

The book is written for the purpose of setting up or managing a dual curriculum in social work and pastoral care. The intent is to assist teachers to better integrate the dual disciplines so that they are both effective social workers (relying on the social sciences) and effective spiritual pastors (providing spiritual guidance for clients being served). It is closely tied to the Clinical Pastoral Experience (CPE) that is common in many ministry training courses in seminary.

Written by academicians, the content of these chapters tends to be quite theoretical for the practitioner or lay reader. My interest in the book was spurred by the fact that I am now coordinating a series of in-service workshops for Chinese medical social workers. Social work does not yet exist in China. Our medical work in China has created the need for social workers, so my colleague, a nurse from the U.S. and I, are coordinating a year-long course with invited speakers and trainers. These workers are Christians providing assistance to mostly non-Christians, so I had hoped this book would help us strike a balance in how to provide good social service, but in a way that would also be a spiritual blessing to these clients. To this end, I was disappointed. But those involved in clinical training and counseling for pastors would find useful perspectives to improve their work.

I appreciated the commitment to holistic care advocated by most of these authors, as well as the social role that the church can and should play. In my theological training in two evangelical seminaries, it seemed as if the only purpose in serving people was evangelism. But now that I work in a country where very few of the patients and clients we serve are Christian, I have felt more keenly the need for broader, more humanistic resources to serve these people in their time of need.

This book explores the possibility of integrating social work with spiritual ministry from many different angles. It is well indexed and with many reference notes for further reading, some of which I intend to follow up on. I believe interest in this book among ASAers would be limited to those involved in social work research or education.

Reviewed by Mark A. Strand, Shanxi Evergreen Service, Yuci, Shanxi, China, 030600.

Intelligent Design from an Old Earth Creationist Perspective

I write as an old earth creationist, although I was formerly a theistic evolutionist, (*PSCF* 49, no. 4 [Dec 1999]: 252–63). As such, I certainly accept Phillip Johnson's rejection of "the creation myth of scientific naturalism" and "Darwinism," with the corollary that I allow for, and recognize, a "Creator" (Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 1991, p. 153).

Notwithstanding Henrickson's concerns (*PSCF* 57, no. 4 [Dec 2005]: 284–300) with Intelligent Design (ID), that for Johnson "'more than science' is at stake," I do not accept

that Johnson's Darwin on Trial e.g., his criticisms of Darwinian natural selection (pp. 15–31), mutations (pp. 32–44), fossil problems (pp. 42–62), or vertebrate sequence (pp. 73–85), is fundamentally unscientific.

To say that Darwinian anti-supernaturalism is one way humans spurn God's common grace and become immoral, is not to say this is the only way, so that Henrickson's pre-Darwin illegitimacy figures are flawed. Moreover, to say that God gives idolaters or Darwinists over to immorality (Romans 1), is not to say that he always gives all idolaters or all Darwinists over to suchlike. But, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Matt. 4:7).

Henrickson's attempt to contrast ID men like Johnson (b. 1940) with Thomas Chalmers (1780–1847), fails to recognize that Chalmers, an old earth creationist, accepted the role of the supernatural in science. In fact, Johnson's concerns about the anti-supernaturalist presupposition of modern "science" and immorality have antecedents in nineteenth century scientific criticism of Darwinism.

In 1859 Charles Darwin sent a copy of his *Origin of Species* to the man he recognized as one of "our greatest geologists," the old earth creationist, Adam Sedgwick (1785–1873). Sedgwick was Professor of Geology at Cambridge University (1818–1873), England, UK. He read the book "with more pain than pleasure," and says to Darwin in one of the first scientific critiques of *Origin of Species*:

Parts of it I admired greatly, parts I laughed at till my sides were almost sore; other parts I read with absolute sorrow, because I think them utterly false and grievously mischievous. You have deserted ... the true method of induction. ... Many of your conclusions are based upon assumptions. ... As to your grand principle—natural selection—what is it but a secondary consequence of supposed, or known, primary facts? ... Acting by law, ... comprehends ... your whole principle [that is, creation by law]. ... I think, in speculating on organic descent, you overstate the evidence of geology; and that you understate it while you are talking of the broken links of your natural pedigree.

There is a moral or metaphysical part of nature as well as a physical. A man who denies this is deep in the mire of folly. 'Tis the crown and glory of organic sciences that it does, through final causes, link material to moral; and yet does not allow us to mingle them in our first conception of laws, and our classification of such laws, whether we consider one side of nature or the other. You have ignored this link; and ... you have done your best in one or two pregnant cases to break it. Were it possible (which, thank God, it is not) to break it, humanity, in my mind, would suffer a damage that might brutalize it, and sink the human race into a lower grade of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history ... I humbly accept God's revelation of himself both in his works and in his word, and do my best to act in conformity with that knowledge which he only can give me, and he only can sustain me in doing (J. W. Clark and T. M. Hughes, *The Life and Letters of the Reverend Adam Sedgwick* 2 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1890], 357–9).

