

AUSTRALIAN CHURCH MANUALS

Is Christianity Scientific?

BY THE REV.

E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, M.A., LITT.D.,

*Lecturer on Dogmatic Theology, Moore College, Sydney;
Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin, 1911-12;
Author of "Christian Certitude: Its Intellectual Basis";
"The Person of Christ in Modern Thought."*



Lieutenant E. Digges La
Touche
Killed in action at
the Dardanelles, Aug. 1915.

ONE PENNY.

No.

ANGUS AND ROBERTSON LIMITED,
89 CASTLEREAGH STREET, SYDNEY.

1

AUSTRALIAN CHURCH MANUALS

EDITED BY THE

VEN. G. A. D'ARCY IRVINE, Archdeacon of Cumberland.	
REV. CANON MARTIN, M.A.	REV. E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, D.Litt.
REV. G. A. CHAMBERS, M.A.	REV. G. C. GLANVILLE, B.D.
REV. W. L. LANGLEY.	REV. S. E. MAXTED, B.D.

No. 1.

Is Christianity Scientific?

BY THE REV.

E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, M.A., Litt.D.

*Lecturer on Dogmatic Theology, Moore College, Sydney ;
Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin, 1911-12 ;
Author of Christian Certitude : Its Intellectual Basis"
"The Person of Christ in Modern Thought."*

"Dr Digges La Touche has given up his precious life, and we shall never again have him in this Synod, where during his comparatively brief membership, he played a part so brilliant. Some of us can never forget him, of commanding ability, brimful of enthusiasm with that charm & his Celtic temperament which endeared him to us even when often thought it was felt that we differed most. But above all with a transparent soul, white-hot with devotion to his Divine Master, for whom he was ready to spend him-
ANGUS & ROBERTSON LTD.,
89 CASTLEREAGH STREET, SYDNEY.
Self with almost a martyr's heroism"
archbishop of Sydney. Synod.

THE PREFACE.

It has been the desire of the Clergy who are responsible for the publication of the Australian Church Manuals to supply a series of freshly-written and sound, if brief, writings. The Manuals will have, as their substance, subjects of the utmost importance to all members of our ancient Church, a Church which, as Archbishop Benson said in a speech delivered in Ireland a few days before his death, is at once "Apostolic, and Catholic, and Protestant, and Reformed."

Sydney, 4th September, 1913.

Is Christianity Scientific ?

A COMMON OBJECTION TO CHRISTIANITY.



It is not an uncommon thing for Christian workers to be told by a certain sort of people that they do not believe in Christianity. They say that religion is a matter of faith; that modern science has passed out Christianity and made it quite impossible for those who are genuinely influenced by it to accept the Christian Faith, without making a fool of their reasons.

This view seems to be somewhat widely held and is largely due to the noisy, anti-Christian declamation of some brilliant natural scientists during the latter part of the Nineteenth Century. If it were true, nobody ought to be inclined to deny the necessity of a revision of our ideas, either of natural science or religion, as the facts should demand.

The only difference would be that some of us who had not had much time for Christianity would be inclined to assume that natural science must always be right and to say that religion must always be subordinated to our knowledge of the natural world. Others, and they would include some men of the very highest scientific brilliancy—*e.g.* Agassiz, Lord Kelvin and Salmon, perhaps, the greatest British mathematician since Sir Isaac Newton—would from experience consider the Christian facts the most important class and either subordinate the apparently opposing facts of natural science to those more vital facts, or else do what would be the most truly scientific

thing in the circumstances—assert both series of facts as true and leave their reconciliation to the scientific workers of the future.

How absolutely wrong-headed this idea—that Christianity is opposed to science—is shown by two facts—the ever-increasing recognition of the harmony between religion and the results of modern scientific enquiry*; and that Christian theology has always regarded itself as a science.

It may be said, however, that this is true so far as ancient theology and science are concerned; but, since modern science has come into existence, Christian theology cannot be regarded as, and does not really consider itself to be, a modern science in its ideas and methods.

On the contrary, the reformed theology has always been a modern science. Indeed, it is the source of modern scientific thought; for, before that great son of the Reformation, Francis Bacon, first put its principles into words, they had been applied and verified in the controversy with Rome by the fathers of the Reformation!

Now, every school has the right to be judged by its best representatives. It is not fair to judge the Labour party or the Liberals by the stupidest and most vicious man to be found in their ranks; nor would it be fair to take a shallow and empty-headed orator like Ingersoll as fairly representative of Rationalism. Similarly, it is only fair to judge Christian theology by its best representatives and they, *e.g.* the Hodges and Shedd of Princetown, Gretillat of Neuchatel, and almost all Reformed theologians are insistent upon the truly scientific character of Christianity and its ways of working. Thus, Dr. McCheyne Edgar—one of the sturdiest and most conservative Irish Presbyterians of the old school—tells us that, as Christian theologians,

* So H. Hoffding, "Philosophy of Religion".

"we are collecting facts, no fact in Nature or in Scripture is unwelcome; then we cast about for good working hypotheses, although in matters theological we call the hypotheses doctrines; and then we verify these in experience or by experiment." Theology, like any other branch of science, learns by experience; its conclusions are only valid so far as they are true to fact, and it is only true to itself so long as it is prepared to accommodate them to any new facts that further enquiry may bring to light. The truth of this claim is shown by the fact that

I.—CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY ASSUMES NOTHING AND REQUIRES NOTHING WHICH IS NOT EQUALLY ASSUMED IN ANY OTHER FIELD OF SCIENTIFIC ENQUIRY.

This statement will come as a surprise to most people; for, most unfortunately, there has been very little presentation of the results of scientific theology in a popular and yet scientific way. There has been plenty of careful and honest scientific work done in the field and a very fair knowledge of the course of scientific theology is not uncommon among the advocates of Christian truth; but the method of imparting the results has been so authoritative in character as to give the impression that theology has no place for the methods of modern science.

Truth, however, does not cease to be truth on account of the defective presentation of its advocates and a brief survey of the assumptions and methods of modern science will make it abundantly clear that every taunt made against Christian theology as unscientific is equally applicable to any other branch of scientific research.

Yet it is constantly being said that religion is a matter of faith; but science is a matter of knowledge. The idea in people's minds seems to be that faith is firmly believing that something is true which you

know perfectly well to be false—a sort of sham knowledge, known to theology and quite unknown to science; but a little thought will make it absolutely clear that, so far from faith being a sham source of knowledge, or the capacity of believing the unevidenced or the unreasonable to be true, it is a fundamental element of human nature, without which, we could neither know, or think, or live our daily lives, or make any advance in scientific knowledge.

A fact which is often overlooked is that to know anything perfectly, we must know everything. If it were otherwise, we would not be living in a universe and science would be quite impossible; for the work of science is to observe facts, their relations to one another and to find explanations by laws which will explain how things are so. Hence it is quite certain that we can have no knowledge in any field of scientific enquiry which entirely dispenses with the necessity of faith. As I am writing this on the verandah, there are some withered leaves lying on the path. What would we have to know to understand a single leaf perfectly? We would have to know all about it from the botanical point of view; but, to know that, we must know all the forces that have come into play to make the world as it is and cause that leaf to lie there. But again—since the earth is part of the Solar system—to know the world as it is, we must know the whole of the Why? and the Wherefore? of the Solar system; and, since the Solar system is only a very small speck in infinite space, we would require to have a perfect knowledge of astronomy. What is more, to understand and know all about our withered leaf, we must know all about its influence upon the insects, birds, animals and men who have seen it and how far its influence upon them, and also on the atmosphere and soil, will affect the future. All this means perfect knowledge. It means that we must know everything which has happened in the universe, is happening or will ever happen.

GOD Almighty alone can fully understand a withered leaf lying on the garden path!

This is not to say, however, that man has no real knowledge. Human knowledge, though partial, is true knowledge and we can have sufficient grounds for believing that our withered leaf is a perfectly reasonable thing.

