Sr. Marianne could reasonably have retired 15 years ago. But “everybody knows” that Priests and Nuns work well beyond the age of customary retirement. Foolishly, too often we take that for granted. We have been successful in persuading Sr. Marianne to stay on through ITEST’s 50th anniversary year (2018); we would not have gotten to this milestone without her. However, it would be outrageously presumptuous to expect her to continue to stay on indefinitely. Sr. Marianne’s family and religious community are based in New England, and she has eminently well-earned a pleasant time of retirement with them. All of us rejoice that Marianne goes there still in vigorous good health.

Therefore, our major point is: **Thank you, Sister Marianne!**

There remains the matter of how we are going to cope with this change. There is no way ITEST could possibly afford to replace Sister Marianne; she has worked for less than ¼ the cost of a manager with comparable skills. We hope to persuade Sr. Marianne to continue as Editor of the ITEST Bulletin, working remotely part-time from New England. Beginning in January, ITEST’s current Assistant Treasurer Dr. Sebastian Mahfood, will be in the ITEST office frequently and will handle mail and phone calls. Our interactions will continue to move in the “electronic” direction, as we’ve begun in recent years. ITEST’s Secretary, Dr. Ralph Olliges of Webster University in St. Louis, will become more prominent in leadership. Dr. Stacy Trasancos will be guiding new enterprises in education.

We very much hope that you, our members, will become more involved as well, via not only writings, but in carrying out ITEST programs in your own church communities.

Director, ITEST

In This Issue...

Announcements	2
<i>Evolutionary Science Strengthens Belief in God</i> by Steven J. Green	4
<i>Albert Einstein, Jesus Christ and Star Trek</i> by Richard Parcinski, MD	6
<i>The Role of Theology in the Faith</i> by Father Robert Brungs, SJ	8
<i>Scientific Naturalism and Techno-Secularism, Two Strong Trends in the Modern World</i> by Agustin Udias, SJ	8
<i>Religion: Emotional or True?</i> by Thomas P. Sheahan	14
<i>Tips for Conversing with Atheists</i> by Michelle Miller	15

Announcements



Good News for ITEST Board Member

Congratulations to Father Kevin FitzGerald, SJ, ITEST Board Member and currently the Dr. David Lauler Chair of Catholic Health Care Ethics in the Pellegrino Center for Clinical Bioethics at Georgetown University. He has also been an associate professor in the Department of Oncology at the Georgetown University Medical Center since 2001. Father FitzGerald will join Creighton University on August 1 as the new holder of the John A. Creighton University Professor endowed chair and associate professor in the Creighton University School of Medicine Department of Medical Education.

Fr. FitzGerald holds PhDs in both molecular biology and bioethics from Georgetown. His research efforts focus on the investigation of abnormal gene expression in cancer, and on ethical issues in biomedical research and medical genomics. He has published both scientific and ethics articles in peer-reviewed journals, books and in the popular press. He has given presentations nationally and internationally, and is often interviewed by the news media on such topics as human genetic engineering, cloning, stem cell research and personalized medicine.

Our Sunday Visitor

Bringing Your Catholic Faith to Life

Update: OSV Funded Project “Scientists Speak of Their Faith”

In the spring issue of the bulletin we reported that we had held the first of our “events” on science and faith in the Archdiocese of St. Louis at Ascension Parish in Chesterfield, MO. Since then three more parishes have successfully held the evenings with scientists, engineers, health care professionals and others from the sci/tech fields who shared with their fellow parishioners their views on their professional lives as scientists and their dedication to the Christian faith. Rather than a conflict between the two, the compatibility of faith and science became even more evident as the speakers spoke convincingly of their belief. Following the meeting at St. Cletus Parish in St. Charles, MO, the St. Louis Review, the St. Louis Archdiocesan weekly newspaper, published a feature titled: “ITEST emphasizes faith-science link” in the July 2-8 issue. Click on the link below to access the article by staff writer Dave Luecking. www.stlouisreview.com/article/2018-06-28/itest-emphasizes

We will continue to update you on the progress of the project in the next issue of the ITEST Bulletin. The facilitator’s manual and the accompanying video clips we are preparing will assist and encourage Adult Formation Parish Directors/Coordinators to offer this program in their parishes not only in the Midwest but in other (arch)dioceses around the country. Contact Sister Marianne at mariannepost@archstl.org for more information.



Institute For Theological Encounter with Science and Technology
Cardinal Rigali Center • 20 Archbishop May Drive • WG-403 • St. Louis, Missouri 63119 • USA
314.792.7220 • www.ITEST-faithscience.org • E-mail: mariannepost@archstl.org

ITEST Bulletin - S. Marianne Postiglione, RSM, Editor
ISSN 1073-5976 • Copyright © 2018

Announcements

Our Lady of Guadalupe Conference

Save the date, Sunday afternoon, November 18, 2018 for our joint conference with the Office of Hispanic Ministry on “Our Lady of Guadalupe: Icon of a New Church and a New America.” The event will be held at the Cardinal Rigali Center in Shrewsbury from 2:00 – 5:00 pm. Featured speakers will be Father Bruce Nieli, C.S.P. who will address the cultural and religious issues surrounding the tilma of Juan Diego; David Keys, physicist and theologian will discuss the Miraculous Aspects of the Tilma of Juan Diego and the scientific implications. Questions arise on the topic: What is the theological impact of the tilma? What does science say about the tilma? What can science not say about the miraculous? Could scientific discoveries on the tilma lead to faith? These and other questions will form the basis for discussion among the speakers and the participants.

In Memoriam

We ask your prayers for **Charles E. Ford, PhD**, a member of the Board of Directors 1986-2008 and Professor of Computer Science at St. Louis University who died and entered Eternal Life in the spring of this year. Born in 1941 and raised in St. Louis, Dr. Ford a member of the Lutheran Church, also studied papal history often lecturing to Catholic groups on the topic. In his professional life he devoted himself to teaching in the field of mathematics, demonstrating its application to computers and to digital systems. As the chair of the ITEST planning committee for the workshop on *Computers, Virtual Reality and Artificial Intelligence* in 2004, he engaged top notch researchers in those fields. Indeed, Dr. Ford’s insight into the importance of the topic was certainly ahead of his time.