Sedgwick's understanding of natural law was opposed at the geological and scientific level by Lyell and Darwin, and at the moral level by the libertine John Stuart Mill. Sedgwick's understanding was defended by the old earth creationist William Whewell (1794–1866) of Trinity College, Cambridge University (Professor of Mineralogy, 1828–1832, Professor of Moral Philosophy, 1838–55) (*Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 25, 95, 404–5; Whewell's *Of Induction*, p. 79).

Gavin McGrath
34 Mill Dr.
North Rocks, N.S.W., 2151
Sydney, Australia
gmcgrath@easyc.com.au

Correction: Values in Millimeters, Not Inches!

In my recent article on "Qualitative Hydrology of Noah's Flood" (*PSCF* 58, no. 2 [June 2006]: 120–9), I made a mistake on p. 122 concerning the average precipitation values for cities in the Iraq/Southern Turkey region. The values should be in *millimeters*, not inches. My thanks to Robert Rogland, who pointed out the correct values, and my apologies to all of those service men and women in Iraq who know better!

Carol A. Hill
ASA Fellow
17 El Arco Drive
Albuquerque, NM 87123
Carolannhill@aol.com

Titanic Deck Chairs and the "Real" Adam

John McIntyre's illustrious background in physics has probably conditioned him to believe that novel—or at least highly interesting—concepts win Nobel Prizes! However, in theology, ideas that have not been accepted by the church through the ages are more than likely to be dangerously wrong.

McIntyre proposes that Adam needed to sin to change from "an 'it' within the creation" to "an 'I' outside creation" who had "taken on the character of the Creator" (*PSCF* 58, no. 2 [June 2006]: 90–8). The idea is not new. It was articulated by Joseph Smith nearly 200 years ago.

This all follows, of course, from the premise that evolution and standard dating are indisputable facts. Adam then becomes a hominid, with perhaps only a dim awareness of God, chosen from among his animalistic peers to receive the breath of life. Ignored are the biblical record of long life and rapid invention of technology and the scientific crumbling of the evolutionary façade.

It is a shame that so much brain power is wasted, essentially arranging the deck chairs on the Titanic, by tying theology to a contemporary paradigm, as the Scholastics did in assuming Aristotle to be infallible.

Ross S. Olson, MD
ASA Member
5512 14th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55417
612-824-7691
ross@rossolson.org

The Two Books: An Appreciated Article

Thank you very much, Giuseppe Tanzella-Nitti, for your article on "The Two Books Prior to the Scientific Revolution" (*PSCF* 57, no. 3 [Sep 2005]: 235–48). I have just finished re-reading your article and remembered that I should send you a thank you note. Your article was delightful, informative, and in impeccable English. Not a hint of an "accent" or a misused word! Another strong point is that your faith is thoroughly infused into the article. That is often very difficult for the believing scientist. (I am a chemist.)

Your article is timely. Many churches and leaders have trouble with accepting (good) science and wish to take a literal meaning of the holy Scriptures. In this way, they may make arbitrary statements about science, for example, the age of the earth. Your article is an excellent reference for a balanced and objective view on the issue. Any forthcoming articles, say on astronomy? Thank you again.

In Christ our Lord,
Harry Alkema
CSCA Member
Burlington, ON Canada
Harry.Alkema@ec.gc.ca

Reduction in Science

I agree with Roy Clouser about the inadequacy of reductionist descriptions of natural systems, though not with his solution.¹ As the following examples show, the behavior of a multicomponent system is generally determined not only by that of its components, but also by the *relationship* between them.

1. Consider the wave emitted by an oscillator undergoing a combination of oscillations. The shape of this wave is determined not only by the amplitude and frequency of the components, but also by their *phase*. If identical oscillations are in phase, they reinforce each other, if out of phase they cancel. *N* components require the specification of *N* – 1 phases. This specification is at the level of the system, not the components.
2. Consider a gas. The properties of this can be derived from the motions of the molecules making up the gas. To do this, however, it is necessary to specify the relationship between these motions – namely, that they are *chaotic*.² A different relationship would result in different behavior. For example, if the motions were confined to a single direction within a pencil, the molecules would comprise a molecular beam.
3. Consider the substance ethanol (ethyl alcohol). Chemists describe this as being made up of molecules comprising two carbon atoms (C), six hydrogen atoms (H), and one oxygen atom (O). This specification is, however, incomplete. Chemists have also to specify the *arrangement* of the atoms in the molecule, as pictured in (I) below:

