

Online ISSN: ۲۴۷۶-۴۸۵X

Print ISSN: ۲۵۳۸-۲۰۹۸

www.irijournals.com

مطالعات ادبیات، عرفان و فلسفه

دوره ۹، شماره ۴، زمستان ۱۴۰۲

صفحات ۲۰-۳۰

A look at the relationship between conflict, division and conflict between science and religion from the perspective of Western thinkers, emphasizing F. Haught's ideas

Nasrin Alavinia¹, Jafar Shariati², Ahmadreza Pakraei³

¹Department of Islamic Studies, Darab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Darab, Iran

²Department of Chemical Engineering, Darab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Darab, Iran

³Department of Computer Engineering, Darab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Darab, Iran

Abstract

Using the descriptive-analytical method and library tools, this article examines the relationship of conflict, division and harmony of science and religion from the perspective of Western thinkers, emphasizing F. Haught's theories. Science has great value for mankind and this point has made people always consider science as one of their most necessary needs, on the other hand, religion has also been very important and its ideas have been accepted by many people. What is called new science started in Europe almost from the 16th century onwards. The most effective advancement of science was in this era. Until the end of the 19th century, the successes of Newtonian physics made the views of this physics unquestionable. But gradually in the 20th century, quantum physics and the theory of relativity took away many of the mechanistic certainties of Newtonian physics.

The results of this research show that from the point of view of F. Haught, the relationship between science and religion was divided into four types of conflict, differentiation, intersection and confirmation, and he stated that religion in the West has been effective in shaping the history of science, and in contrast to cosmology Science, in turn, has influenced theology.

Keywords: science, technology, religion, F. Haught.

1. Introduction

The history of the relationship between science and religion can be considered as old as the use of these two words in human culture. In fact, this issue has been of vital importance for both science and religion. Science has great value for mankind and this point has made people always consider science as one of their most essential needs.

On the other hand, science includes many branches and fields. Physics, biology, astronomy, cognitive sciences were among the most important of these branches. Religion is also connected with human life. Therefore, examining the relationship between these two and how they co-exist in the human knowledge system has been one of the most important intellectual adventures during human life on earth.

In the coexistence of science and religion, in some cases, science has been doubted and sometimes some people have attacked religion. In fact, some people tried to make the two incompatible by expressing the hostile relationship between science and religion, to the extent that some considered this incompatibility in the essence of science and the essence of religion. In the meantime, some have interpreted science and sometimes religion while preserving the privacy of both and tried to prove the compatibility of scientific findings with the teachings of revelation.

On the other hand, those like Kant and existentialists and proponents of the theory of linguistic analysis played the instrument of absolute separation of science and religion and in the meantime solved the problem by differentiating between the language of science and the language of religion and considered each independent from the other. Now the problem is, which of the relationships proposed in the interaction of science and religion is closer to the truth and can answer the questions of today's mankind? Since the first page of the history of thinking about the relationship between science and religion was turned from the point of conflict between the two and the story of the confrontation between science and religion started from the conflict between them, it can be concluded that the other types of confrontations raised in the relationship between science and religion has been an attempt to answer the problem of conflict.

In fact, the expression of all kinds of relationships, including independence or bilingual theory, dialogue or hypothetical agreement, unity or overlap, are all trying to solve the problem of conflict and answer the challenges raised in this direction. Now, which one of these theories is able to answer all the questions raised by those who believe in conflict?

Perhaps the beginning of the collision between science and religion can be seen from the story of the famous astronomer Galileo Galilei and the theory of the central sun, which was opposed to the theory of the central earth.

However, many of the conflicts that arose between religion and science during the following centuries can be attributed to the conflict over boundaries; That is, he considered a difference of opinion about the real realm of science and religion. For example, the discussion about creation and evolution has been one of the hottest disputes in this field for more than a hundred years, or the theory of Freudian psychoanalysis claims that religious life is rooted in

wishful thinking and suppressing desires, and by proposing this claim, the legitimacy and validity of this It puts the way of life into doubt.

