

RELIGATION

By Geoffrey Dobbs

An expansion of a discussion paper read to the Science and Religion Forum on April 9, 1976, at their meeting at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor Great Park on the theme: Man's Responsibility for Nature.

Our President* is on record as stressing the need for philosophical sophistication in the science-religion debate – a need which I cannot supply, but the remark drove me to the dictionary to confirm what I understood by the word ‘sophistication’. Just as I thought, according to the S.O.E.D. it means “the employment of sophistry, the process of investing with specious fallacies”, although, no doubt, the Bishop meant no more than: “up-to-date and academically acceptable in the use of current philosophical terminology.” However this may be, this Forum is concerned with science and religion, not philosophy and religion, and there ought therefore to be room in it for the scientist who is not sophisticated in academic philosophy.

Science shares with religion another dimension, beyond the cerebro-verbal plane of academic philosophy, namely that of the external world, in that its thoughts and symbols must be ‘bound back’, in detail, to an external, non-cerebral, non-verbal, reality. It is of the essence of the scientific method that theory must constantly be checked by observation and experiment. It is of the essence of religion that the professed faith must be put to the test of practice, both on the individual scale, and on the more visible, general, social scale. It is of the essence of words and of symbols of all sorts, that their connection with the referent is indirect – entirely through the human mind, and hence easily confused or diverted or even inverted. Hence it is natural enough that a scientist should view with some skepticism and distrust any lengthy or complex verbal process which is not constantly tied back to some observable reality, and to demand of it: “What does this mean in practice?” And in so far as one applies this to the current state of the world and of our society, it would seem apparent that the currently fashionable and accepted philosophy is widely at variance with reality, and that, wherever else we may look for a correct viewpoint, it cannot be in a direction which could be welcome or acceptable to those who lead the intellectual fashion.

While both complexity and simplicity have their proper and their corrupt uses, it is of significance that the word ‘sophistication’ should have been upgraded from a badword to a fashionable goodword, and that the word ‘simple’ is seldom used in a favourable sense but has been largely replaced by the sneerword ‘simplistic’, which is trotted out almost invariably to discredit any broad outline of the fundamental considerations or policies

*Dr., John Habgood, Bishop of Durham. See report in, *Nature*, 255, 280, May 22 1975.

underlying a complex verbal statement, particularly where sophistication has been used for the purpose of deceiving the unsophisticated.

Philosophy may, or may not, be sophisticated. In the important, practical, and everyday meaning of the word, in the sense of a man's 'philosophy of life', everyone, necessarily, has a philosophy, that is, a conception of the nature of things, or of the universe, whether this is extremely simple, very complex and sophisticated, or even confused and wavering. Whatever it is, it determines his objectives, his long-term aims and the action directed thereto, which may be called his 'policy' in life, and it is this 'binding back' to reality which is probably the most useful meaning to attach to the word 'religion'. In this sense the Christian Creeds, for instance, constitute formulations of a 'philosophy', as does Marxist-Leninism, or a vacillating agnosticism or humanism, however vaguely formulated. Inevitably, they manifest themselves, individually, and socially where they are widely enough held, in 'policies' of action and inaction, and it is the completed whole which constitutes a religion, while the word 'religation'* (used, e.g., by Coleridge and Gladstone) may serve to designate the process of 'binding back' the idea of reality to the actual reality of the world in which we live.

I cannot stress this too strongly. Unless it is realised that *every* conception of the universe and of man's place therein *must* issue in its resultant policy it is not possible even to begin to consider or discuss or compare the validity of different conceptions, or to study the vital process of religation in any detail or with any understanding. If the word 'religion' is restricted, as it usually is, to the organised Religions, or to a belief in God, or in the supernatural, those who reject these conceptions and adhere to atheistic, humanist, or materialist beliefs are never challenged to formulate their ideas and to relate them to policy, but are allowed to adopt the pose of persons with no commitment to faith or policy, who claim merely to be pursuing the path of reason. In fact, the policies which most of these people openly pursue are based upon assumptions about the universe and about man's place in it which are every whit as much based upon faith as are the more precise statements formulated in the Creeds, and unless the nature of this faith is revealed or exposed, its realization in the world of today cannot be followed or ascertained, its ideas and policies cannot be related, and we cannot even start to escape from our present confusion, or to develop, in the Baconian phrase: "a just familiarity between the mind and things".

Religation in Biology

I come now to the particular theme of the religation of different beliefs to the policies

*Although the O.E.D. gives the pronunciation of 'religation' with a short 'e' and 'i' as in 'relic'; this so closely resembles the more familiar word 'relegation', which has a contrary sense, that I have thought it justifiable to avoid confusion by pronouncing 'religation' with a long 'e' and a long 'i' as in 'remigration'.

which determine teaching and research in biology – a subject in which a marked divergence of policy has again become manifest in recent years, although, in fact, it has been present, and at least implicit for over a century. That this is, fundamentally, a religious difference is obvious, much as it has been confused by the mass of verbiage expended upon it; and for any attempt at clarification it may be necessary to reconsider the great evolutionary conflict of the last century, as epitomized in the notorious confrontation at the British Association at Oxford in 1860 between T. H. Huxley and Samuel Wilberforce, which resulted in so famous a victory for the evolutionists over the ‘special creationists’ that neither side has yet recovered from it.

