apples and oranges. The physical/chemical aspects of atmospheric science can be discussed without raising any confusion about world views and metaphysical presuppositions. I don’t see too much space devoted in this journal to scientific and Christian perspectives on atmospheric science, but evolution is discussed constantly because it comes loaded with metaphysical presuppositions and social implications.

Regarding Harvey’s comments about my “God of the gaps” error, I am accustomed to hearing this phrase used to silence all objections to theistic evolution, so I am grateful to David Snoke for his article “In favor of God-of-the-gaps reasoning” (PSCF 53 [September 2001]: 153). Of course, the biblical perspective is that God fills all the gaps; he created and remains actively involved with his creation. To glorify God for his providential and creative acts is a dominant theme throughout the Scriptures. The question is not if but how he created. Theistic evolutions prefer to believe that he created according to some facsimile of Darwin’s theory. That paradigm feels more comfortable in the context of the secular scientific community where few dare to challenge Darwin’s emperor status, but in my view, the emperor’s clothes are increasingly transparent. With sincere respect to theistic evolutionists, I think the ongoing effort to squeeze the Origin of Species out of the first few chapters of Genesis is a futile exercise.
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Humans and Consciousness
William Struthers in “Defining Consciousness: Christian and Psychological Perspectives” (PSCF 53 [June 2001]: 102–6) deals with the difficult question of the nature of human consciousness. This involves the ability to separate “me” from “not me” to, perhaps, its being the central processor of information that attempts to make sense of our inner and outer experiences.

The study of human beings encompasses all sorts of disciplines—cognitive science, neuroscience, philosophy, psychology, etc. However, although the existential object under study is the same, viz., humans, yet the subject matter of each discipline involved is totally different. This difference determines, for instance, the nature of the evidence to which each kind of knowledge appeals. Also, one ought not to equate a person’s use of reason to know, which can be applied to non-scientific as well as to scientific studies, with the pursuit of knowledge solely with the aid of the scientific method.

A Christian perspective considers a human being to be body/mind/soul; whereas to science a human being may be viewed only as mind/body and mind further reduced to brain. Note, however, that John Eccles says: “It [‘ego’ or ‘self’] is essential to the concept each of us has of being a self,” and he adds, “in the religious sense it corresponds to the soul.”¹ Accordingly, consciousness cannot be determined or measured with physical devices and so it is not the subject matter of science. Only the nonphysical self in humans can detect consciousness.

The scientific attempt to relate the function of consciousness to the ability to enhance survival and procreation considers only the aspect of history consistent with evolutionary thoughts. One ought to distinguish historical science, e.g., cosmology, evolutionary theory, etc., from physics. The former is more akin to forensic science and deals only with unique events; whereas physics is the prototype of experimental science. Of course, the introduction of history into the study of the nature of consciousness brings forth the fundamental role that miracles play in the Christian world view.

C. S. Lewis clearly indicates that the notion of miracles requires a clear and unequivocal understanding of what Nature is.² It should be remarked that the subject matter of science is data collected by physical devices. In physics, knowing is based on evidence obtained via the interactions of particles/fields. If something cannot, in principle, be measured by physical devices, then that something is outside the purview of science. This gives a clear demarcation of what science is and what it is not. This definition of science is what requires that the evidentiary data of the historical sciences must be collectible by physical devices.

The essence of consciousness, the ability to know self, is not something that can be detected with the aid of physical devices. Therefore, the study of consciousness cannot be limited to the methods of sciences. A human being is the “detector” of his or her own self and so a human being is in a sort of space with both physical and nonphysical dimensions. The latter is what C. S. Lewis calls “Supernature.” Conceptual thought, free will, moral autonomy, the notion of God, etc. are all unique to humans and cannot be reduced to the purely physical. Of course, different levels of conscious experience are related to brain-states but self cannot be reduced to such physical states. It is analogous to electrical charge that must always be accompanied by mass but cannot be reduced to it.

Notes
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“AGOG versus GOG”
Stimulated by the article by David Snoke entitled “In favor of God-of-the-gaps reasoning,” (PSCF 53, no. 3 [September 2001]: 152) I think I must declare I am AGOG and think that GOG and MAGOG are not good enough.

Let me start to explain with two quotations from C. A. Coulson, onetime holder of the Rouse Ball Chair at Oxford University (from Science and Christian Belief, London: OUP, 1955). The first is from a letter of Isaac Newton to the master of his college at Cambridge, Trinity. He says: “The