Einstein's theory of relativity fundamentally changes our understanding of space, time, and causality, and thus forces us to reconsider God's relationship with the world. It seems that technological advances in the field of computers and artificial intelligence endanger the unique dignity of intelligent people. And the discovery made about DNA molecules is close to provide scientists with the secret of life.

Therefore, the proper solution of such conflicts depends on obtaining a correct and comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the work and burden of science and religion. Presenting various interpretations of new science and the emergence of new understandings of religion and religious texts have been one of the important achievements of this discussion. This important question was raised in this context, how far can science be accepted and how far can religion be interpreted? Does science have border limitations or is its platform so broad that it has been able to answer all the basic questions of mankind?

2.The history of the emergence of ideas about science, technology and religion

What is called new science started in Europe almost from the 16th century onwards. The most effective advancement of science was in this era.

Lewis William Helsey Hall says:

After the scientific revolution, instead of a mere theoretical function, science found both a theoretical function and a practical and applied function. The technical and practical effect of science was not very serious in the past centuries. Practical progress in engineering, agriculture, medicine and military had a profound effect on the daily life of people and the fate of societies.

This fact showed the importance of scientific progress. These transformations were so effective that they could change the foundations of human culture.(Paul, 1983:14)

Lewis William Helsey Hall has an interesting interpretation of this change of human attitude that happened in two stages. He calls the first stage celestial geometry and the second stage celestial mechanics. In the first stage, human scientific calculations made significant progress, and in the second stage, finding the physical causes of the phenomena of the world brought about a deep transformation. Although some political, economic, religious and military movements prepared the cultural space in which the scientific revolution was possible, but the scientific revolution itself also brought about important changes in the attitude of humanity.

Anyway, the starting point of this revolution was in astronomy, and these scientific developments occurred both in the measurement and in the theories explaining the movement of the stars. Celestial mechanics led to the view of homogeneity of nature. Under the influence of this attitude, Newtonian mechanics was able to dominate all scientific endeavors for two to three centuries, and also became the basis for all future scientific developments.(Bohm, 1980:107)

Therefore, it can be said that Isaac Newton was the initiator of this way. He emphasized that I do not make hypotheses and only the apparent explanation of the phenomena and not the reason for their existence is important to me. Anyway, what became important in this era is

that science does not only explain natural phenomena and what happens in nature, but also pays attention to their use in life. Therefore, the discussion of technology was raised and showed mankind how to use nature and conquer it.

With the emergence of the theory of evolution, the conflict between science and religion became very hot. Because the scope of this issue does not only refer to biology, but also to the perception of humans. Because according to this theory, humans can be descended from monkeys and have reached this state due to blind evolution, and as a result, taffeta is not a separate fabric. In the middle of the 19th century, this theory, with its successes and analytical power, had reached the point where it was considered an almost undisputed theory. Such theorizing continued and grew in scientific fields. Even this theory is still one of the cases where science conflicts with the religion of Christ.(Longdon,1985:31)

But at the beginning of the 20th century, another problem arose that caused a fundamental change in physics. Until the end of the 19th century, the successes of Newtonian physics made the views of this physics unquestionable. But gradually in the 20th century, quantum physics and the theory of relativity took away many of the mechanistic certainties of Newtonian physics. Concepts such as probabilities, uncertainty, and leap changes, as well as the quantum of seeing the world and... questioned the rule of Newtonian physics. Of course, this did not mean the ineffectiveness of Newtonian physics, because all technological successes were based on Newtonian physics, but only the issue that Newtonian physics could provide explanations outside of its correct area was discussed.

With the beginning of the 20th century, the scientific evaluation of scientific laws was seriously revised according to a comprehensive scientific method. At first, it was thought that the scientific method is a simple and laboratory method. That is, in this method, phenomena are observed and tested under different conditions, and then a theory is made from this collection and used to explain and predict the phenomena.

But some people doubted this kind of explanation of the scientific method, and these questions were raised: can induction be used everywhere? Has anyone ever tested Newton's first law? How can the movement of molecules be observed? Are the concepts used in physics seen anywhere? Who has ever seen the force? Is there an observed concept of force? When the nature of the force or magnetic field is not known, what does it mean that if iron is placed in a magnetic field, it will be subjected to force?

The more these people studied the scientific method, the more they became disappointed with its certainty. At the end of the 20th century, Feyerabend wrote in his anti-method book that the scientific method is chaos and one cannot speak of a comprehensive scientific method with any certainty. The method and falsifiability of Thomas Cohen (scientific revolutions), the method of positivists and Karl Popper (researchability) and the method of Francis Bacon (inductiveism) are not acceptable methods because all these methods are subject to debate. This issue caused doubt in the reality of science and its explanatory abilities. (Whitehead,1925:141)

Certain developments also occurred in the use of common scientific methods. For example, the attitude towards pharmaceuticals changed. In the past, they found the chemical cause of

diseases and then prepared the appropriate medicine for it. But it was observed that the work is not that simple and returning to old medicine is more effective in many cases. This issue showed a flaw in the definitive methods of science. Therefore, other methods could replace inductive approaches and produce better results. Of course, science still had its technological achievements and tried to increase them.

In the last two decades of the 20th century, the basic problems of the environment caused a kind of pessimism towards technology and its undesirable consequences. The task of technology, which is based on scientific discoveries, was considered to bring mankind to a more comfortable and less troublesome life, but technology created such pollution and destruction that its sufferings for humanity were more than its benefits. Therefore, the absolute value of scientific progress and its ability to provide well-being and comfort for all people was questioned. Ethical factors with the limitations they created found an important position in all scientific research. Directed progress replaced the free and unrestricted progress that had shown its destructive effect in the past. This unrestricted development was destroying the natural environment, which was the human being who claimed to help it. During this period, a kind of return to nature and valuing nature itself became popular among scientists. (Ayatollahi, 1386: 14).

3.Conflict between science and religion

With the increasing progress of science in all fields, from the beginning, a group believed that there is a fundamental conflict between religious and scientific mentalities; Because until that day, religion had an answer for many problems surrounding mankind, but now it was seen that science provides a more subtle and accurate answer for the same problems, and now by putting both answers together, we come to the conflict between them, so that with the plan Religion, science is rejected and with the design of science, religion. But it should be kept in mind that the conflict between science and religion is possible when the subjects or ends or methods of both are considered to be the same to a great extent.

If the subjects, goals and even the methods of science and religion are to a great extent the same, then a competition between science and religion emerges, which often leads to a dynamic conflict and efforts to resolve that conflict. (Peterson, Hasker, Reichenbach and Basinger, 2013: 359)

Perhaps, for the reason of emphasizing the conflict, it can be said that this conflict appeared either when religious officials felt threatened for their spiritual values or worldview, or when the scientific community, such as in the late 19th century in Britain, wanted criteria and to establish the special privileges of new professions that were deliberately not accepted by clerics without expertise. Among the scientists and philosophers, those like August Comte and Bertrand Russell are of this opinion. By rejecting religion and accepting matter as the only fundamental reality of the world, scientific materialists consider science to be the only way for human progress and advancement, and therefore refer all laws and theories to physical laws, as Monad said: "Everything that can be delivered to The mechanical interactions are obvious. A cell is a machine, an animal is a machine, and a human is a machine" (Barbour, 1997: 80).

According to the conflict point of view, religion and science have fundamental conflicts due to common claims, which makes compromise between the two almost difficult. Therefore, scientific explanations have repeatedly challenged religious sensitivities and this conflict has often ended with the victory of science. Russell says in the book *Science and Religion*: "There was a difference of scope between science and religion until these recent years until science invariably won" (Russell, 1935:7).

For example, the cosmology that was founded in the name of religion had to retreat with more reasonable theories from science.

Of course, apart from discussions such as cosmology, many other topics have fueled the discussion of the conflict between science and religion.