It has been said that Evolution expanded men’s idea of the Creation in time as astronomy and physics had expanded it in space; but in both cases the enlargement was too vast, too sudden, too appalling. For centuries men had worshipped an Almighty and Everlasting God, Creator of all things, but when science lifted the curtain and gave a glimpse of what these words might begin to mean the sight was too much. A reasonable degree of almightiness, such as could create the world in six days and rest on the seventh was conceivable, but when space and time yawned upon us in this awful way, the God who could create such a Universe became inconceivable. Indeed, we had always been told that He was beyond conception, while we satisfied ourselves with conceivable images such as the Grand Old Man enthroned above the clouds; but when the traditional language concerning God was manifestly justified by our expanding knowledge, the inconceivable became the incredible, because beyond the finite scope of our imagination. Perhaps it is not surprising that the awe-inspiring process of Creation, as revealed under its new name of evolution, should have seemed a sufficient object for worship rather than the Creator.

Meanwhile, the idea of Creation had become identified with a shaman-like process of instant verbal magic, under the terms ‘Special Creation’, in which one recognises what has been called ‘the technique of the essential adjective’. For differentiation is necessarily of the essence of creation, which can mean only that every creature must be ‘special’ – of distinctive character and marked off by distinguishing features – so that ‘Special Creation’ is a tautology meaning no more than ‘Creation’ if taken literally. But when this term is applied to a childish conception of the Creation based upon the literal interpretation of the words of Genesis, which is then superseded by a more mature conception involving time and continuity, it is not only the idea of conjuring into existence by verbal edict which is discredited, but to some extent also the idea of Creation and of a Creator altogether, in so far as the verbal situation is not consciously analysed.

Thus, what for some was the greatest enlargement and enrichment of the idea of the Creator for centuries, for others was the greatest retreat in history. For if ‘Creation’ is taken to mean that all species were brought into existence and fixed for ever by divine edict in 4004 B.C., which we can now see to be manifestly untrue, then ‘Creation’ ceases to be credible, and we must seek another religion. For many scientists this religion has

been achieved not only by substituting the fascinating and awe-inspiring impersonal process of evolution for the Creator, but further, since this process is held to culminate in Man, by substituting Man, or the Mystical Lump of Mankind, for God, as the Supreme Being of the Universe.

Man is held to be the Supreme Being because of his *power* – power, that is to dominate and manipulate and change and impose his will upon all other beings by virtue of his Great Brain, which has enabled him to develop language and numbers and other symbols, and hence abstract thought and cumulative knowledge and method and cunning in imposing those thoughts upon the world around him.

There are many versions and variations of this widespread but unacknowledged anthropotheism, in some of which the Supreme Being is represented by Groups other than the whole of Mankind, such as the State, the Party, the Class, or the Race, and in all of them the power to dominate is the criterion of supremacy, which necessarily results in a built-in policy of progressive centralisation of power in the hands of fewer and fewer, more and more powerful men, operating in the name of the Group, as the Head and Brain, so to speak, of the Collective Being. For the most part these philosophies are ill-defined, the most definite being that of Marxist dialectical materialism, though even that is drowned in a mass of chaotic literature; but they are discernible through hints and innuendoes, and by their reliction into policy. Among scientists a vague ‘scientism’, or scientific humanism, is fashionable, which among biologists may take the form of evolutionism, or evolutionary humanism, of the type publicised by Julian Huxley. Whatever the precise form of this substitute religion, it now dominates science, and especially biology, and in recent years, particularly, has been determining policies in teaching and research in a manner widely at variance with former policies largely determined by a general background of assumptions based upon Christianity. In view of the dangerous potentialities now deemed to be within reach of biological science, it is urgently necessary that we should take note of the *direction* in which that science is moving, and relate that direction to the religion of those who are directing it.

But until the science and religion discussion can escape from the distorted myth that the evolutionary conflict was between science and religion, in which, as school children are now being taught by anti-Christian religionists, science ‘debunked’ religion, it cannot begin to get off the ground. To a large extent it has become a contest between two religions, in which anthropotheism made use of nineteenth century science against the prehistoric Chaldean science of the Old Testament, doggedly defended by a small group of Christians. In contrast, its even more famous predecessor in the reputed ‘Science vs. Religion’ contest – the confrontation between Galileo and the Inquisition – was not, basically, concerned with religion at all. All the participants were Catholic Christians, and the conflict was between the classical, pagan science of Ptolemy and the then modern, scientific viewpoint, developed under the influence of Christianity by Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo.

Evolution as a Religion

In about half a century of experience of academic biology in various institutions, as student, teacher and research worker, the writer has always been aware of the dominant influence of evolutionary theory which, so long as it has remained what it claims to be: a scientific theory, has usually been constructive and stimulating; but in so far as it has, at certain periods, been held, and taught, as a religious doctrine opposed to that of Christianity, has become a mental, prison, stultifying the subject. For instance, one remembers that in the late 1920's biology was still dominated by eminent professors for whom the great evolutionary conflict of their nineteenth century youth was the chief inspiration, and who, in consequence, could scarcely look with interest at any organism from any other viewpoint but that of speculating about its ancestry and phylogeny. This had a particularly dreary effect upon the branch of biology to which I became attached, namely mycology – the study of fungi – of which, at the time, there was virtually no fossil record, but which, by virtue of certain similarities, were deemed to be a degenerated group of algae which had lost their chlorophyll. This grossly distorted both the teaching and research on the group and delayed the development of the subject until the 1930's, when the late Professor Reginald Buller broke away from this traditional approach and initiated a lively and direct observation of these unique organisms, which turned out to possess a fascinating and distinctive character and nuclear life history, quite different from those of plants and animals, which is now widely held to justify classing them as a separate Kingdom.

