
Pro Rege

Volume 6 | Number 4

Article 8

June 1978

Clockwork Image: A Christian Perspective on Science (Book Review)

Harry Cook
Dordt College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege

Recommended Citation

Cook, Harry (1978) "Clockwork Image: A Christian Perspective on Science (Book Review)," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 6: No. 4, 26 - 27.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol6/iss4/8

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Dordt Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Dordt Digital Collections. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

against the will of God. Also, individualism, the destructive effects of which are nicely summed up in the following passage:

American revivalism ever since the days of Finney has emphasized an individualistic approach in which sin is reduced to simple, personal proportions and the solution to it similarly is very personal—the regeneration of individual souls. The essence of the pietism which revivalists extol is alleged ultimately to have “contributed more toward making men conform than reform,” thus, contributing to making America one of the most materialistic and secularistic nations in the world. (pp. 88-90)

Such individualism characterizes not only historic pietism, but other traditions as well. The frequent tendency of conservatives to identify also with political and economic conservatism is also a major barrier, brought about in effect by conformity to a present world system.

Chapter 7, “Social Sin” refutes standard arguments that sin is merely personal and also rejects evangelism aimed at saving individuals as being the only Christian option. Moberg also discusses the possibilities of revolution in the overcoming of social sin in its institutionalized form.

Most of the rest of the book is concerned with the attempts of evangelicals to “reverse” the great reversal in theory (ch. 8) and in practice (ch. 9). Chapter 9 is a summary of evangelical attempts at church renewal and more active social involvement. I found it encouraging to survey Moberg’s evidence that Christians from many different traditions and persuasions are trying to articulate normative principles and procedures for Christian social action. Even some of those traditions often considered to be pietistically inclined, for example, the neo-Charismatics, Baptists, and Mennonites, are busy restudying their societal obligations in the light of Biblical teachings.

I am in agreement with Moberg’s statement on page 211: “Even congregations and denominations can be likened to the parts of the Body of Christ. No two parts have the same spiritual gifts. By working together we can accomplish collectively that which we cannot do alone. This can help to overcome the sin of individualism as well as to eliminate a sense of guilt for not doing directly everything that needs to be done.” Tragically, so many of us evangelicals are preoccupied with fraternal conflict—as if other Christians are our enemy—that such collective action seems remote.

In sum, I recommend this book for the

widest possible reading.

The Clockwork Image: A Christian Perspective on Science by Donald M. MacKay, Inter-Varsity Press, London, 1974, 112 pages. Reviewed by Harry Cook, Associate Professor of Biology.

MacKay’s book discusses the relationship between science and the Christian faith. This relationship is a problem not yet adequately resolved in the Christian community and for this reason the book merits close attention. Because MacKay states his ideas clearly and simply and often uses the British idiom, his style is engaging. The book is very readable and develops its main argument well. It is a valuable contribution to the discussion among Christians about foundational problems in science.

Donald M. MacKay is professor of communication at the University of Keele in Great Britain, where he conducts research into the physiology of the brain. In writing about the relationship between science and faith, he performs a valuable service to the Christian community, for to many this relationship is unnecessarily antagonistic. MacKay has also lectured widely on this topic and is slated to be the 1979 lecturer for the Consortium of Reformed and Presbyterian Colleges, of which Dordt College is a member.

According to MacKay, many Christians feel that “. . . if God had anything to do with the events of the natural world, there must be something scientifically odd about them. The trouble was that, as science advanced, there was a steady shrinkage of the class of events that were ‘odd’ enough for God to be brought in to explain them. . . . The problem of finding room for God seemed to grow continually more embarrassing” (pp. 56-57). MacKay rejects this way of looking at the problem. He states, “The essential point made in the Bible, and in a sense, I think, the key to the whole problem of the relation of science to the Christian faith, is that God, and God’s activity, come in not only as extras here and there, but everywhere. If God is active in any part of the physical world, he is in all” (p. 57). The reason, therefore, that we can study natural phenomena and formulate scientific laws about them is God’s upholding hand, His faithfulness.

Our belief in this faithful God and our scientific investigations are complementary and do not compete, MacKay suggests. Complemen-

tary theories are probably best known from the physical explanations of light, where both the wave and the particle characteristics are required for an adequate description of the properties of light. But unlike these two theories of light—which both operate on the physical, that is, the same, level—the complementarity of science and faith is suggested by MacKay to be hierarchical. Thus they are not competitive; they are two *levels* of explanation, two ways of looking at reality. Because there is always a danger of using this kind of reasoning to avoid conflicts between mutually exclusive theories, MacKay warns the reader not to decide lightly that two explanations are complementary or that the complementarity of two explanations is hierarchical (pp. 91-92).

It is possible, it seems to me, to have chemical, physiological and psychological theories for example, about the function of the human brain; and several Christian philosophers have recognized this. Complementarity theories have probably been formulated for the same reason. When one is dealing with the relationship between faith and science, I feel that the danger to be avoided when using the complementarity argument is the idea that the two complementary theories are *needed* to *complete* one another. Although there may be other pitfalls in the idea of complementarity, MacKay has articulated a view of the relationship between faith and science that is more helpful than the competitive one mentioned above. MacKay has stated these views in a form that is readable for people engaged in the natural sciences. Students struggling with these problems would benefit from this book.

In his dealing with the topics of science and the Christian faith, MacKay's description of what the Christian religion says about man, his need for salvation, and the work of Jesus Christ are, in my opinion, Biblical, accurate, and refreshing. I *do* have a problem, however, with MacKay's seeming acceptance of the scientific enterprise as it is usually represented. Although it is not a major theme of the book, it seems that a positivistic view of science, with its ideals of methodological autonomy, objectivity, and progress, are accepted without challenge. Furthermore, many Christians will not share MacKay's acceptance of organic evolution (p. 51).

I would also question MacKay's use of the word *mechanistic*. He uses it without the reductionistic connotation that is usually attached to it in the literature. Thus, *mechanistic* becomes synonymous with scientific, chemical, and other similar terms. For reductionistic views, MacKay has coined the term "nothing-buttery" ("life is nothing but. . ."). I feel that

this usage has tended to bring confusion into a topic that is complicated enough as it is.

When we challenge MacKay on these two points, we should remember that his book is popularly written, and that it is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of the Christian view of the philosophy of science. MacKay's book is, therefore, recommended.

The Stones and the Scriptures, by Edwin Yamauchi. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and New York, 1972, 207 pages, paperback, \$3.95. Reviewed by Wayne Kobes, Instructor in Theology.

Of what significance are the findings of archeological science for a study of Scripture? Every Christian is faced with this question as he undertakes a study of the Bible, using the resource materials available today. And yet the question raised is not easily answered! Do the findings of the archeologists confirm the teachings of Scripture as some contend, or do they show the Bible to be an unreliable record of the past as others maintain? Can the average Christian benefit from the findings of Biblical archeology, or is it advisable for him to keep his distance from such studies?

Dr. Edwin Yamauchi, assistant professor of history at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, provides clear and responsible answers to the preceding questions in *The Stones and the Scriptures*. In this introduction to Biblical archeology, Dr. Yamauchi makes his reader aware of the history of his subject as well as the contributions and limitations of this recently developed science. Dr. Yamauchi refuses to gloss over the difficulties that face the Christian as he attempts to reconcile archeological discoveries with Biblical teachings. Yet he is convinced that the findings of archeology have overwhelmingly confirmed the reliability of Scripture. The author shows himself to be fully informed, balanced, and current in his understanding of this science which can be very helpful for Biblical studies.

The scope of Dr. Yamauchi's book is best illustrated by noting the chapter headings: "Mari, Nuzi, and Alalakh: *The Illumination of the Old Testament*;" "Ramsay Vs. The Tubingen School: *The Confirmation of the New Testament*;" "Qumran and the Essenes: *The Dead Sea Scrolls*;" "Fragments and Circles: *The Nature of the Evidence*."

As indicated above, *The Stones and the*