4. Separation of science and religion

Examining the relationship between science and religion has not always brought mankind into conflict, some have considered some differences between science and religion, including differences.

Sometimes science and religion have shown themselves in such a way that they are not two competing or opposing forces, and each responds to a different set of human needs, and based on this, the language of science and the language of religion are related to different fields of action. Religion deals with moral and spiritual issues that are not directly concerned with science.

According to Wigner, an American physicist: "Religion mainly acts as a guide" (Golshani, 2016: 5) and in contrast to science, it seeks a quantitative understanding of the material world, which has nothing to do with religion. One deals with verifiable facts and the other surrenders reason for faith.

One enjoys change as advances in scientific understanding, and the other finds relief in God's fixed laws. Accordingly, scientific discoveries do not contain any verbal implications.

In this approach, some people, having religious beliefs, keep it completely separate in their scientific research and do not see any connection between them. Based on this, talking about God may be appropriate in the context of worship or austerity, but it is inappropriate in the context of laboratory practice. In the words of Pasteur, the discoverer of germs and one of the founders of experimental knowledge in medical sciences: "The laboratory is one world, and home, life, and religion are another." The laboratory and the field of religion are two completely different realms. (Townes, 1995: 31).

5. Cooperation between science and religion

The third point of view expresses a closer relationship between the interests and preoccupations of science and religion. Unlike the first position which was the conflict model, in this model it is said that sometimes some religious beliefs help scientific activities or in other words they are complementary. And unlike the second position, the position of separation, it has been argued that the interaction between science and religion is not only destructive but can be beneficial to both.

McGrath says: "These complementary fields must together yield a coherent worldview." For example, religion gives us a coherent idea of the world, but at the same time it raises questions that are beyond science, and it is in this field that there is a possibility of a fruitful interaction between the two. It can be said that the origin of this approach goes back to the natural theology of the 17th century in England and emphasizes that all types of truth are truths from God. This model states that all scientific advances should be welcomed and reconciled with faith. Dynamic theology has made a lot of efforts for this compatibility. This view was at its peak in the 19th century. (McGrath, 1999:50).

On the other hand, sometimes those who believe in this position directly derive theological inferences from science and believe that the existence of God is either from the inherent natural complications such as the existence of design and planning or the mastery of craftsmanship and order or from more specific discoveries such as directionality. The evolution or mathematical character of new physics can be deduced.

Perhaps it can be believed that the emphasis on the cooperation of scientific and religious beliefs has often appeared in societies where the newly emerging scientific society had to assume an existential look in front of the powerful religious officials. Also, when religious defenders use new scientific findings to defend the rationality of their faith or when they want to justify their religious tradition in front of other religions, that emphasis occurs again.

In the history of research on the relationship between science and religion, many thinkers have theorized, but among them, some people have made more precise divisions and have collected many materials in each group in this field.

6. The view of F. Haught

F. Haught divides the relationship between science and religion into four types: conflict, differentiation, intersection and confirmation.

Of course, he himself believes that a combination of the method of intersection and verification is the best method for the relationship between science and religion. He expresses the approach of each of the four relationships to issues such as the relationship between science and religion, evolution, personal God, the environment, etc., and here F. Hutt's approach to the relationship between science and religion is introduced.

6-1. Conflict

F. Haught begins by asking whether religion is opposed to science. He gives the answer to this question from the words of people who believe in conflict. He believes that this group will say in this regard: apparently, religion cannot show the truth of decoration explicitly, while science can. Religion tries to act mysteriously without providing any concrete evidence for the existence of God. On the other hand, science wants to test all its hypotheses and theories experimentally. So there has been a conflict between the ways of scientific knowledge and religious knowledge.

F. Haught says: Those who say conflict consider the main problem in the untestability of religious beliefs, while science does not take anything for granted, moreover, religion is strongly based on uncontrollable imaginations, but science clings to observable facts.

Religion is completely emotional and subjective, while science is neutral, non-emotional and objective.