By the 1930's the dead hand of evolutionism had been, to a great extent, lifted, and most people had, by then, accommodated the facts of evolution in their religion, so that the biological sciences were able to expand, diversify, and explore their subject matter more freely and directly, especially in the fields of physiology and ecology; also in cytology and genetics, although it was a curious fact that, at this period, nearly all the more eminent geneticists were outspoken Marxist-materialists. It was during this period that the 'New Soviet Genetics' of Hichurin and Lysenko, made its appearance in the U.S.S.R., and drew attention to the power of political 'religion', commonly called 'ideology' to impose its nature upon science. 'Western' Genetics, condemned as 'Mendelist-Morganist-Weissmannite-bourgeois-reactionary deviationism', was 'anti-dialectical' because of its insistence on the definiteness and relative immutability of the physical basis of heredity, which would impose unacceptable limits on the power of Man, the Supreme Being, to change 'Nature' as he wishes. As the following statement by the Praesidium of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences (quoted from Julian Huxley's *Soviet Genetics and World Science*, 1949) put it:

Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science, because it is based ... on the revolutionary principle of changing Nature for the benefit of the people. Weissmannite-Morganist idealist teaching is pseudo-scientific, because it is founded on the notion of the divine origin of the world and assumes eternal and unalterable scientific laws. The struggle between the two ideas has taken the form of the ideological class-struggle between

between socialism and capitalism.

Ironic as it may have been that committed Marxists and atheists such as Huxley, Haldane and Darlington should have been accused of adhering to the divine origin of the world, in so far as they assumed unalterable scientific laws, the conclusion is quite logical that if there is an external reality, a nature of things not subject to the will of Man, then Man cannot be the Supreme Being. Conversely, if Man is the Supreme Being, then the 'nature of things' must be totally manipulable at his will, and, indeed, exists, and is created, in and by his brain, which, itself, is the highest product of the material process of evolution, and hence comprises and controls all that is 'below' it. There can therefore be no 'things-in-themselves', with their own nature, external to, and or totally knowable and manipulable by Man. This, is condemned as the bourgeois deviation of 'objectivism', the 'crime', particularly, of the scientist who studies his subject matter 'for itself', rather than on the revolutionary principle of changing it for human purposes.

There is a fundamental contradiction in the Marxist claim that their ideological science (even if the ideology is called materialism) puts them in touch with an objective reality external to the human brain, while at the same time they insist that this reality contains 'nothing but' that which can be fully understood and known by the human brain; but a faith in such contradictions is of the essence of dialectical materialism. Marxists, however, are unaware of their own 'fideism', but deceive themselves, with Engels, who wrote: "The materialist outlook on nature means no more than simply conceiving nature just as it exists ...". If this were so, materialist science would necessarily be completely static, having achieved objective truth at its first step in every field; and, indeed, such materialists are liable to the illusion that they know everything – and that "what they don't know isn't knowledge". Their religion is based upon the projection of a property of human language and thought upon the external world. "Dialectics", wrote Lenin, "is the study of the contradiction *within the very essence of things.*" The very word 'contradiction' relates only to the use of words, and, if we think about it, we must realise that there can be no 'contradiction' in reality. A real thing cannot contradict itself in its being; it is only unreality which can be said to do this. There is no such direction as 'north-south', though the words may be said or written, as, for instance of a line running both north and south. There is no such tinge as 'black-white', though a thing may be part black and part white, or each in turn, or grey. But reality cannot contradict itself, as God cannot be mocked. Perhaps those two phrases may mean the same thing. In the end, even in the U.S.S.R., ideological genetics, which could maintain itself only by the brute force of the state, had to yield to the greater realism of the monk Mendel, though not until it had imposed imprisonment and martyrdom upon the great geneticist N. I. Vavilov and many of his followers.

It may be that the brutal farce of Lysenkoism did something to postpone the dominance, in biology, of the evolutionary religion; but, in any case, the breakthrough into molecular biology initiated by the elucidation of the DNA molecule by Watson, Wilkins and Crick in the 1950's, plus the invention of the electron microscope revealing a whole new world

of fine structure in the cell, resulted in a sweeping 'religious' revival which has transformed many biological Departments, especially those with younger and more 'withitist' Heads, into chapels of evolutionary humanism, in which the traditional Christian is made to feel that he is under suspicion of 'heresy' or 'scientific deviationism', since, by now the evolutionist has lost the power to distinguish between his science and his faith.

Non-Biology

Some of the leading revivalists, however, are in no such confusion. Dr. Francis Crick, for instance, in his book *Of Molecules and Men* (1966) clearly wants to substitute teaching in schools about natural selection and DNA for Christian education. Concerning the borderline between living and non-living he writes: "... only by a very considerable act of faith could one believe that an explanation would be possible in terms of physics and chemistry", but as a dedicated preacher of this faith he has done much to determine "the ultimate aim of the modern movement in biology" which is "to explain *all* biology in terms of physics and chemistry." One might add, that if this were the aim of a modern movement in physics and chemistry, it would be a perfectly legitimate application of these sciences. It is only as applied to *biology* that its implicit reductionism is ideological, rather than scientific, as also is his dogmatic conviction that Christian doctrine is 'utter nonsense' and that what he calls 'scientific values' should replace 'Christian values'. Science, in fact, does not deal with 'values', and the word should be 'materialist', or perhaps, in his case, 'evolutionist' rather than 'scientific'; but the use of the word in this context clearly shows us that science is being used as a 'cover' for a clash of religions.

These two religions: Trinitarian Christianity and various forms of materialism tending towards Anthropotheism, religate in widely different ways, both in society at large and, in particular, in the teaching of biology and in the direction of biological research. As the potentialities for disaster inherent in recent advances in biology now rival, and perhaps surpass, those inherent in nuclear physics, it becomes, literally, a matter of life and death that the policies implicit in these concepts of the universe should be understood, and that their religation, or expression in practical affairs, should be studied in detail, and, moreover, studied with integrity and by acute intellects, since the situation is far from simple. Now that 'dogma' and 'doctrine' have become 'dirty words', there are so many vague ideas passing under the name of Christianity that their relegation has become desperately confused; while on the other hand, most of the materialists and evolutionists have never verbally formulated their beliefs at all, so that in practice the only way of arriving at them is to work back from the real policies which they generate. A further complication arises from the fact that many people suffer from a sort of religious schizophrenia, professing a Christian philosophy which they attempt to religate in their 'private' lives, while supporting in public affairs an anti-Christian policy, derived, very

often, from dialectical materialism which they have absorbed unconsciously through environmental pressure from their colleagues and from the mass media. The individual case, therefore, if not fully analysed, can be very misleading; but, even so, certain broad outlines in the relation between belief and policy can at least be discerned.