Below is a quote from Charles Ford at the beginning of Session Five from that workshop:

“Someone made the observation that the first major product of the printing press was the Bible and that we still have people carrying bibles with them today. I have read that the Bible is by far the most published book even today. Was there something about the print media or something about Christian medieval Europe that resulted in the Bible being the greatest fruit of the printing press? In the virtual world of the present there seems to be much more involvement with games of destruction, pornography and things like that. Is it

the times we live in or does it have something to do with the different medium we are using? That’s merely a question, not an editorial.” Computers, Virtual Reality and Artificial Intelligence, ITEST Faith/Science Press. 2005. P. 190.

We ask your prayers also for **Deacon John L. Hubisz, PhD** who died and entered Eternal Life on March 6, 2018. A Massachusetts native, he studied physics receiving his PhD in 1968 from York University and Centre for Research In Experimental Space Science, Toronto, Ontario. He joined the NC State Department of Physics in 1993 as visiting physics professor.

At NCSU, his research centered on physics education. Along with colleague, Professor Gould, he carried out a study of errors in middle school science texts, which was covered by the NY Times and other news media in the U.S. and abroad.

John was ordained as a deacon in 1975 and was the longest serving deacon in the Raleigh Diocese. His most recent service was as deacon at St. Mary Magdalene Catholic Church in Apex, NC. He and his wife, Jola, were also team-teaching a sacrament preparation class for middle schoolers at St Bernadette Parish in Fuquay Varina, NC, where they resided at the time of his death.

In a note from John’s wife Jola, married to John for 43 years, Jola writes of John’s concern for the faith/science intersection: “John was all about the connection between science and religion. . . always trying to educate, even though, John seemed to think, some [religions] were not well versed in science. Still that didn’t keep him from trying.”

Rest in Peace, John from your ITEST colleagues!

ITEST web site changes and updates

Please refresh your ITEST web site at www.ITEST-faithscience.org go to View, scroll down to Refresh and click on the link. Within the past few months we have made some changes to the web site; therefore, it will be necessary for you to refresh before the changes will appear. Note in particular the updated “Mission” of ITEST under About Us and then Vision and Mission.

ITEST’s mission is to further advance the Kingdom of God by demonstrating that faith and science are complementary paths to the one Truth.

Evolutionary Science Strengthens Belief in God

by Steven J. Green

The evolution of humans from apes is a widely accepted theory in scientific circles. Many scientific evolutionary theories have been presented to the public based on fossil research and discoveries made in Africa. Fossil evidence of *Homo sapiens* recently found in Morocco is one example that the human evolutionary process potentially spanned across all of the African continent during a rapid time period, an estimated 315 thousand years ago. But how does continued scientific research such as this stand in regard to the story of Creation in the Bible? Can hu-

Can human evolution be accepted by a believer when Adam and Eve are considered the origin of humanity?

man evolution be accepted by a believer when Adam and Eve are considered the origin of humanity? What does the Catholic Church teach about this matter? Evolution may have played an unknown role in the history of the world, but Adam and Eve, the parents from which all human beings spawned, were created by God. This paper aims to show the believer how science can help solidify the belief in God and His Creation.

The scientific paper, "New Fossils from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco and the Pan-African Origin of *Homo sapiens*," published in *Nature*, and conducted by Moroccan Institut National des Sciences de l'Archéologie et du Patrimoine and the Department of Human Evolution of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, analyzed

Steven J. Green

Steven Green is a Catholic convert and graduate student at Holy Apostles College and Seminary in Cromwell Connecticut. He has been an active student in the theology program with concentration in Apologetics since 2015. He graduated from the University of Maryland University College in 2015 with a Bachelor of Arts English degree and has served in the United States Air force since 1999. Following retirement from the service in 2019, he plans to pursue a second career in teaching the faith. He and his wife, Janelle, have two children and live in Idaho.

fossils found in Morocco. These fossils were then compared to other African-found humanoid and primate fossils on record. The Morocco fossils showed evidence of being the oldest African examples of modern morphology. The massive excavation yielded several valuable fossils: an adult braincase, an immature mandible (jaw bone), an immature humeral shaft, an immature hip bone, and a fragmented mandible. Unfortunately, of all of these, records showed that only the humeral shaft was properly documented by identifying the precise location in which it was found. This complicated the research and resulted in many uncertainties regarding the age of these fossils. It was originally thought that these fossils were 40 thousand years old and were a form of Neanderthal (archaic humans). However, it was more probable that the fossils were much older, as evidence from the excavation site suggested a mid-Pleistocene time period (~780 to 125 thousand years ago).

Specific scientific methods were utilized on each specimen. Computerized isotropic testing of both dental and non-dental samples were used in conjunction with virtual reconstruction. The fossil fragments were scanned and pieced together digitally. The gaps were filled virtually to recreate a face and skull. The shape of the reconstructed face was paramount to the cranial analysis to determine morphology. Dental metrics from across global research centers were used as comparative models. The morphology of these tests showed that the Morocco fossils are closely related to *Homo sapiens*, as opposed to Neanderthals or non-sapien Pleistocene samples. Interestingly enough, the testing does show similarities between the dental samples and other groups from Northern Africa. The roots from the molars of the mandible and the development of the dental samples are in-line with recent modern humans (RMH).

The testing methods concluded that morphology was accelerated and showed evidence that the braincase contained a series of genetic changes, yet the fossils appeared to be more than a morphological stepping stone between Neanderthals and RMH. There was almost no facial morphology distinction when compared to modern humans, despite the estimated 300 thousand year difference. Ad-

Continues on page 5

ditionally, the evidence gained from the Morocco fossils helped reinforce the idea that a rapid anatomical shift occurred across the African continent between early Homo sapiens and Africa's archaic Pleistocene specimens. "The Irhoud fossils currently represent, to our knowledge, the most securely dated evidence of the early phase of Homo sapiens evolution in Africa."¹

The scientific research and study contained in this paper, at first glance, shows to heavily support human evolution through fossil evidence. However, the reader must remember that the authors are scientists, who are writing a scientific paper for the sake of science. The beliefs by which a theologian or philosopher live are not considered in the research. The scientists' aim is to catalog, report,

The scientists' aim is to catalog, report, examine, and test the evidence to develop a plausible explanation.

examine, and test the evidence to develop a plausible explanation. This explanation is not, and must not, be considered fact, but rather scientific theory. The Catholic Church's stance on science was made clear in Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*:

There can never, indeed, be any real discrepancy between the theologian and the physicist, as long as each confines himself within his own lines... If dissension should arise between them here is the rule also laid down by St. Augustine, for the theologian: "Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature, we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures; and whatever they assert in their treatises which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to Catholic faith, we must either prove it as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events we must, without the smallest hesitation, believe it to be so"... Hence they did not seek to penetrate the secrets of nature, but rather described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science.²

In some cases, science can help with explanations, but the believer's faith should not be shaken because of the science.

In some cases, science can help with explanations, but the

believer's faith should not be shaken because of the science. Again, research and theories about a given topic are not definitive truth. Many examples of science improving upon its own theories, or correcting theories originally thought to be true, can be found (e.g. the earth was flat, the indivisibility of the atom, etc.). As the Catechism of the Catholic Church puts it, "[m]ethodical research in all branches of knowledge, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific manner and does not override moral laws, can never conflict with the faith, because the things of the world and the things of the faith derive from the same God."³ The specific science theory of evolution addressed above contained several key phrases and word choices used by the authors that indicate ambiguity in the research. These ambiguities should help the believer understand there are some questions that have yet to be answered by science:

"...the exact place and time of emergence of H. sapiens remain obscure..."

"...it is unclear whether the present day 'modern' morphology rapidly emerged..."

"The interpretation of the Irhoud hominins has long been complicated by persistent uncertainties..."

"It has therefore been suggested that the archaic features of the Irhoud fossils..."

"This pattern, which may include some primitive retentions..."

"Among the Irhoud hominins these structures are rather variable and this variability may be related to..."

"The Irhoud fossils currently represent, to our knowledge, the most securely dated evidence..."

"Delimiting clear-cut anatomical boundaries for a 'modern' grade within the H. sapiens clade thus only depends on gaps in the fossil record..."

These examples are not listed to show scientific incompetence, but rather to show that fossil evidence can only drive a theory or hypothesis so far. Much of scientific research depends upon the available technology and previously discovered fossils, and as the Morocco research mentioned, there are holes in the fossil record. Even though scientific claims pool relevant data, use updated technology, and consult past records to help build the human evolution case, the Catholic faithful should proceed with caution and refer to what God and His Church teach-

Continues on page 6

es and advises.

The theory of evolution is not explicitly defined by the

...but the Church does specify that only God can be the ultimate Creator:

Church as being wrong, but the Church does specify that only God can be the ultimate Creator: “the world and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, as regards their whole substance, have been produced by God from nothing.”⁷⁴ The Magisterium has concluded that if evidence points to the evolution of any living being over any period of time, it was done under the guidance of God.

As Catholics we believe what the Book of Genesis describes: God is the Creator of all things, to include mankind and his soul. Even though decades of extensive research and scientific data attempts to prove otherwise, the Catholic Church teaches the man and his soul are ascribed to God alone. The rational soul could not have evolved from an irrational being and “the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God.”⁷⁵ Pope Pius XII expressed in one of his encyclicals that “the faithful cannot embrace that opinion which maintains... that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who

Human evolution and science have their place with faith, but it cannot replace faith.

did not take their origin through natural generation from him.”⁷⁶ Human evolution and science have their place with faith, but it cannot replace faith.

Science research, although meticulous in nature, cannot answer every question. In fact, by providing one or two answers, the research can even conjure more unanswerable questions. The data often times is filled with vague words that cannot wholly support the claim despite being supported by other scientists. The advantage for the theologians and philosophers is they have the ability to extrapolate conclusions in the light of faith without having the obligation to accept all that science has claimed to have discovered as truth. The Church has been explicit in stating that God is the ultimate Creator of all things, regardless of science’s input. Science will continue to expand upon and redefine its own discoveries while seeking the truth and the faithful must be sure to read these discoveries with a clear understanding and perspective. For the believer the realization is simple: no matter if science discovered a new way to test fossils, or if science claims a new truth, or believes to have shed light on a new evolutionary discovery, the Way, The Truth, and the Light have already been discovered in Christ Jesus.

End Notes

- 1 Hublin, Jean-Jacques et al. “New Fossils from Jebel Irhoud, Morocco and the Pan-African Origin of Homo sapiens.” *Nature*, no. 546 (2017): 291.
- 2 Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical on the Study of Holy Scripture *Providentissimus Deus* (18 November 1893), §18.
- 3 *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 2000), 159
- 4 First Vatican Council, Session 3, Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith (24 April 1870), in *Canons*, 1.5, at EWTN, www.ewtn.com.
- 5 Pope Pius XII, Encyclical on the Human Race *Humani Generis* (12 August 1950), §36.
- 6 *Humani Generis*, §37.

CHAPTER THREE IN THE LIGHT OF THE MASTER

63. There can be any number of theories about what constitutes holiness, with various explanations and distinctions. Such reflection may be useful, but nothing is more enlightening than turning to Jesus’ words and seeing his way of teaching the truth. Jesus explained with great simplicity what it means to be holy when he gave us the Beatitudes (cf. Mt 5:3-12; Lk 6:20-23). The Beatitudes are like a Christian’s identity card. So if anyone asks: “What must one do to be a good Christian?”, the answer is clear. We have to do, each in our own way, what Jesus told us in the Sermon on the Mount.[66] In the Beatitudes, we find a portrait of the Master, which we are called to reflect in our daily lives.

64. The word “happy” or “blessed” thus becomes a synonym for “holy”. It expresses the fact that those faithful to God and his word, by their self-giving, gain true happiness.

From *Gaudete et Exultate* 2018, April Pope Francis

Albert Einstein, Jesus Christ and Star Trek

by Richard Parcinski, MD

(Father James Benz, Pastor of St. Cletus Parish in St. Charles, Missouri sent ITEST this insightful reflection on the New Testament from a 21st century physician and parishioner. We offer it to our readers for their consideration and feedback in Letters to the Editor or directly to Dr. Parcinski at drpar3@aol.com.)

Now that I've got your attention let me say that this is not a representation of my belief system but merely an attempt to look at the New Testament through twenty first century eyes.

My reflections are based upon the assumption that the universe is governed by God's laws. Physics is a glimpse into these laws i.e. the universe seems to obey the laws of physics. Therefore it is not a great leap to say physics is an example of at least some of God's laws

Einstein's: famous equation $E=MC^2$ represents the expression that while matter cannot be created or destroyed it can be changed into energy. He waited decades for his equation to be proven when the atomic bomb exploded. Mass being converted to energy. Note that this is an equation i.e. theoretically energy can be converted back into mass. We are not close to this part presently. So what? And what about the New Testament and Jesus Christ?

There are at least three events in the gospels that could represent mass to energy and energy to mass.

There are at least three events in the gospels that could represent mass to energy and energy to mass. Let me explain. In the gospel describing the Transfiguration of Christ i.e. Mathew 17:1-9 "His face shone like the sun and his clothes became as white as light." It was also observed that he was speaking to Elijah and Moses. First of all Elijah and Moses were long since dead. Could this be an example of all three being in an energy state? After the event Christ returned to his normal human state. The Resurrection is the next event described in which mass to energy back to mass could have happened.

I don't know if the Shroud of Turin is or is not the burial shroud of Christ but the burns on the clothes that have confounded scientists for decades could have been made by pure energy passing through the cloth. Following the Resurrection in the garden when Mary first encountered the risen Christ he told her "Touch me not for I have not yet ascended to my Father."

Could it have been that he was in a transitional state and the energy field was dangerous if he were contacted by her?

Lastly the assumption when Christ ascended into Heaven we know that a human body could not remain intact above the atmosphere. It would explode into a million pieces because of the difference in pressure. It is logical that his body was converted to energy.

These are merely questions that may never be answered. In no way am I suggesting that these events did not occur but that God may have simply used his own law of physics that we are only beginning to understand millennia later. Oh! I forgot Star Trek. When Christ ascended into heaven was this the first century "beam me up Scotty"? The Star Trek transporter converted mass to energy then sent the energy to a co-ordinate, then reconstituted it to mass. Remember this is theoretically possible according to $E=MC^2$.

Next to free will I believe God's greatest human trait given to us is intellect.

To Summarize: Next to free will I believe God's greatest human trait given to us is intellect. If God didn't want us to get closer to our Maker, his laws would not be understood by us. I'm sure if an intelligent alien appeared before us as in Star Trek, we would think it was a miracle. The events in the Bible were miracles but the real miracle is God allowing us to begin to understand things that were not even imagined in Christ's time. Who knows what miracles God will reveal to us in the future but the miracles mentioned above I believe could be in keeping with the laws of physics. After all God wrote them!

"The coincidence of our mind to the activities of the cosmos is one of the greatest gifts we've been given. Its exercise is a glorious mandate from God our Creator."

- Fr. Robert Brungs, SJ 2005

The Role of Theology in the Faith

by Father Robert Brungs, SJ
(Spring Bulletin 2004, Vol. 35, No. 2)

(We chose to reprise this essay because it has a remarkable resonance with the essay by Fr. Udias on scientific naturalism in this issue – Eds.)

“What is the role of theology in the explication and defense of the faith? Theology helps to define the questions facing the faith in any given time or place. It also has the task of presenting the truth of faith as best we can –without altering it. Often that is not an enviable task, especially in times of great secular progress.

“The faith is beset on most fronts with a science that is meant by many of its most active promoters to be a secularizing “solvent” of the faith of Christianity. Walter Lippmann, more than seventy years ago, often referred to the “acids of modernity.” The “conflict,” assumed to exist by most scientists today, is one of those acids. It is not really a “conflict between science and faith.” It is a clash between a scienti-fically derived worldview and a faith-based view of cosmic reality. The “other side” is neither science nor scientist. It is those who extrapolate a view of all reality from scientific result. The end result of all their speculation is really a philosophy of “scientific materialism,”

heavily dependent on the notion that there is no true knowledge beyond that derived from science. Scientific growth or scientific “progress” is by definition definitive of nothing.

“It is constantly changing as more data become available. The view of the world derived from it is said to be the way things are. Perhaps astrophysics might serve the proponents of a scientific materialism as a caution. Almost every new set of data sends the scientist back to “the drawing board.” It is passing strange that some of these “scientists” believe in an infinity of unknown and unknowable universes, simply to avoid the belief in one God. Such is human gullibility.

“There are many valid Christian theologies. But there is only one faith to explain. Faith is prior to theology. Theology is merely the handmaid of the beliefs of Scripture and Tradition. Theology explains the faith; the faith does not explain theology.”

Scientific Naturalism and Techno-Secularism, Two Strong Trends in the Modern World

by Agustin Udias, SJ

Emeritus Professor of Geophysics Universidad Complutense, Madrid

Abstract

Science and technology have a profound influence in today's world. Both contribute to the spread of attitudes often referred to as naturalism and secularism. In both cases, in practice, these attitudes can lead to a substitute of a religious vision of life. The doctrine described as “scientific naturalism” affirms that there is no other reality than that of the natural order which can be known through the methods of science. The influence of technology's overall successes creates the persuasion that it can finally solve all problems that afflict man and nothing falls outside its capabilities and becomes the foundation of all human hopes. This generates attitudes that have been called “techno-secularism”. Naturalism and secularism imply a negation of supernatural or transcendent realities and presents a vision that limits all reality to the natural realm leading to materialism and reductionism. They are not necessary consequences of science and technology, as often claimed, but ideologies. Sometimes they are presented as the foundations for a certain type of spirituality and religiosity.

Science and technology today

Today, no one can doubt the profound impact that science and technology have in the world. This influence goes beyond the specifics of each of them and encompasses an ever growing domain of human life.

First, science provides man with the vision of the world and of himself, duly endorsed by the prestige of the absolute reliability attached to scientific knowledge. This vision includes, for example, the origin, structure and evolution of the universe, the constitution and interaction of matter and energy, the origin and evolution of life on earth and even the explanation of human behavior. Science offers an answer for almost all questions that man can put to himself. If for some question it does not yet have an answer it offers hope that finally it will find one in the future. Scientists, a term coined in the middle of the nineteenth century, are at present at the top of the social ladder and their influence has extended to all levels of society. Thus, the scientific community has increased worldwide in number and prestige. Today governments surround

Today governments surround themselves with scientists as advisors as in medieval times kings did with bishops.

themselves with scientists as advisors as in medieval times kings did with bishops. The general public is mainly influenced by the scientific vision of the world through popular science books and press, radio and television reports. The big-bang theory, relativity and quantum physics, Higgs boson, gravitational waves, human genome and brain waves have become through mass media familiar terms, although often, most people only have a vague idea, not always correct, of what they mean.

Second, technology, which uses the principles of science for man's practical use, has an even greater influence. From the middle of the nineteenth century together with the industrial revolution, technology has affected all aspects of life by, for example, enormously improving transportation, communication, information and health care. Developments of computer applications have put in our hands through mobile telephones an effective means of communication and information unknown in the past. Science and technology has revolutionized medicine, lengthened

Science and technology has revolutionized medicine, lengthened man's useful life and freed it from physical ailments and limitations.

man's useful life and freed it from physical ailments and limitations. During the last century in developed countries energy consumption has experienced a five-fold increase in benefit of a greater well-being and comfort. There are, practically, no limits to what technology can provide us with in the future in all aspects of life. However, the negative aspects of technological developments, such as the new more lethal armament, the harmful effects on the environment and the large inequalities in the benefit from their progress among different human groups are frequently overlooked.

A consequence of the influence on modern man of science and technology (sometimes referred to together by the term "techno-science") is to contribute to the spread of the general trends of thought commonly known as naturalism and secularism. By naturalism we understand the reduction of all reality to the purely natural, that is, that can be reached by the senses with the exclusion of all transcendence. Secularism adds its application to social behavior at all levels of private and public life. Both trends are opposed to religious belief which implies an acceptance of a transcendent reality or God, source from which natural reality depends. These trends can manifest themselves in an explicit naturalism as a life philosophy or more often as an implicit practical position that affect man's behavior. In both cases, in practice, they can lead to a substitute of a religious vision of life.

Scientific naturalism

A key postulate of the scientific method is that its propositions are reduced to natural principles. We can, then, say that science assumes what can be called a

Science studies only natural phenomena, that is, phenomena which can be experimentally observed and measured.

"methodological naturalism". Science studies only natural phenomena, that is, phenomena which can be experimentally observed and measured. This postulate

Continues on page 10

of methodological naturalism of science gives origin to the broader trend, very extended today, of what is called “scientific naturalism”, which applies this postulate to all reality. Scientific naturalism affirms that there is no other reality than that of the natural order that can be known through the methods of science. This is really an ideology, but because of its appeal to science, it has a strong power of persuasion and can lead to a confusing identification with science itself.

It (scientific naturalism) implies a vision of the world that considers natural sciences as the only guide to understanding the world.

It (scientific naturalism) implies a vision of the world that considers natural sciences as the only guide to understanding the world. According to Willem Drees this type of naturalism is based on the assertion that the natural world constitutes all reality which we know and we can interact with. The natural world is thus, a unity with only those constituent elements which science describes. Nothing, then, falls outside scientific knowledge, since the natural order constitutes all reality¹.

It should be made clear that science in itself is not an ideology and it is independent of all ideology. We understand by ideology any conceptual system which provides an overall vision of reality that serves to give meaning to life, creates a global references framework and justifies personal and social behavior. Although science in itself is not an ideology, its transmission at a popular level can be affected by ideology, frequently of naturalist character, which is often communicated with it. This happens very often in the presentations of scientific results in the mass media and in popular science books. For example, we can find this in some popular books by the physicist Steven Hawking and the biologist Richard Dawkins. Scientists have a right to have an ideology, but it is not correct for them to mix ideology with science, without distinguishing between the two – least of all to present a concrete ideology as based on science as its necessary consequence.

The relation between naturalism and science is often fostered by scientists’ opinions who present naturalism as an unavoidable consequence of science. For example, the Nobel Prize winner in Physiology, Jacques

Monod, considers the naturalistic outlook as a direct consequence of the scientific vision of the world, and thus he affirms that one must not ask any questions beyond those science can answer². Another Nobel Prize Winner, in this case of physics, Steven Weinberg, maintains that physics leads to a vision of a self-creating and self-sustaining universe and rejects any idea of a reality outside the natural order and therefore of God. Thus he affirms that the more the universe seems comprehensible, the more it also seems pointless³. An ardent advocate of naturalism is the biologist Richard Dawkins. He considers religious faith a pernicious delusion, a virus of the mind, a persistent false belief against strong scientific evidences. He justifies his visceral hostility to religion considering that it actively perverts the scientific enterprise, encourages bigotry and leads to negativity in society in many ways. For him the scientific vision of the world and in particular evolutionary Darwinism provide the only valid type of knowledge⁴. These examples show that the so-called scientific naturalism is presented as a necessary consequence of the scientific vision of the world which cannot coexist with religious faith and must finally substitute it.

Techno-secularism

Today this naturalist trend, which denies the existence of all reality outside the purely natural, is a practical position resulting from the influence of technology on man and society rather than a speculative one. It is not a theoretical attitude which absolutizes scientific knowledge, but a consequence of the fact that today technology, being present in every aspect of life, reduces in practice all reality to what it can handle. Technology’s overall successes create the impression that it can finally solve all problems that afflict man and nothing falls outside its capabilities. Technology becomes in this way the foundation of all human hopes. Benedict XVI drew attention to this negative influence of technological development and its ambiguous face which may encourage the idea of the absolute self-sufficiency of technology. Man becomes satisfied with only asking about the how to solve the problems and not about the reasons which drive him to act⁵. This practical naturalism affects also the values of life, accepting only those that are related to material well-being that technology can provide, thus eroding religious senti-

Continues on page 11

ment. John Caiazza describes this pervasive influence of technology with its negative consequences for religion as “techno-secularism”⁶.

If scientific naturalism is related with religious faith, denying it all validity and replacing it with scientific certainty, techno-secularism is mainly related with religious hope, which man should substitute with that based on technology. Technology, in this way, furthers man’s self-sufficiency and makes it harder for him to experiment his contingency and dependence, which opens him to transcendent and supernatural realities. In this regard, technology’s influence can erode and even override religious convictions which see man in

In practice, techno-secularism also threatens to displace and substitute religion in the social consensus more than science does, because its influence is more extended.

relation with God. In practice, techno-secularism also threatens to displace and substitute religion in the social consensus more than science does, because its influence is more extended.

In fact, a larger majority of people is more influenced by technology, present in all aspects of their life, from communications to health, than by science itself, which they do not understand and is often only considered as the “mystery” behind technological advances. Consider, for example, the mobile telephone, that in a short time has become present everywhere, even in the third world, as an absolute need, a dependence and even an addiction, although its foundation on complex electronics and data processing are not understood. In practice, the influence of technology ends up spreading a naturalistic and secular attitude of the world which generates hopes and give security and may end

Technology joined with science may even be put as the foundation of ethics and of the ultimate meaning of reality.

up substituting for religion. Technology joined with science may even be put as the foundation of ethics and of the ultimate meaning of reality. Nevertheless, it is true that there are also incipient critical attitudes opposed to some aspects of technological and scientific

progress which recognize the undeniable fact of their ambiguity and evil use that man can make of them. However, these critical positions do not undermine the unconditional faith and hope in science and technology present today in society.

Naturalism, materialism and reductionism

As we have seen, naturalism implies a negation of supernatural or transcendent realities and presents a vision that limits all reality to the natural realm. The difficulty of defining in a positive sense what is meant by the natural leads to a negative one with the exclusion of all supernatural realities or what is meant by the divine. Another term which is generally used in the social realm is secularism, meaning by *secular* the non-religious. As a world vision naturalism has many meanings from a radical materialism (only material things exist) to positions that accept spiritual realities but contained in the natural not supernatural or transcendent ones.

It is important to examine the relation between naturalism and materialism, especially, the so called scientific materialism. This term implies a double assertion: ontological and epistemological. The first affirms that matter and/or energy is the only reality in the world. The second, a consequence of the first, is that scientific knowledge, which deals with nature and behavior of matter, can explain all reality. The first thing we can ask is if these assertions belong to science itself or if they are its direct consequence. Somehow we can say that science assumes what can be called a “methodological materialism” in so far as it only studies phenomena that can be observed and measured experimentally, that is material phenomena. The objective character of science depends on its relation with repeatable observations and experiments where measurement is an important element through a process of inter-subjectivity. This limits its field of knowledge, precisely, to those aspects of reality which can be observed in this form. This implies that there may be other aspects of reality that may fall outside this methodology. An example could be subjective experiences which in themselves can only be experienced by the subject itself. To try to objectify them would result in the loss of their subjective character.

Scientific materialism as an ideology affirms that only

Continues on page 12

matter and its interactions are all that exists and nothing else. In consequence it goes beyond the methodological materialism of science. Science only considers, as the object of its knowledge, the theories and laws that rule the interaction of matter and energy in the universe based on observations and experiments. Scientific materialism proposes that those interactions are all that exist. It goes from the assertion of “this is what can be known by science” to “this is all that exists”. In this way many aspects of reality that fall outside the realm of science are denied; for example, many personal human experiences of aesthetic, ethical or religious character. This step is not a consequence of science itself, which does not consider the existence of reality outside its own realm. Materialism, therefore, with its exclusive position is not part of science or its direct consequence; it is rather a philosophical position which can become an ideology.

If we accept this basic postulate of materialism, that is, the identification of all reality with matter alone, the second postulate follows that scientific knowledge exhausts all knowledge of reality. Thus, there are no aspects of reality which cannot be explained by science. As already mentioned, consider the rich and diverse world of personal human experiences, the ethical demands which are concerned with what ought to be done, the sense of responsibility in addition to the perception of freedom of action, the experience of beauty and the religious experiences. This manifold world escapes the direct handling by science and thus for a materialist its existence must be either denied or reduced to material interactions that science can measure.

Naturalism, generally, implies also a certain type of reductionism. By reductionism it is understood the position that holds that any system, as complex as one may like, can be completely explained in terms of its simplest elements and it is in some form related to the analytic method used frequently in science. According to this method a complex system can be explained in terms of its simpler elements. There is no doubt that the analytic method is very efficient to study a complex system, separating it into its simpler elements, but it cannot be taken as the only method of knowledge. Reductionism, not always in its explicit form, is a very general position among scientists. There are many types of reductionism and to a certain degree

it is present in all sciences. However, for an absolute reductionist this is the only approach to be used and the organization of a system, no matter how complex, does not add anything new to the sum of its more elementary parts.

According to the reductionist program, the statements of a science which deals with objects of a certain complexity can, in principle, be reduced to those of the science which deals with the simpler elements, including also human behavior, individual (psychology) and collective (sociology). For a convinced reductionist, for example, biology and chemistry can be reduced ultimately to the fundamental laws of physics. For this reason, Steven Weinberg affirms that physicists are especially susceptible to be qualified as reductionists⁷. Murray Gell-Mann, author of the theory of quarks in the constitution of matter, defends a totally reductionist explanation from the simplest to the more complex⁸. Thus, at least in principle, everything could be explained by the elementary laws of physics and the ultimate constituents of matter. In principle, because in practice, as the complexity of a system increases, its reduction to the elementary parts becomes more difficult.

Physicists, always tempted by reductionism, have forestalled the implications of this approach by calling the future theory which will unify all physical forces as the “Theory of Everything”. As Stephen Hawking, concludes: “If we do discover a complete theory, it should in time be understandable in broad principle by everyone, not just a few scientists. Then we shall all, philosophers, scientists and just ordinary people, be able to take part in the discussion of the question of why it is that we and the universe exist. If we find the answer to that, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason -- for then we should know the mind of God”⁹. In what we have called the reductionist program there are many levels. At the highest level all natural phenomena can be reduced ultimately to matter-energy interactions study by physics. Other levels of reductionism accept the interaction of the basic principles of other sciences without assuming that everything derives from physics.

However, many authors think that the study of complex systems, like the human person, is not fully cov-

Continues on page 13

ered by the reductionist approach and the analytic method which only accept bottom-up causality, that is from the elements to the ensemble. They propose that new ways of interpretation must be looked for with holistic and synthetic methods, which take into account top-bottom causality, that is, from the ensemble to the elements. Materialistic reductionism which gives good results in the fields of natural sciences always turns out always insufficient and even misleading when applied to man and society. For example, human freedom, can never be explained by such an approach which can only conclude that human actions are unpredictable but not free.

Naturalist spirituality and religiosity

A purely naturalist worldview, upholding the exclusion of everything not natural, includes sometimes concepts and attitudes that are generally associated with religion and the supernatural, such as a certain sense of mystery and the sacred, with a corresponding sense of admiration and reverence. This may lead to what is called a “naturalistic spirituality” and a “religious naturalism”, that is, a spirituality and religiosity based on the purely natural. These are relatively recent trends with a great variety of forms which are taking on a growing importance¹⁰. In general, they try to generate attitudes traditionally related with religion, such as a search for meaning, reverential attitudes toward life, contact with the totality of reality, human fellowship, etc. They may have a purely materialistic character or accept spiritual realities, but without any connection with the supernatural. In general, naturalists try to find meaning in reality only from a natural point of view, accepting that everything will finally have an end (death of the individual, of humanity, end of life on earth, end of the universe, and so on) and propose also a purely natural universal ethic.

In some of these trends there is a special emphasis on the reverence toward nature as expressed, for example, in the writings by the astrophysicist Carl Sagan. The biologist Ursula Goodenough, a proponent of religious naturalism, suggests that the ability to grasp the complexity, consciousness, intention and beauty of nature serves as a source of an ultimate meaning without any further justification, as that of a creator¹¹. According to her, the scientific narrative on nature is able to produce by itself a certain satisfying faith and religious experience. A similar attitude can also be

found in some environmental movements and those of the so called “New Age movement” which adopts a belief in a holistic form of divinity that imbues all of the universe, including human beings themselves. Secularism may also sometimes have a certain character of naturalist religiosity when it is referred to as a “sacred laicity” (sacré laïcité).

Although there are many different tendencies in the naturalist viewpoint some basic principles can be found in most of them. First, only the world of nature is real, that is, all reality is reduced to the purely natural, with the exclusion of any transcendent reality (God). Second, nature is necessary in itself, that is, it does not require a reason outside itself to explain its existence, origin, or ontological foundation. Third, because in nature there are only natural causes, nature as a whole can be totally understood by science, there

Naturalism, in consequence, implies a materialistic or physicalist understanding of reality.

is nothing that escapes its knowledge. Naturalism, in consequence, implies a materialistic or physicalist understanding of reality. Although some versions admit some kind of spiritual realities, they are considered to be aspects of nature itself and it is not clear what they consist of.

Regarding naturalist religiosity or spirituality its rejection of God and all supernatural reality limits its foundation to the purely natural, assuming that the world is the only reality. For the materialistic current nothing should be searched for beyond material reality and the image that science gives of it. With this limitation it is difficult to understand how to support religious attitudes, such as reverence, toward nature. For spiritualistic naturalism an added difficulty is what is understood by the spiritual dimension of reality and how to integrate it in the world of science that does not include that dimension.

Summary

A consequence of the strong influence of science and technology in today’s society is the spread of a naturalistic trend which reduces all reality to the natural

Continues on page 14

that can be known by science and handled to man's benefit by technology. This naturalistic trend can become an explicit ideology that denies all religious and transcendental meaning to life or a practical attitude where man behaves as if the natural known by science were all that there is and technology as having the solution for all problems. Often this viewpoint is misrepresented as a necessary consequence of science, which is considered as the only valid knowledge, and that must substitute for religion. Science, however, considers only those aspects of reality which can be observed and measured, but does not affirm that they constitute all reality. Materialism is often part of the naturalism trend which holds that there is nothing beyond matter-energy interactions. Reductionism adds that any complex system can be totally explained in terms of its most elementary elements. Some authors of the naturalism school do not deny the positive aspects they see in the religious sentiment, proposing a naturalist religiosity and spirituality in which nature itself is the object of a sacred sense and veneration.

It is not clear, however, how these sentiments can be maintained outside an acceptance of God on whom nature depends and to whom man can relate.

End Notes

1. W. B. Drees, 1996. Religion, science and naturalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. J. Monod, 1971. Chance and Necessity. New York: Knopf
3. S. Weinberg, 1993. The Dream of a Final Theory. London: Vintage
4. R. Dawkins, 2006. The God Delusion. London: Bantam Press
5. Benedicto XVI, 2009. Caritas in veritate. Madrid: San Pablo.
6. J. C. Caiazza, 2005. Athens, Jerusalem and the arrival of technos-secularism. Zygon 40, 9-21.
7. Weinberg, 1993, The Dream. 49-58
8. M. Gell-Man, 1995. The Quark and the Jaguar: Adventures in the Simple and the Complex. New York: Owl Books.
9. S. Hawking, 1988. A Brief History of Time: From the Big-Bang to Black Holes. London: Bantam.
10. J. M. Stone, 2008. Religious naturalism today. Albany: State University of New York Press.
11. U. Goodenough, 1998. The sacred depths of nature. New York: Oxford University Press.

Religion: Emotional or True?

by Thomas P. Sheahen

In June 2018, the New York Times carried an Op-Ed which argued that "religion is good for you." (<https://www.nytimes.com/.../03/opin.../why-we-need-religion.html>). It was by a professor Stephen Asma of Columbia College in Chicago. The tone at first seems favorable to religion. However, hidden beneath that superficial pleasant view, the author basically agreed with Marx and Freud that religion is phony ("the opiate of the people"). His central thesis was that it's beneficial for your emotional state. It's a "cultural analgesic." Religion has some survival benefit and therefore shows up in the human brain. The essay, taken as a whole, was typical of the snooty superiority characteristic of the New York Times.

For centuries, serious philosophers have disdained "Pascal's Wager" because it is intellectually dishonest. Here, the NY Times is endorsing an alternate variety of intellectual dishonesty: be religious because it makes good things happen in your nerve synapses.

The foundational problem that undermines such an approach is this: the pursuit of neuropsychology to explain religion tries to cram into the 4-dimensional domain of science a variety of human properties that lie beyond the boundaries that con-

fine science to four dimensions. With each step downward from studying the concept of "human being," something is discarded and lost. Reducing the spiritual life to culture, and culture to psychology, and psychology to biology, and biology to chemistry, and chemistry to physics forfeits something essential at every step. To investigate human beings, that is not a fruitful path at all. But that blind alley is the only path the secular humanists will allow themselves.

In Asma's article the question "Is religion true?" isn't even entertained as a serious consideration. *That* is a far more important question.

I doubt very much that any of these typical professors of philosophy or professors of religion at 95 percent of universities would ever bother to read a book like philosopher Bernard Lonergan's "Insight"; or Robert Spitzer's series "Happiness, Suffering, and Transcendence"; or "God and the New Atheists" by John F. Haught; or physicist Stephen Barr's "Modern Physics and Ancient Faith." Those books require that science be taken seriously and understood; they won't let you hold vague fluffy notions about what "somebody else scientific" says.

Continues on page 15

The secularists just automatically assume that because those authors are religious (Lonergan and Spitzer are Catholic priests), they can't possibly be sufficiently scientific to be worth reading. It's a form of censorship they impose upon an entire field of thought. That really is too bad: they're missing a lot of excellent science, careful logic and philosophical examination, and very carefully reasoned conclusions. That whole coterie of philosophers were shocked a few years ago when their colleague Thomas Nagle wrote "Mind and Cosmos" and demonstrated why their viewpoint was wrong.

Lonergan devotes about 650 pages to correctly stating the terms for his proof that God exists. I doubt that one tenth of one percent of these professors would make it past chapter 5 of Lonergan. They just go on about their daily practice of thinking they have the right scientific explanation for other people's religion, and assume they're too smart for that sort of stuff. Like Stephen Hawking in "The Grand Design," they pick out some primitive religion (e.g., Pacific Island tribes) and then claim all religions are just like that. They're pushing a facile argument that goes over well with intellectually lazy people who are already inclined to believe their pitch; and with students who just want to get a decent grade in a course

and move on.