He believes that skeptics are not the only ones who insist on the relationship between religion and science, and those who believe in the authenticity of the text of the holy books often see a conflict between their faith and some scientific theories. In addition to them, some people consider science as the enemy of religion and believe that it was the advent of science that mainly caused the emptiness and meaninglessness of the life and culture of the new era.

6-2. Distinction

This category argues that each of science and religion are in a well-defined field of research and each has completely different tasks, and if they are properly in the field of their separate judgments, there will never be any real problem in the relationship between science and religion. . In this point of view, the attempt to unify is unsuccessful. For example, there are those who combine science and religion and argue that because the Bible is inspired and infallible, it gives us the most reliable scientific information about the beginning of the world and life, or another. One of the methods of integration is compatibilism, which instead of rejecting science completely, forces the text of the Bible to conform at least in an imprecise way with the views of the new cosmology.

Maybe at first glance, these are good solutions, but history shows that eventually science and religion will be separated and the conflict will be replaced by an artificial agreement. They finish it.

More specifically, proponents of this approach generally emphasize that the game of science is to investigate the natural world empirically, while the role of religion is to express an ultimate meaning beyond the empirically known world. occur, and religion deals with the question of why something essentially exists instead of nothing. Science deals with causes and religion with meaning, science deals with solvable problems and religion with unsolvable mysteries, science deals with specific questions about how nature works, while religion deals with the ultimate context of nature, science deals with specific facts. It does, and religion wants to explain why we are fundamentally seeking to find the truth.

6-3. Intersection

F. Hutt believes that the differentiation method may be an important step towards clarity, but it has not yet succeeded in satisfying those who want a unified picture of reality, as Ian Barbour believes that the differentiation approach, although a useful first approximation, puts things in a Disappointing closure leaves. (Barbour, 1990: 15)

This approach accepts that science and religion are logically and linguistically distinct, but at the same time, it is aware that in the real world they cannot be separated from each other as easily as the differentiation approach assumes. It should be remembered that religion in the West shapes The history of science has been effective and, in contrast, scientific cosmology has in turn influenced theology, for this reason, the intersectional approach follows an open

debate between scientists and theologians. The word intersection requires that science and religion come together without necessarily merging.

The intersectional approach allows interaction, dialogue and mutual influence, but prohibits both integration and separation. The intersectional approach is based on the fact that scientific knowledge can expand the horizon of religious faith and the perspective of religious faith can deepen our understanding of the world. The intersectional approach does not try to prove the existence of God through science, but is content with the interpretation of scientific discoveries within the framework of religious meaning.

6-4. Confirmation

F. Hutt declares that I acknowledge here and throughout my book that religion profoundly undergirds all scientific activity. My point is simply that religion basically reinforces the humble desire to know, that is, religion confirms that drive that leads to knowledge in the first place. I know that today science is under heavy criticism, even many critics They believe that science is responsible for most of the calamities of the new world. They say that if it wasn't for science, we wouldn't have any nuclear threat or global pollution of air, soil and water.

But it is clear that if science was intrinsically related to this evil, religion would not support science. Most critics of science are unable to acknowledge that, in principle, science originates from a simple, humble desire to know. To separate from other human desires, desires such as pleasure, power or security, which puts science at the service of desires that have nothing to do with the search for truth, so when we say that religion supports science, I am not claiming that religion is all It accepts the wrong ways in which science is misused. I am simply saying that the love and hate interest in knowing which is the source of the growth and prosperity of science finds its deepest confirmation in a religious interpretation of the cosmos.

He emphasizes that religion cannot add anything to the list of scientific discoveries and is not in a position to reveal things about nature that science can achieve by itself, but religion in its essence makes us trust the general rationality of reality. The reality of religion is the support of trust, which is necessarily the basis of science. Religion enters human culture due to our awareness of the possibility of losing trust, and its main purpose is to constantly restore this trust. Trust does not start with religion, because the ability to trust reality is a natural thing when our trust is taken away. Religion plays the role of reviving it. Religion seeks to restore our hope in the face of despair. It helps us not to lose our belief that there is an ultimate meaning and promise for things.(F. Haught, 2014: 7).