As Dr. Crick makes very clear, what he would call the 'modern' biologist, and I should call the atheist-materialist biologist, is not primarily interested in biology, in the sense of the study of living organisms as such, since his 'ultimate aim' is to explain them all in terms of physics and chemistry. This is no mere theory, for in recent years it has been working through quite blatantly into University syllabuses and modes of teaching. Another natural tendency for anthropocentric, rather than theocentric, science, is to impose the fashionable opinions of influential or 'top people', often exaggerated in importance by the careerist and political set-up, upon the reality which is the subject of study. Thus in recent years, the vogue for the Unity of Biology has inverted the order of teaching, so that first-year students are introduced first to the most advanced and complex aspects of the subject, such as DNA and electron micrographs, which can be genuinely studied only with the use of expensive and complicated apparatus far beyond their scope, while, very often, an elementary introduction to the actual organisms is postponed until the Final Honours year, or even omitted altogether. So University Departments are now turning out graduates with Honours Degrees who lack even a commonplace general knowledge of the common organisms in that branch of biology in which they are supposed to have been specialising. Living beings are deemed to be 'nothing but' lumps of DNA, mitochondria, etc. illustrating the Unity of Life. Their immense variety and peculiarities are considered just a crashing bore which interests no one but amateur naturalists and out-of-date theocentric biologists.

The anthropocentric fashion is for anything which will distract from the actual study of the living things themselves, but which imposes abstractions of the human mind upon them: surveying, plotting, mapping, making mathematical models, and elaborate statistical ordinations of vegetational patterns, with little interest in the plant itself, or in its real, complex and remarkable associations with fungi and other microorganisms on and around its roots, which is regarded as an eccentric, minority concern of a handful of old-fashioned and amateurish naturalists. Abstractions such as 'population', 'competition' and various 'parameters' are studied rather than 'whole plants', animals or fungi, which merely furnish material for the studies. The cruder the departure from reality, the more complex the techniques, and the more complicated and expensive the apparatus required, the more prestigious the research. There was a time when mathematics was regarded as the 'handmaid of the sciences', though a very necessary and useful handmaid. Now it seems to have become the tyrant of the sciences, or perhaps the usurper of the sciences, and particularly of biology. To be sure, the sciences of physics and chemistry could not exist if it could not be assumed that one atom = another atom of the same isotope, and that one molecule = another molecule of the same substance.... But when it comes to organisms: bacteria, for instance, it cannot be

assumed that one bacterium = another of the same species. One has to be certain that they are also of the same strain, that they both originated from the same unicell culture; and, even then, there may have been mutations. The proposition that one oak tree = another oak tree is obviously absurd, unless, indeed, they are heavily managed plantation trees. As for the proposition that one man = another man – this is, probably, the ultimate denial of humanity.

Life, Mathematics and the Pseudo-World.

There is an obvious carry-over, in both directions, between the dominance of number and quantity in biological science and in politics and economics. The concept of ‘numerical democracy’ in politics, and the dominance of credit finance, by now a form of mathematics barely connected with any physical reality, but exercising a virtually absolute rule over politics, commerce and, incidentally, science, can scarcely be unconnected with recent trends in scientific education and research, especially since, in Britain, the State now exercises a monopolistic control, mainly through the medium of finance, but increasingly, also, with political overtones. It has been forgotten that ‘statistics’ was a political tool from its inception, in the form of military ‘logistics’ under Frederic the Great. The idea has been fostered that to substitute ideal and imaginary, equal and identical ‘units’ for the complex realities of the living world, and to manipulate those units, is in some way more ‘objective’ than direct observation. To be sure, such manipulations sometimes suggest relationships which were not observed at first sight, and may be useful tools in helping to eliminate certain sorts of bias, but it cannot be denied that they take the observer several steps away from the external objects with which he is concerned; quite often with ludicrous or disastrous results which are contrary to common sense, if they are not checked by direct observation.

The social sciences now provide a continuous ‘bridge’ between the outlook and practice of politics and of the natural sciences, especially biology, not only because a high proportion of social scientists are open adherents of the Marxist religion, but even more so because, whether they are professed Marxists or not, they apply the methods of collectivism and dialectical materialism to human ‘material’ in the name of ‘science’ (which is also what Marx thought he was doing). It is, indeed, the application of the quantitative methods which have been so successful in the physical, inorganic, sciences, to those which deal with living organisms, and even more, with humanity, which is characteristic of that blind destructiveness which now pervades the scene. The ‘higher’, the more complex the entities dealt with, the more limited the application, and the greater the distortion and error, implicit in the treatment of them as mathematical units, and therefore, by assumption, equal and identical in character. This elementary and fundamental fact used to be rubbed into the mind of every child who was taught that ‘you cannot add apples and oranges’. The trouble is, of course, that mathematical processes need have no relation to reality, and there is no difficulty in carrying out the

almost meaningless summation of x apples + y oranges = $x + y$ somethings, but what? In this case, perhaps, we can find a single, very specialised meaning under the heading 'dessert fruits'. But add marrows, potatoes, sloes, beetles and pebbles, and we can add them up to z 'objects' = a summation which has no reality whatever, but is merely an imaginary collection or 'set' which I have made in my mind and transferred to words on paper; though I could, if it were not far too much trouble, impose my imaginary 'set' upon the real world by physically assembling the things in one fatuous heap, an action with real consequences in waste of time and energy, probably annoyance to other people, and waste of some of the perishables.

My point here is that the modern teaching of mathematics, which introduces young children *first* to the concept of number by causing them to assemble and count 'sets' of non-integrables (even if they are later taught to sort them out into sub-sets with some common characters) is a process, of ideological (or religious) indoctrination which has the deepest consequences. It is a conditioning exercise in the imposition of 'mathematics' upon reality, rather than the use of 'mathematics' in the understanding of reality. It is a first step in a process which leads on to the imposition of mathematical models upon the real, and especially upon the living world, and the gross tyranny of numbers, of bureaucratic and financial control and 'numerical democracy' under which mankind now increasingly groans. The summation: $1 \text{ person} + 1 \text{ person} = 2 \text{ people}$ is an imaginary 'set' more remote from reality than any assembly of heterogeneous objects which a child might make in infant school, because the differences between the two 'units' have a vastly wider amplitude. To be sure, it has its strictly limited uses in relation to their basic human physical properties. If I invite x people to dinner I must provide x dinners, x places at table and x chairs. If they are old friends, i.e., 'persons' to me, I shall know what they like to eat or drink, and who to seat where; but the larger the numbers, the more they have to be treated as identical units, the more I shall have to impose my 'mathematics' upon them. By the time personal contact has been completely lost we are in a never-never land of imaginary 'sets' of human units, mentally 'collected' and categorised for identical treatment, such as, for instance, the various categories of 'labour' which, it is now completely taken for granted, must of course be allotted 'equal pay' in numerical units of currency for their equal and identical units of 'work'. It should be noticed also that the application of this ideology does, necessarily, result in the maximum standardisation of the 'labour' with its dehumanising and collectivising consequences and its inevitable conflict with the humanity of the 'labour'. Finally, we reach the ultimate absurdity in the situation of the 'set' of voters' opinions, with its implicit assumption that every unit vote is precisely equal to every other unit vote, which in turn implies a similar uniformity among the electors. Here again, the means dictated by the ideology tend to realise the condition assumed. The only point at which all choices become equal is that at which they become pointless and valueless (just as human equality is finally achieved only with death) and it must be admitted that most of the 'Western Democracies' are approaching this point, while in the so-called 'People's

Democracies' of the East, where there is only one Party list to vote for, it has already been reached.

It should be noticed also that in the 'West', though there may be a choice between Parties, there is no choice concerning the single overriding policy which the Party elected has to carry out. This is dictated by its creditors by means of the ingenious numerical device of 'credit' (or 'debt') finance whereby the whole economy, and its consequent politics, is controlled and held in the mathematical vice of imaginary 'credits', issued in such a way that they can be cancelled only by the issue of larger 'credits'. Mathematics being purely ideal, there is no limit whatever to this process, but there is a real limit to the material processes which this numerism imposes upon the people. As for the one tiny degree of freedom allows to the equal and identical units of the electorate in the choice of Parties dedicated to the pursuit of conflicting 'interests' which do not challenge the overriding policy – the effect of this is frequently to divide the electorate so equally that its fate is often determined by minimal mathematical differences. A two per cent swing in the feed-back to party propaganda can change a Government, and, as at the time of writing, important Acts, interfering with, or abolishing age-old or popular customs or institutions, can be passed by one parliamentary vote, which my little calculator makes equal to 0.0015748 of the total number of units of elected lobby-fodder. When this sort of dictatorship by minuscule mathematical differences is represented as the Will of the People, which the Revising Chamber has no right to hold up, because it does not represent some similar decimal of a mathematical difference in snap unit preferences on a particular day, the idiotic game becomes more than a joke. Whatever else the Will of the People may be, it is not something which requires mathematics to decipher, it is something which manifests itself very clearly whenever the people are given a chance to choose what they want, or even more, to reject what they do not want. But this, the Party choice between versions of the same policy never gives them.

Logistics, Statistics and Social Engineering

This rampant numerocracy has its repercussions throughout the whole of our Society, especially in the bureaucracy, and in that terrible interface between politics and sociology in which vastly important and intimate matters affecting the personal life are decided or interfered with on 'statistical' grounds. Usually, also, the 'statistics' are childishly incompetent, the data unconsciously selected for a purpose, but that is by the way. It should never be forgotten that statistics was a technique originally developed in Prussia under Frederic the Great, for the purpose of what is now called 'logistics', the collective handling of troops and their materials, i.e. of expendable units of human personnel, centrally manipulated in bulk as a fear-sanction, used to impose the policy of their controller upon others. The transfer of this treatment and attitude of mind concerning people from troops to the whole population, in peace as well as war, is now

taken for granted; its origins are forgotten, and its implications ignored. The following quotation, taken from the O.E.D. under the word 'statistics' illustrates the next step:

1798 SIR J. SINCLAIR *Statist. Acc. Scot.* XX App. P. xiii. In 1780, I found, that in Germany they were engaged in a species of political inquiry, to which they had given the name of Statistics; and though I apply a different idea to that word, for by Statistical is meant in Germany, an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining the political strength of a country, or questions respecting matters of state; whereas the idea I annex to the term, is an inquiry into the state of a country, for the purpose of ascertaining the quantum of happiness enjoyed by its inhabitants, and the means of its future improvement; yet, as I thought that a new word might attract more public attention, I resolved on adopting it.

Doubtless 'the liberal mind' would regard this as a move towards 'humanizing' statistics, instead of, as it must be, towards 'dehumanizing' humanity by the substitution of a quantifiable abstraction called 'happiness' for the real human condition which is completely non-quantifiable and incapable of being described in the language of numbers, appropriate as this may be for the accurate designation of the quantum of ammunition to be issued to military units, or even the quantum of to be dished out to all hands.

We then move on to Jeremy Bentham's: "The greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation."

So now, having quantified happiness as a statistical property of the units of population, we see morals and legislation established on the same basis as military logistics. Clearly 'happiness' has now become some thing 'dished out' by the Government to the population, for which the preferred word, nowadays, is 'welfare'. 'Health', 'wealth', 'education', and certain numbered and specified 'freedoms' are now included, not one of which, in any real sense, can be numerated or quantified, which means that the realities concerned are inevitably overridden and crushed and distorted by the imposition upon them of imaginary statistical abstractions. On the negative side also, we find a political sociology which concerns itself mainly with numerical abstractions, under such headings as 'crime', 'social violence', 'delinquency', 'illegitimacy'. With what 'factors' are these associated? And so on.

What is so alarming is that all this should be taken for granted. "Why not?" I am constantly asked. "Why should not this valuable technique of statistics, so useful in the state of war, be used also for the better purposes of peace?" "Why should not mathematics, with its proven, astounding and world-changing success in the field of inorganic science, be applied also to human welfare?" All I can reply is that means and ends are inseparable, and that the use of inappropriate means for alleged ends with which they are not connected is always disastrous. Hot steel bars can be rolled out into sheets very effectively in a modern roller-mill, but to ask why, therefore, should not the same process be applied to an organic material such as timber, would be mere foolishness; but a far less disastrous form of folly than to ask why, if the numerical

treatment of unit quantities has proved so successful, therefore, why should not the numerical treatment of living, idiosyncratic beings be equally successful.

The application of ‘numerism’ to the forces of inorganic nature has made enormous power available to mankind, but its application to humanity has concentrated that power in a few hands, and those, necessarily, the hands of power-lovers. The process which started with military logistics, and was then extended to all the powers of the State over the people, has now reached something approaching its logical conclusion in the rival arrays of nuclear-armed IBMs programmed to destroy the main industrial and population power-centres of the rival State, eliminating in the process most of the units of human population – not to mention all other forms of life – which, being, as our ‘modern’ biologists inform us, merely the product of a purposeless concatenation of evolutionary occurrences, have significance only as units contributing to the collective power of the State, the Super-State, and ultimately of Planetary Humanity.

Policy, Finance and the Ecological Movement

It should be noticed also that the necessary vast numerical ‘credits’ necessary to finance this programme have always been forthcoming, as they have been also for the parallel programme of centralization of domestic and industrial energy-sources, with its policy-drive towards an ultimate plutonium economy, providing not only the physical basis for the maintenance of current world-terrorism, both official and unofficial, but also imposing indefinitely upon future generations a burden of toxic waste which will enforce the maintenance of a collectivised nuclear technology for the sake of sheer self-preservation.

Welcome as is the growing awareness and reaction against all this, which has resulted in the allocation of some relatively petty sums to the development of decentralised sources of energy-income, it must be remembered that, whatever evolution is deemed to be, finance is by no means a random process. It is wholly centralised and man-controlled, and, when on a major scale, it is always a matter of carefully thought out and deliberate policy. The idea that these astronomical sums could have been created, and the consequent debts imposed and accepted, and committed to the cause of developing and maintaining the technology of a permanent World Terror, by mere chance, or in pursuit of such commercial aims as might influence a local branch bank manager, is quite childish. What we have here is the relegation of a ‘philosophy’ or conception of the nature of the Universe and of mankind’s place in it, expressing itself as a religion of human power, and aiming at a World hegemony not only over people, but through the statistically and collectively controlled human population, over all other forms of life and, indeed, even of inorganic nature.

One point that I want to bring out here is that the application of a form of statistics which implies a collectivist outlook upon, and treatment of, the living world is not a legitimate extension of the branch of knowledge known as mathematics, but the

extension of a power-technique used by the rulers of mankind upon the masses of humanity. The form of this technique known as finance is a particularly effective tool in the manipulation and control of human purpose, and no one, I imagine, at the present time, could deny its effectiveness in controlling the general direction of scientific research, including biological research. The illusion that the *direction* in which we explore the universe at a given time does not matter, because all knowledge is good, unless misused, is an example of very superficial, generalised thinking. Because means are linked to ends there is always a correct direction to move, or a correct order in which to act. To walk down a cliff path is the correct means of getting to the bottom. To jump off the cliff may be said to be another means of achieving the same end, and much more quickly; but this, as we know well, is a piece of verbal nonsense which could be said only as a joke, because the 'end' is crippling or suicide, as compared with which the other is a petty irrelevance. Unfortunately, when nuclear reactors are described as a means of supplying electrical power to the Grid, or the use of an entire public water supply to raise the intake of fluoride by children is described as a means of reducing dental caries, it is not said as a joke nowadays, although past generations would have seen and rejected such proposals as the outrageous absurdities they in fact are. The chief, overwhelmingly most important 'end' of the use of nuclear power is the accumulation of dangerous radioactive waste for many centuries or millennia and human generations to come, compared to which the mere supply of some current for contemporary use, for a few decades only for each 'station', is indeed a petty irrelevance. The chief end of so-called 'fluoridation' is the *permanent* raising of the intake of this already widespread pollutant by the entire population, against the declared wishes of many of them, plus the establishment of a precedent for such an insanity and the encouragement of the development of medical 'science' in this direction under the headings of 'public health' and 'preventive epidemiology'. As compared with these consequences, an alleged and statistically dubious correlation between the fluoride content of the water and an abstraction called the DMF (decayed, missing, filled) Index in children's teeth, which no one has even claimed to solve the problem of dental caries, is a footling absurdity. The deplorable fact is that these two examples merely illustrate the type of verbally clever-clever thought and language which are being used by the 'pundits' of officialdom and of the mass media progressively to detach the minds of the ordinary people from reality and from their innate common sense.

Both of these examples involve a permanent assault not only on people but on the rest of 'nature'. The growing volume of 'hot' radioactive waste must isolate and sterilise any place in which it is kept, and the power-stations themselves have, so we are given to understand, a very limited safe life. As for the wildly insane objective of the fluoride-broadcasters, namely, the conversion of insoluble fluorine minerals into soluble form on a scale sufficient to pour them continuously through the piped water systems of the civilised world into our rivers, at a rate about ten times that which maintains the present earth-sea-air fluorine cycle, while at the same time innumerable and growing industries,

which have now discovered how to handle this violently active element, pour more and more of its compounds into the atmosphere, one is reminded of a General Workers Union, and the County Council. The opposition consisted of some local farmers and residents and some conservationists, whose objections concerning such matters as the extent of pollution, unemployment, noise, and the traffic burden on the island's bridges, were brushed aside like so many flies. Obviously, the highly paid professionals of the Company concerned ought to know better than these amateurs what they were going to do and what its effects would be. But in the event, most of the objections turned out to be rather timid understatements of the truth, while the impressive quantitative estimates, which were used to crush them were shown to be a mere exercise in public manipulation. To give but one example, although the objectors had grave doubts about the figure given for the biggest possible fluoride effluent from the smelter, they would never have dared to suggest that it would be exceeded by some 55 per cent.

Every way one looks at it, it seems clear that our Society is now dominated and controlled by people with minds and beliefs which are widely estranged from reality. They live, or imagine they do, in a pseudo-world of symbols – of figures, especially monetary and voting numbers, and words, especially political and other promotional power-verbiage. They believe that, Man being the Supreme Being, and they being the Supreme Men, 'nature' including human and other biological natures, must adapt itself to this imaginary 'world' which they have created and imposed upon the 'undermen', rather than that the human mind must humbly bend itself to grasp and accommodate itself to the nature of things, which is the posture of mind which, hitherto, has been responsible for the great achievements of science. But this posture was originally inspired by the belief that this 'nature' is the work of a Creator, whose will is the ultimate reality to which we must adapt ourselves, or die. With the weakening of this belief and its abandonment by many, especially scientists, we are in a lag phase in which the belief in the reality of what the natural scientist studies is also weakening, and getting overlaid by what looks like the far more dominant 'reality' of the pseudo-world of words and numbers which superficially seems to control his life, but which the Created Nature is now telling us, with its manifold voices, is dangerously at variance with the real world.

It has been said that the Ecological Movement has not yet found a 'soul' – that is, a consistent philosophy or religion. It is largely a movement of protest and of somewhat puritanic doom-prophecy, reacting against the insane squandermania of our civilisation without any clear vision of the alternative. Such protest movements are notoriously vulnerable to being taken over and used, as tools by the very people the people against whose actions and ideas they are protesting, since those people, at any rate, have a practical philosophy which they are carrying out. It is not all too clear that this is what has been happening since 'environmentalism' became a 'bandwaggon'. Now we have a Department of the Environment, and every major Conference on the subject is dominated by the representatives of Government and of Big Business. A protest against

the dreary squandering of vast resources of energy and materials and human effort on phoney imitations and substitutes for the real things of life can easily be twisted round with the aid of current financial policy to become an attack on the quality of life: on the life more abundant and all that belongs to it, on growth and reproduction and expansion and initiative and on the consumption of what people really need and want, which is the only legitimate reason for the expenditure of energy in production. In so far as some of the environmentalists have allowed themselves to become associated with this perversion, they have changed sides. They are contending against life itself. The cure can lie only in looking closely at their true objectives, and deeply at their philosophy of life and its relation with reality.

In recent years there has been a strong tendency to turn to the East for this philosophy, in the belief that its spirituality and contempt for material things will provide the needed antidote to the gross and witless materialism of the West; but this is no antidote, merely the other side of the same false coin. In broad terms, if the one religates to a life of overfed comfort and convenience, based upon a plethora of shoddy and wasteful throw-away gadgetry which we pay for by mortgaging the future, the other expresses itself in that terrible apathy and indifference to the most ghastly extremes of human poverty, misery, sickness and starvation which come as a shock to every traveller from the West on his first visit to the East. Man is not a witlessly evolved matter-lump with an enlarged and clever brain, which has given him an epiphenomenon called 'mind' that enables him to dominate the Universe; but neither is he a spirit, temporarily inhabiting and imprisoned in a coarse material body, from which he strives and yearns to purify himself and to escape into the ultimate nirvana. We Christians have been taught that he is a tri-une being: body, mind, spirit, three in one, made in the image of a Tri-Une God, and in this belief there lies that balance, that stability, that peace which quite clearly passes our understanding, now that the churches are largely abandoning it or reducing it to a mere formula.

Quicumque Vult

There seems to be a disastrous tendency among contemporary theologians and leading Christians to retreat from the immense revelation of the nature of the Godhead implicit in the concept of the Holy Trinity which it is fashionable to refer to as 'hellenistic', into a rejudaised religion which is constantly referred to nowadays as 'Judaeo-Christianity'. Ironically enough, this is commonly represented as 'modern' and 'progressive' rather than, as it clearly is, wholly retrogressive. That 'Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius' and formerly said in the Anglican churches on thirteen Feast Days during the Christian Year, is now said only on Trinity Sunday, and then may be 'explained away' in a sermon as an ingenious verbal formula thrashed out in the Councils of the Early Church for the confounding of heresies and the defence of the *Unity* of the Godhead, with no mention of the *Diversity*. Sometimes the

word '*persona*' is translated as 'an actor's mask' rather than as 'character' or 'personality' so that the faithful are given a picture of the tribal god of the Jew, blown up until he becomes the Monolithic Dictator of the Universe, play-acting with humanity by appearing in different 'guises'. The Creed goes to elaborate lengths to place precisely equal stress on the Unity and the diverse Trinity of God; "And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: Neither confounding the Persons; nor dividing the Substance." So this Creed has to be 'phased out' before our religion can be brought 'up-to-date' and in line with the modern obsession with centralised Power, which is the characteristic of Unity not balanced by diversity.

If we think in practical terms, rather than verbalisms, about the Created Order, we see that unity-in-diversity and diversity-in-unity are of its very nature. A simple, unitary God, who does not comprise Diversity within his Being, cannot be a Creator; for the act of creation is the act of diversifying. However, if the *Personae* of the Godhead are but masks, then the man Jesus is a mask; and whatever that may mean, it cannot mean that he is the Incarnate Deity. One or other of the ancient heresies must be revived: either he was a mere simulacrum of a man, temporarily used by the Divine Spirit at a certain time in history, or he was a true man, and only a man – a Jewish prophet of such exceptional merit that he may be said to have had a special relationship with God, which by some verbal legerdemain might even be stretched to include some participation in the Godhead. In either case, the co-eternity of the Son becomes an incredible nonsense, and the Love which He gave dwindles in its very nature to a mere exhibition of supernatural Power. The Holy Spirit also proceeding from the Father and the Son must be lost also to the faith of those who share this thinking.

Why then are we so often given to understand that the *Quicumque vult* is nowadays mainly of historical and academic importance, scarcely applicable to the World of To-Day; that the heresies of the past which it was devised to meet have little bearing on the thinking of to-day; and that the tremendous doctrine concerning the eternal nature of God which emerged was a matter of temporary applicability to the circumstances of the time which we must now regard as expendable? Why are we scarcely ever shown that the World is now increasingly dominated by very much the same types of wrong thinking, wearing, indeed, contemporary 'masks', and especially the dualism of dialectical materialism which is the modern form of Manichaeism? And why, with all this talk about adapting our theology to the current situation and the new knowledge which science has brought us, has not this new knowledge been used to enrich our understanding of this historic revelation rather than to impoverish it or even to destroy it?

These questions are not merely rhetorical. They are asked in the hope of a reply from those who ought to know the answers, but there seems little hope of receiving one from those who are operating the current factory for 'situational theologies', manufactured to fit a world dominated by the atheology of human power.

What is so difficult for a practical scientist to grasp is the sort of verbal thinking which seems to dominate this whole field, varying abruptly with the current fashion or ‘trend’ which in turn is probably based upon the temporary dominance of a particular author or ‘school’ in the printed dialogue selected by the editors and publishing houses. I shall probably be asked – at least by implication – whether I am up-to-date in current theological verbalistics, with the further implication that if I am not I am merely making a fool of myself in expressing my inexpert and unimportant opinions; which may well be true, but is of no significance as compared with the idea implicit in this criticism that the nature of God and of Man is a matter of opinion rather than of reality.

Science, at least since the Renaissance, has been based upon the belief that facts are not determined by thoughts and symbols, but are subject to the tests of the real Universe. It is *not* a matter of opinion as to whether water is correctly represented by the symbols H₂O or HO₂ because this deals with realities which can fairly quickly and easily be tested. Because the supreme questions of the ultimate nature of the Universe and of Man’s place in it are not subject, by their very nature, to such simple tests, must this imply that they are less real than the chemical nature of water? If indeed the water molecule were HO₂ the practical consequences would be catastrophic. But is it a matter of no practical consequence as to whether God exists, and if so whether He is a simple Unity, or a Trinity-in-Unity or whether Man is essentially a Hebraic duality of body and soul, or a tri-une being of body, mind and spirit?

This would appear to be a question which invites the answer ‘No – of course not!’ But the whole trend of the current writing and discussion on the subject seems to carry the implication that such matters are matters of opinion, of expert scholarship, of linguistic interpretation or historical analysis, of anything but their practical consequences. We are led to believe that radically different and opposed beliefs about the nature of Man and the Universe can lead to similar results; and not only that the road to Hell can be paved with good intentions but the road to Heaven with wrong ones. Is it surprising that when the vision is so confused and detached from reality the people are on the way to perishing? How can Man be responsible for Nature if he has no idea of what Nature is or how to treat her? The English countryside at its best is the product of centuries of belief that Nature is the Creation of the Love of God in whose Trinitarian Nature the principle of balance, of equilibrium, of unity-in-diversity, is made holy. In the deserts of North Africa (created by the Roman *latifundia*), the dust bowl of the Middle West, the slums (vertical and horizontal) of our great cities, the dreary blocks of workers’ flats in Moscow and the vast collective farms of the Russian Revolution may be seen the product of the belief that Nature is a chaos engendered by an impersonal play of forces, upon which Man alone can impose order, and the Masters of mankind their supreme will, whether by the operation of financial or of political power. So much of the argument and discussion about Man’s responsibility for Nature is futile, because it covers a fundamental difference of belief about Man, about Nature, and even about responsibility. Particularly since our nation has been made into a multiracial,

multicultural, multi-religious conglomeration of humanity, with no common ground to work from except a common subjection to money and employment and to the State and its controls and its universal, compulsory education, it has become vitally necessary for Christians especially, to make clear the basis of belief from which they operate, since this can no longer be taken for granted, and to seek to apply it, in full, here and there, so that it may be known by its fruits, its results may be seen and its example may be followed by others.



Dr. C. Geoffrey Dobbs (- 1996) was a senior lecturer in Forest Botany, specializing in the ecology of soil fungi (mycostasis), at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, U.K. He was a devoted advocate for Social Credit and contributed many addresses and published articles to the advancement of that cause.