We must now glance at some of the more important presuppositions of modern science and try to estimate the place of faith in modern scientific research.

(1) Since there can be no scientific knowledge without a scientist, a knower, to grasp it, we must know that we exist. Yet is there anyone of us who can prove the absolute certainty of his own existence? If we knew that, perfect knowledge would be ours; for we would then have a perfect knowledge of everything which was, and is, and is to come. Since that knowledge is impossible to any creature, the only Being who absolutely knows that He exists is the Almighty, and—just because He knows it—for Him no scientific enquiry is necessary! Unless we are willing to believe in our own existence, no science is even possible for us. We must, therefore, begin our scientific work by believing in ourselves!

(2) Nor is belief in our own existence the only exercise of faith necessary to scientific enquiry. In spite of the facts that until we begin to act we cannot even verify our beliefs and that human reason has very often proved misleading in the past—we must believe that human reason is generally a trustworthy guide and can be trusted in the great enquiry of modern science.

(3) Nor is this all. We must also believe that the object of our enquiry, the subject of our science, really exists—or else there would be no use whatsoever in trying to do anything at all.

If we did not believe that things existed, what would be the good of trying to observe them? But we cannot prove, before experiencing them, that things exist and, even then, our evidence, though good enough for all practical purposes, is very far from being ideally perfect. In other words, before we can enquire what Nature is, we must believe in a revelation of Nature, in a revelation of her character and activities which will appeal to our imperfect intelligences.

(4) Though there are very many other similar points in connection with which scientific enquiry must start, continue and end by putting a more or less reasonable, *i.e.*, evidenced, faith in objects or processes, all scientific enquiry must assume a thing to be true which it cannot now, and never will, be able to establish—the reasonableness of the world. What would be the use of attempting to look for order which you did not believe existed? Yet the whole aim of modern science is to perceive the order in the universe and, to do this, it must act on the belief that we really live in a universe.

Thus science starts, of necessity, from faith, works by faith, and hopes to attain its goal by faith.

Every enquiry of science which achieves success is as much a life, walk, and triumph of faith as that written of by old William Romaine in his noble, devotional treatise of that name.

2. "But Christianity requires moral and spiritual qualities—or claims to do so—which are not needed by the scientific enquirer. The treasures of science are for all. Those of Christianity, on its own showing, are only for the few who have the special qualifications which enable them to understand it."

This is not the case. There is no single moral qualification or aptitude necessary for the discovery of Christian truth which is not equally necessary in any

other possible field of scientific enquiry. Are not the three great qualifications for the knowledge of God sincerity, repentance and faith? Is not sincerity necessary to the doing of any good work whatsoever? Sir William Ramsay's sadly true statement—that the great lesson University teachers have to impress upon the minds of clever students is that mere cleverness is a poor thing in itself, has no staying power in itself and must, if it is to do anything worth doing, be backed by moral earnestness and love of truth—is sufficient proof of the decisive significance of moral qualities throughout the whole field of human thought and science.

Now, what is repentance? Is it not simply turning away from all other things and turning to God? In other words, is it not simply the devoting of a man's self to the Object of theological science? Yet what good is any man likely to do in geology who is not willing to turn away from other employments and devote himself to the object of his science? Repentance, in a very real, though not necessarily a moral sense, is as indispensable to the knowledge of the rocks or plants as it is to the knowledge of God, and of the Revelation of God in Christ.

3. "But this is all very well. You show that Christianity has much in common with modern science in its presuppositions and conditions; but you have not touched the real difficulty. The real difference between Christianity and scientific knowledge is this: There are insuperable and unanswerable objections against Christian belief which do not lie against scientific belief."

This statement, however, is not only open to doubt. It is positively untrue.

(1) Even Huxley admitted that the difficulties of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity were insignificant beside the difficulties involved in Nature and Admiral

Mahan—one of the greatest historians the United States has ever produced—tells us that the antecedent improbability of the resurrection of the Lord is as nothing compared with that of the existence of the world.

(2) What is more, no single argument against the reality of the Christian knowledge of God is known to the present writer which is not equally relevant against the reality of our knowledge of our own existence and of the existence of the universe. Every single argument in favour of religious agnosticism will equally establish agnosticism with regard to the existence of the finite, human self and of the universe.

The price we must pay, if we wish to be genuinely scientific, religious agnostics, is to push our arguments to their logical conclusions and deny the reality of all knowledge. In other words, we must come to the position of the ancient agnostic teacher—"I know nothing; not even that I know nothing." Such a miserable creed destroys, it is true, the incentive to Christian enquiry—at the not inexpensive price of the abolition of all scientific knowledge whatsoever!

4. Further, it is important to observe the necessarily imperfect character of both theological and natural science. It is quite certain that we can never have a perfect knowledge of Christian theology. God is Infinite and our finite brains can never perfectly comprehend the Infinite. It is equally true, however, that we will never perfectly comprehend the world as we know it. To do so would mean that we had observed all the facts and forces that have ever, or ever will, work in it and upon it; and that is a task which even those agnostics who presume to declare the impossibility of certain kinds of knowledge may well hesitate at attempting. Thus, man's knowledge of theology and our knowledge of the world as he sees it are alike, and always will be, scientifically imperfect.

We will have all eternity for the acquisition of knowledge and yet we will never exhaust its store.

A very important consideration follows from these facts. Our knowledge is and always will be imperfect. Hence contradictions and difficulties—some of them, perhaps, quite insoluble by us—may be expected. The fact that there are difficulties which we cannot solve should not, therefore, prevent us accepting the facts that are well established or, unless, of course, a better theory which explains more facts and more important facts is offered to us in its stead, the theories which are sufficient to explain them. To do so would be shockingly unscientific. The difficulties in the way of a theory may be enormous; but, so long as no better explanation of the facts is available, the only truly scientific thing to do is to work on that theory as best we can and hope either for a solution of the difficulties which perplex us or for a new and better theory.

Now, what light does all this throw upon Christianity? It shows that its fundamental demand of faith in its sons is the same demand as that which all modern science makes upon its followers. It establishes the fact that the moral requisities for the successful search after Christian truth, are identical with those for the successful prosecution of any scientific enquiry whatsoever; that the basic assumptions of modern science are those of Christianity; that the methods of Christian theology are those of modern science, and that Christian theology in regarding revelation—if revelation be a fact—as the subject matter of its science is simply true to the practice of all branches of modern scientific enquiry.

Indeed, it has done more. It has shown that modern science presupposes God. Science assumes that we live in a universe; that order reigns in the universe—and this assumption of reason in the universe, made by

modern science to enable its work, is amply confirmed by all its researches. Now, reason in man presupposes a reasoner and—unless we are able to show that thought without a thinker really does exist—it would be most unscientific to say that thought ever exists without a thinker. It is quite impossible in the nature of the case that we should ever be in a position to say this; for the simple reason that our knowledge is limited and we cannot possibly know, for certain, that there is any thought without a thinker. Hence, on its own principles, modern naturalistic and agnostic science ought to confess the existence of GOD or else commit suicide by a denial of the reason in the universe. Its assertion of the order in the universe and its refusal to ascribe it to an Orderer immediately puts it out of court as being shamefully unscientific both in spirit and procedure.

The Being of GOD is a scientific doctrine, or hypothesis, of such vital interest to modern science that they stand or fall together.

II.—SCIENCE, LAW AND MIRACLE.

"But this is all very well as far as it goes. It does not, however, touch the most serious point at issue—the conflict between science and Christianity. Christianity is essentially supernatural and stands or falls with the reality of certain great miracles; but science has no place for the miraculous. The whole advance of science has been in the direction of establishing the reign of Law in the universe, and the "eternal, iron laws of nature" know no change and no relaxation. Hence the miraculous is impossible and it is quite unscientific even to think that it could ever have happened."

1. This whole position rests upon a total misunderstanding of the nature of science, of natural law and of the miraculous. One would

think, to hear some people talk of science, that it was a perfect knowledge of things as they are—not merely an imperfect method of getting to know them. Natural science is simply the observation of things as they appear to us to be, their sequences and relations. Its natural laws are simply attempts to put those relations into words. They are simply well-attested scientific theories, liable to be overthrown at any time by the production of a single sufficiently vital and well-established fact.

2. Nor is it permissible—except as a figure of speech whose fanciful character must always be kept in remembrance—to speak of the "eternal, iron laws of nature."* Our imperfect attempts at the stating of the methods by which the processes of nature are governed are far too imperfect to justify us in treating them as a sort of scientific Athanasian Creed, the unreserved acceptance of which is essential to our scientific salvation!

Nor is it true to the experienced facts of Nature to say that natural law knows no modification. Every natural law is continually modified in its workings by other natural laws and forces. When we say, *e.g.*, that the law of gravitation is a universal law, we do not mean that its working is never modified by circumstances. If that were so, we could never go up stairs! But experience teaches us that the working of this law is modified in countless directions by countless forces; and it is just this marvellous elasticity of natural law which makes life and the universe the varied, beautiful and wonderful things that they are.

3. Similarly, there is a perfect misunderstanding of the nature of miracle. A miracle is simply the operation of a superhuman personality in an abnormal and superhuman way within the realm of human experience. As the Bishop of Newcastle said at a

*Haeckel.

recent Conference, "Miracles are the normal works of an abnormal personality." Since there can be no true science without the existence of a personal God, it is scarcely reasonable for us to say what things He can, or cannot, do in His universe. Is it impossible for personality to work in the universe? Is it not the case that every single one of us expresses our thoughts by means of, not in spite of, Nature and her laws? We do it by the directing of the forces of Nature in the way we want.

An illustration will make this clear. Twenty years ago I heard some old military officers discussing the idea of flying machines in war and treating the whole notion with absolute contempt. To-day flying machines are a fact and even the Turks have their aviation corps! What my father's friends said was impossible has now come to pass—not by the violation of natural law, but by the knowledge of it. Now, if GOD is—and we can only deny it at the cost of destroying all science—is it not certain that He, Whose reason is revealed to us in Nature as natural law, will be able by His perfect knowledge of all the forces of Nature to do anything He wants by directing those forces in accordance with His purposes?

4. The whole trouble with regard to natural law arises from two causes—(i.) Some people seem only to be able to regard the inexplicable as worthy of GOD and indignantly refuse to recognise that GOD may choose to work through His universe, not independently of it. These, when Christians, raise unnecessary difficulties for those who are inclined to think that GOD having made a universe will probably respect the laws of His own giving. When they are not Christians, they naturally find plenty of difficulty in accepting the miraculous working of GOD.

(ii.) Besides this, all of us are far too fond of using the narrow limits of our own experience as a guide—not to what has happened, but to what can happen, in

the universe. The universe, strange as it may seem, is greater than our experience and it is simply bad reasoning to say, just because we do not see them happen, that miracles cannot happen. The Siamese Prince who, because he had never seen ice in Siam, said, when he was told that water was sometimes hard in England, that his informant was a liar, was absurdly wrong; but he fell into the error by putting too much trust in the teachings of his own experience and that of the overwhelming majority of the people of his country.

If we try to use experience to determine what has not happened and what cannot happen, it is almost certain to mislead us. Its right use is not to show us what cannot happen, but what can happen. It is, therefore, silly to say, because we have no experience of its occurrence, that a thing cannot happen. Now, this is precisely the mistake into which our objector falls. Instead of adopting the scientific attitude, simply enquiring as to the evidence available for their occurrence, he tries to use our very imperfect experience to show that such things as the Resurrection of our Lord cannot happen and have not happened.

Thus, Science and Natural Law offer no barrier whatsoever to the possibility—or, when we remember that GOD is an essential hypothesis of all true science, even probability—of miracle and must be regarded as the handmaids of Christianity, not its bitterest opponents.

III.—EVOLUTION, CHRISTIANITY AND THE MISTAKES OF THEOLOGY.

Our objector, however, has another arrow in his quiver. "This kind of talk is all very good; but the fact remains that Modern Science is committed to the evolutionary way of looking upon things and

Christianity claims a creating God. Evolution explains all the order in the universe without the necessity of God and the slow development of man from the irrational creation make it sheer nonsense to say that he is the image of God."

1. If it were really true that Evolution was an established fact and not simply a most important theory, it would follow that nobody would attempt to dispute it and there would be very little difference among people as to what exactly it was. Men are generally agreed as to facts and only disagree as to their explanation. Hence the serious disagreements among Evolutionists are quite sufficient to show that, while the Descent of Species seems to be a fact, the explanation of the fact is a somewhat doubtful theory. Is it altogether wise to build so extensively upon the shifting sands of theory?

2.—In any case, Evolution is, and only professes to be, an explanation of *how* things came to be what they are, not of *what* they are, *why* they are, or *whence* they are. Hence it has nothing whatsoever to do with Creation which is a theory of the origin of things. Christianity and the Bible are not committed to any method of creation—only to the fact. Hence Evolution may, or may not, be true without affecting Christian belief and practice in any serious degree. Indeed, its influence has been for good. It has taken us into God's workshop and shown us the Creator at work, how He works out His purposes through almost boundless time, and thus established a far grander and profounder order in the universe than Paley ever dreamed of—than that which drove the unbelief of Cent. xviii. in utter rout from off the field of battle!

3.—"How is it, then, that when Darwin first put forward the theory, the parsons all denounced Evolution?"

For the same reason as the majority of then living scientists relentlessly opposed it—because they did not believe it to be true. They had also a further reason than their belief in its unscientific character from the naturalist standpoint; for the atheistic minority of scientists said that it destroyed the evidences of design in the universe and was hostile to God's Word. Instead of making an independent inquiry for themselves, most Christians were foolish enough to believe them at first and followed the majority of Naturalists in their opposition to the theory. Had they, then, made an independent enquiry as they afterwards did, a most serious misunderstanding of the relations of Christianity and Natural Science would have been averted.

Does it ever occur to those people who are fond of talking about the old conflict between some Christian thinkers and some Evolutionists, what a wonderful thing it is that a system of thought, formulated in prescientific times, should find so little difficulty in adapting itself to the better-established scientific theories of to-day? That, within fifty years of the controversy which the theologians, together with the majority of natural scientists of that time, waged with the evolutionists, Evolution should give no serious difficulty to any Christian thinker known to the present writer? The fact that Christianity has found no difficulty in assimilating the new scientific knowledge, is surely sufficient to show that it had no essential quarrel with scientific facts and that the whole trouble was caused by men reading their own ideas of natural science into the Holy Scriptures and into Christianity.

Nor is it fair to say that the Christians are always in the wrong in their scientific controversies. Very often they have taken the right side. Thus, the scientists of the early part of Cent. xvii.—*e.g.* Bacon, the father of modern science—ridiculed the Copernican

theory of astronomy and the true scientific theory—that the earth goes round the sun—was first popularised in England by a Bishop of the Church of England; but even if it were not so, it would be the very height of silliness, while the whole history of those other sciences is a record of the scientific errors into which theologians, in common with the rest of mankind, have fallen, to say that the mistakes of theologians in other departments of science, or even in their own, invalidate theology as a true branch of science.

IV.—THE ONLY GENUINELY SCIENTIFIC POSITION IS THAT OF CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity, with its noble conceptions of man as the child of GOD, of this world as the training ground of moral beings for a higher life, is absolutely adequate to the explanation of all the facts of life and experience. The universe, conscience, man's capacity for GOD, find ample explanation in the fact of GOD. The order in history and the mighty moral fruits of Christianity find adequate explanation in the fact of Divine Love expressing itself in Self-sacrifice for sinful man; and human life and destiny thereby receive a grandeur and inspiration which amply explain the fact that most of the greatest triumphs of the human intellect have been won in the conditions created by Christian belief; for modern science has followed in the wake of Christianity and owes more to Christianity than to all other influences put together.

2. Nor is this belief an unevidenced belief. There is no system of thought on earth that is so well evidenced by so many different kinds of evidence as the Christian faith. The philosophic evidence derived from its conception of GOD as Holy Love and its fusion of the real and ideal in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ; the moral evidence of the character of our Lord and the moral influence of the faith; the his-

torical evidence for the great central miracle, or manifestation of Divine power, of our Lord's Resurrection from the dead, are all of the very highest order of testimony, each in its own department of scientific research, and their united testimony is so massive an evidence of the truth of Christianity that there is every reason for believing that all future activities of speculation or scientific enquiry will only add to its strength.

There is, however, one method of scientific enquiry in which the natural scientist rightly puts the greatest confidence. It is the method of verification by experiment. If, in the same conditions, our scientist can always get the same results, he will be absolutely certain that he is using the right method. Now, this is an experiment which has been tried with regard to Christianity throughout nineteen centuries by all classes of men, from the University Professor to the man in the street, in all conditions of life from the lowest tribes of humanity to the highest civilisations which the world has ever seen; but *not a single well-authenticated instance of its failure has ever yet been established.*

Whenever, and wherever, men have fulfilled the conditions of the experiment by putting genuine trust in our Lord Jesus Christ, turning away from their sins and turning to GOD, the same results have always followed. The consciousness that they were made the children of GOD, that their sins were forgiven and that they were being delivered from their sins, that they had fellowship with One who could really be a perfect Friend to them and, always with them, could perfectly understand all their trials and difficulties, and enter into all their joys and sorrows, has been the inevitable experience of those who have taken Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour, their Lord and their GOD.

Even if some should say that in their case the test had failed, it would not destroy, or even seriously

affect, the value of the argument. Owing to our imperfect fulfilment of the conditions of the experiment, there must always be a certain percentage of apparent failures in all scientific experiments. Hence we may reasonably expect, especially in dealing with so complex a problem as man, that we will not always succeed in getting precisely the right conditions and that a certain number of our experiments will seem to be failures; but, before we have any right to say that any experiment has been a scientific failure, we must be able to show that the conditions of success were exactly fulfilled a very difficult thing to do. Hence, in Christian theology, as in every other branch of scientific enquiry, a series of successful experiments proves a great deal and occasional unsuccessful experiments only create a presumption that the experimenter has, in some way, failed to secure the conditions of success.

Thus, Christianity as the only hypothesis which explains the facts as we know them, as the hypothesis which rests upon the widest induction—upon the longest series of facts, as the only hypothesis resting so close to the facts of human life and experience that it can be verified by personal experiment, is the inevitable goal of all truly scientific thinking.

Our answer, therefore, to the charge that science has passed out Christianity is simply this: The honest application of scientific methods inevitably brings us to Jesus Christ, our Lord and our God. Our position is, therefore, shown to be scientific and yours unscientific. If you continue to hold it you thereby show that you lack the genuine scientific spirit and method and are unworthy of the name of scientists. Christianity is science. All other beliefs are unscientific.

Australian Church Manuals.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

No.

- 1 **IS CHRISTIANITY SCIENTIFIC?** *Now Ready.*
By the Rev. E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, Litt.D.
- 2 **WHAT DID THE ENGLISH REFORMATION DO FOR US?** *Nearly Ready.*
By the Rev. D. J. DAVIES, M.A., Principal of Moore College.
- 3 **JESUS CHRIST, LORD AND GOD.** *In Preparation.*
By the Rev. S. E. MAXTED, M.A., B.D.
- 4 **THE LORD'S SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION.**
By the Rev. G. A. CHAMBERS, M.A.