Spitzer's series of four volumes is likewise too daunting for the secular-humanist philosophers. But across those four books, Spitzer has shown with great clarity that there are only two choices: either the universe was created by a Transcendent Being outside the universe, whose existence supersedes all created entities; or there is a "multiverse" composed of an infinite number of other universes, which necessarily includes many nearly identical to our own, many with horrible consequences that no one would believe in.¹ Following Spitzer, after you accept the most reasonable and responsible conclusion that God created the universe, a whole bunch of other things fall into place.

However, professor Stephen Asma and his NY Times fans will never get there, because they're so sure his explanation of religion as an emotional crutch explains it all. Too many people want to believe that narrative. That's so much easier than investing the hard work necessary to learn how science and faith complement each other in the search for truth.

¹ See "The Incoherence of the Multiverse", T. Sheahen, ITEST Bulletin Volume 45, Number 1 Winter, 2014, pp. 7 -10



Tips for Conversing with Atheists

by Michelle Miller, The Magis Center

In answer to a question, posed by an EWTN listener on how to talk to atheists, Fr. Robert Spitzer, SJ of the Magis Center urges the viewer to meet the non-believer where they are. Below is a brief overview of four examples of presenting evidence to a specific kind of non-believer with links to articles and videos that more fully explain each argument.

Evidence from Cosmology

When conversing with a scientifically inclined agnostic or atheist, Fr. Spitzer recommends presenting the Borde-Guth-Vilenkin (BVG) theorem and the evidence from entropy. The key concept here is that physical reality had a beginning and that a beginning implies a creator. The BVG theorem and the entropy based evidence not only provide evidence for a beginning of our universe, but also the necessary beginnings of hypothetical multiverses, bouncing universes, and eternal (cosmic egg) universe models. The BVG theorem when combined with entropy is an efficient and convincing

way of demonstrating the necessity for a beginning. As nothing can come from nothing, so there had to be something (or better yet someone) that created physical reality. For a more in depth explanation of this this evidence watch Fr. Spitzer's video from Module 8 of the series, God and Modern Physics.

In addition for the evidence for a beginning, there is also the "fine-tuning" argument. Father Spitzer looks at the extreme precision of the initial physical constants of the universe to demonstrate the high improbability of a life-supporting universe coming into existence by chance.

Evidence from Near Death Experiences

Some people deny the existence of God because there is no verifiable evidence. For this type of skeptic-Fr. Spitzer recommends looking into research on Near Death Experiences (NDEs). This research provides compelling evidence that we have a transphysical soul. People are (and should be) skepti-

Continues on page 16

cal of anecdotal accounts, but peer reviewed studies that investigate large numbers of NDE cases, such as the Pim van Lommel study, can be convincing. These studies show that it is very likely that humans can survive bodily death.

Atheists will frequently oppose NDEs on the grounds that they are induced by hallucinations. However, patients who have undergone an NDE sometimes report accurate veridical (provable) data that they could not have previously known. Moreover, as reported in this study, 80% of blind patients are able to see during clinical death.

Existential Evidence

When conversing with the lonely or someone who seems to be suffering from existential anxiety, Fr. Spitzer recommends beginning with questions like, “Do you feel lonely, even when surrounded by loved ones? Do you ever have a sense of profound emptiness or alienation.”

We are called by our nature to something more. The human person is not just a clump of cells, but a marvelous composite of body and soul made in the image and likeness of God. The cause of this feeling of cosmic loneliness, emptiness, and alienation may stem from an unsatisfied longing for the transcendent – that feeling of being part of something infinite and eternal. We all feel this loneliness at times, but believers have a way of rising above that feeling – prayer. Fr. Spitzer has a list of spontaneous prayer for such times of crisis.

Some with existential anxiety may sense that there is “something more” but subscribe to alternative, less-satisfying, explanations. For this type of person, Fr. Spitzer recommends St. Augustine’s book, *The Confessions*. Although it can be a difficult book at times, it is an excellent first-person journey from nihilism to faith.

As St. Augustine says – “Our hearts are restless until they rest with thee.” If you know someone with existential anxiety read these articles to get more information on how to alleviate their stress and help them fulfill their desire for the transcendent.

In summary, each person needs to be met where they are, and sometimes they just need a friend. As Venerable Fulton Sheen says “Holiness is the only convincing argument for those who have rejected all the rest.” However, if you know of anyone who is looking for science or reason based evidence for belief, try using the tips from above or some of the resources found on our website.

For more information about the programs and projects of Father Spitzer and staff from the Magic Center click on www.MagisCenter.com

New Program From The Magis Center

Credible Catholic a free on line series produced by the Magis Center explains the Catholic Catechism by “Parts” while addressing issues affecting and infecting our religion.

Joe Miller reports July, 2018: Catholic News Service (CNS) is featuring Father Spitzer and *Credible Catholic* as one of their top stories today. The article provides an excellent summary of the project, and points to Father’s efforts to stem the flood of young Catholics leaving the church.

The article, entitled *Jesuit aims to stem decline of faith with launch of catechetical website*, highlights not only the learning modules of *Credible Catholic*, but also their reason for existing:

Father Spitzer’s foray into a multidisciplinary catechetical website sprang from his growing concern that religious affiliation is declining, due in large part, he believes, to the influence, particularly on youth, of “secular myths that misstate and/or misrepresent the facts.”

These myths include “science has proven God does not exist,” “humans are just a bunch of conglomerated atoms and molecules,” “suffering proves God does not exist,” and Jesus was “a very special person but he certainly was not divine.”

Catholic News Service also included some remarks from educators such as Anne Steinemann, professor of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Melbourne, Australia.

“Science can explain ‘what,’ but it cannot answer the question, ‘Why?’ *Credible Catholic* is effective, easy and exciting. It answers, head on, the typical objections to the Catholic faith.”

“Students,” said Steinemann, “can view the presentations on their own time, on their own device, in their own way. In the age of information overload, and trying to get students’ attention, this does.”

Since its launch, *Credible Catholic* has met with great success, and continues to grow. Just this past June, 80 U.S. bishops signed on to use the modules in their diocese.

To learn more about *Credible Catholic*, check out their website. www.crediblecatholic.com.