Conclusion

Science has great value for mankind, and this point has made people always consider science as one of their most essential needs, on the other hand, science includes many branches and fields. What is called new science started in Europe almost from the 16th century onwards. The most effective advancement of science was in this era.

In the coexistence of science and religion, in some cases, science has been doubted and sometimes some people have attacked religion. In fact, some people tried to make the two

incompatible by expressing the hostile relationship between science and religion, to the extent that some considered this incompatibility in the essence of science and the essence of religion. In the meantime, some have interpreted science and sometimes religion while preserving the privacy of both and tried to prove the compatibility of scientific findings with the teachings of revelation.

With the beginning of the 20th century, the scientific evaluation of scientific laws was seriously revised according to a comprehensive scientific method. At first, it was thought that the scientific method is a simple and laboratory method. That is, in this method, phenomena are observed and tested under different conditions, and then a theory is made from this collection and used to explain and predict the phenomena.

Sometimes science and religion have shown themselves in such a way that they are not two competing or opposing forces, and each responds to a different set of human needs, and based on this, the language of science and the language of religion are related to different fields of action. Religion deals with moral and spiritual issues that are not directly concerned with science.

Emphasis on cooperation and cooperation of scientific and religious beliefs has often appeared in societies where the newly emerging scientific society has had to assume an existential look in front of powerful religious authorities. Also, when religious defenders use new scientific findings to defend the rationality of their faith or when they want to justify their religious tradition in front of other religions, that emphasis occurs again.

F. Haught divides the relationship between science and religion into four types: conflict, differentiation, intersection and confirmation.

Of course, he himself believes that a combination of the method of intersection and verification is the best method for the relationship between science and religion. He states the approach of each of the four relationships to issues such as the relationship between science and religion, evolution, personal God, environment, etc.

Skeptics are not the only ones who insist on the relationship between religion and science. Those who believe in the authenticity of the text of the holy books also often see a conflict between their faith and some scientific theories. In addition to them, some people consider science as the enemy of religion and believe that it was the advent of science that mainly caused the emptiness and meaninglessness of life and culture of the new age.

References

1. Ayatollahi, Hamid Reza. (1386) *Essays in Philosophy and Comparative Religion*, Qom: Kitab Taha.
2. Barbour, Ian. (1362) *Science and Religion*, translated by Bahauddin Khorramshahi, Tehran: Academic Publishing Center.
3. Patterson, Michael, Haskerwilliam, Reichenbach, Bruce, Bazinger, David. (2013) *Reason and Religious Belief*, translated by Ahmad Naraghi and Ebrahim Soltani, Tehran: New Design, first edition.
4. Popper, Karl Raymond. (1374) *Objective cognition: Evolutionary view*, translated by Ahmad Aram, Tehran: Asreno Andishe.
5. Alfred N. whitehead. (1925) *Science and the modern world*(Newyork: the macmillan company .
6. Andrew D. White (1896), *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*
7. *Christendom* (New York: D. Appleton & Co.)chap.III.
8. Barbour, Ian G. (1997). *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (San Francisco: Harper),
9. Barbour, Ian.(2000) *When Science Meets Religion: Enemies, Strangersin or Partners*. London:Spek, xiv
10. Barbour Ian (1990), *Religion in and Age of Science*
11. Bohm, David. (1980)*Wholeness and The Implicate Order*, London.
12. Brooke, John H. and Cantor, Geoffrey.(1998). *Reconstructing Nature: The Davis, Paul, (1983) God and The New Physics*, New York.
13. *Engagement of Science and Religion*. Edinburgh: T &T Clark.
14. Fred Hoyle, *The Nature of the Universe*(New York: Mentor,1950
15. Gilkey, Longdon. (1985) *Creaitinism On Trial*, Sanfransisco.
16. McGrath, Alister. (1999). *Science and Religion: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell