

Copyright © 2014 by Academic Publishing House *Researcher*

Published in the Russian Federation
European Researcher
Has been issued since 2010.
ISSN 2219-8229
E-ISSN 2224-0136
Vol. 75, No. 5-2, pp. 980-989, 2014

DOI: 10.13187/issn.2219-8229
www.erjournal.ru



Philosophical Sciences

Философские науки

UDC 12

Building a Consonance Between Religion and Science: an Antidote for the Seeming Conflict

Omomia O. Austin

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria
E-mail: austin.omomia@yahoo.com

Abstract. It is commonly argued by a school of thought that there is no relationship between religion and science. This extreme position has led to a lasting conflict, which has pitched religion against science and science against religion. The attempt in this paper is to articulate the fact that there can be an enduring consonance between religion and science. No doubt, the conflict and debate on the subject of religion and science has taken the front burner in both religious and philosophical discusses. Some scholars have argued that science has no role in religious or theological domain, while others contest that all religious concerns and considerations must be exposed to empirical investigations, and, proven by the dynamics of our intellect or reason. This paper, therefore, attempts to examine how religion and science complement each other. The author applied philosophical, sociological and historical methodology in his research. It is recommended that there is the need for dialogue between religion and science.

Keywords: antidote; consonance; conflict; religion; science.

Introduction.

The challenge posed by the continuous contention between science and religion has led to a wide dichotomy. This has consistently orchestrated and fanned the ember of disagreement and disunity between science and religion. On this premise therefore, it is contested whether there can ever be a meeting point between science and religion. The consequence of this argument is hinged on the fact that where ever the “pendulum swings”, would determine the obstinacy canvassed by the different schools of thought. That is, the extreme positions of strong conflict and that of mild disagreement. There is the position of compromise and dialogue, which is canvassed by this paper.

This paper, among other objectives, is poised at examining the areas of conflict between science and religion. Another objective of the paper is to examine how this conflict can be resolved. In addition, the paper would also consider the positions of some scientists, philosophers and theologians on the issue of the conflict between science and religion. The consequence of this would be to build an enduring consonance between science and religion. This position is expected to bridge the existing gap between science and religion, thus forging the desired depth of dialogue and co-operation. The paper, in establishing the right premise and building an enduring position, would begin by examining what religion and science represent. This would be elucidated by the writer as he considers what science is

and what religion is. This approach, no doubt would give the desired comprehension concerning the objectives set out by the writer.

What is Science?

The word science etymologically is from the Latin word, *scientia*, which means knowledge (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2014). On this note, Wilson (1998) submitted that it is “a systematic enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe.” It can be deduced from this definition that the body of knowledge considered by science can be explained rationally and logically applied. This is also supported by Zimmermann and Britt (2012), who opined that science is a systematic and logical approach to discovering how things in the universe work. They further opined that there is a sharp dichotomy between science and the humanities. On this note they declared that the basic aim of science is the establishment of measurable results through testing and analysis. This, they contested, is due to the fact that science is based on fact, and not necessarily on opinions and preferences. This is why the scientific process is designed to challenge ideas through research; they further argued (Zimmermann and Britt, 2012). The writer would define science as the acquisition of knowledge about the universe and building such into testable laws and theories. The one who is involved in the application of scientific method in the collection of measurable, empirical evidences in the conduct of a research is referred to as a scientist (Wilson, 1998).

In most scientific approach or method, there are basic steps as elucidated by Zimmermann and Britt (2012). They include the following steps among others:

- (a) Make an observation or observations.
- (b) Ask questions about the observation and gather information
- (c) Form a hypothesis. This is actually a tentative description of what is been observed and make predictions on that hypothesis.
- (d) Test the hypothesis and predictions in an experiment that can be reproduced.
- (e) Analyze the data and draw conclusions, accept or reject the hypothesis or modify the hypothesis if necessary.
- (f) Reproduce the experiment until there are no discrepancies between observations and theory.

As a follow-up to this, they further argued that there are key underpinnings to the scientific method. They argued that this includes the followings: first, the hypothesis must be testable and falsifiable. Second, the research must involve deductive reasoning and not inductive reasoning. This means that true premises should be used to reach a logical true conclusion. Lastly, the experiment should consist of both dependent and independent variables, with the establishment of an experimental group and a control group. The author agreed with the fact that there are several empirical dynamics involved in scientific methodology. This, in the opinion of the writer may be responsible for the dichotomy that is often demonstrated by science with regards to religion. It can be clearly stated that most religious phenomena are not subjected to this deep level of scientific methodology or investigation. The argument to be advanced in this regards would be whether this could be seen as a logical *alibi* for accepting or supporting the conflict between science and religion. In arriving at any far position, it is relevant to consider what religion is. This would enable us to comprehend if the position of religion also involve some logical dynamics that would lead us to the desired truth.

What is Religion?

It is safe to concede to the fact that religion does not have a universal and generally accepted meaning or definition. However, there are various definitions ascribed to the term religion. According to Obilor (2002), he defined religion as the whole complexes of attitudes, conviction, and institutions through which we express our deep fundamental relationship with reality and not excluding the created order. On his part, Odumuyiwa (2006) defined religion as man’s effective desire to be in right relationship with the transcendent order, controlling human destiny and events, either a prescribed system of beliefs and rituals. It is also the position of Omoregbe (1993) that religion is essentially a relationship, a link established between two persons, namely, the human person and the divine person believed to exist. Religion can also be defined as man’s expression of deep belief in a transcendent being, and living in obedience to the moral demands of that being, requisite of an ideal society (Omomia, 2011). Although the list of the various definitions

of religion is in exhaustive, it can be safely argued that religion deals basically with a set of beliefs held by a particular group of people. This may have been responsible for the deferent religions as different people hold to different set of beliefs. Some common religions include Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and Judaism. There are definitely many other religions.

The underlining factor in the belief system expressed in religion converges at faith. In this instance, Craig (2010) declared that the word faith, which is a noun in modern English, is derived from the Latin word *fides and fido* which means faith and to trust. The Latin word is also derived from the Greek words *pistis and pisteuo*. This description of faith signifies the belief in the truth concerning a particular thing that may not necessarily be provable by empirical or rational means or methodology. This sets religion distinctly from science.

However, it must be noted that religion, in spite of its approach, is also preoccupied with arriving at the truth. This could also be said to be the main goal of science as she applies empirical methodology. The ultimate could be that religion and science are working towards the same goal but applying different methods. The latter applies the dynamics of faith while the former applies empirical methodology. Could the differences in their methods justify the orchestration of conflict? Must religion be subjected to scientific and empirical method of inquiry before she could be seen as arriving at acceptable truth or propositions? Should science consistently demand that religious phenomena can only be considered as authentic if they are subject to empirical investigations and inferences? Must science see religion as antagonistic as she makes demands on religion to appreciate the implications of blind dogmatism? Could science appreciate the fact that there are some religious experiences and expressions that cannot be exposed to scientific investigations?

The queries that should be addressed by science and religion in order to achieve the right level of dialogue and consonance are in exhaustive. Although this paper would not implicitly or explicitly address all the questions earlier on highlighted, albeit, her position would be a modest attempt to deal with the issues and pave the right way for an enduring compromise between science and religion. The writer gives cognizance to the fact that there is a seeming contrast between science and religion. It could safely be argued that this seeming contrast may have been misunderstood, and exploited by both proponents as they continue to widen the gap between science and religion. It is important to consider these seeming differences as this would serve as the right panacea towards the quest for an enduring consonance.

Seeming Contrast between Science and Religion.

The attempt in this subsection is to establish the fact that though the method and aims of science and religion appear to be different, the contrast should not engender any conflict. However, it is important to acknowledge the fact that these differences exist. A clear knowledge of their prevalence should rather cement the bond of unity and dialogue between science and religion. It is obvious that science, by its methodology, is linked to the material, while religion is linked to the spiritual. What then are some of the seeming contrast between science and religion? They include the following:

1) Science could be said to be objective, as it relies on experimental methodology. While religion is subjective, relying on experience.

2) Science deals with the material world while religion deals with the supernatural.

3) On the other hand, science believes on things that can be proved, while religion is concerned with ideas that have to be accepted without empirical proof.

4) Science depends mainly on reason, while religion depends on intuition. The approach of science is in the laboratory while religion operates within the recesses of man's personal experiences.

5) It could be commonly argued that science is analytical while religion takes for granted the reality. This makes the path of religion to be metaphysical, in most cases.

6) The truths of religion could be said to be the property of the one who experiences them through his inward soul. On the contrary, scientific truths are said to belong to the whole world as they add to the universal store of knowledge.

7) Religion is said to be as old as mankind. It could be rightly acknowledged that man had an idea of the supreme higher power even in the earliest time. On the contrary, the Sample essay on the relation between Science and Religion (2014) declared that science is of more recent growth.

It further argued that the earliest phases of science may not be more than four or five years old, while modern science began only in the 15th century.

8) It is commonly argued that science is not able to answer the fundamental questions of the mystery of life and death. It is mostly from religion man seeks answers to these realities.

9) Religion is acclaimed as been able, to a large extent, to answer the question of the “First Cause.” This brings man clearly to the idea of religion.

10) Neither science nor religion could claim absolute monopoly of knowledge with regards to all aspects of man’s experience and the universe.

From the foregoing, it may be tempting to conclude that there is no conflict or there should be no conflict between science and religion. This assumption may be prone to several discrepancies when the present relationship between science and religion is examined critically. It may appear safe to assume that there should be no conflict between them. This is likely premised on the fact that their goal could be said to be the same, in spite of the different approaches applied by them. The question that arises and demands an objective response is: Can it be rightly claimed that there is no conflict between religion and science? The clear response to this question can only be addressed as the position canvassed by various authors and the position shared by this writer are clearly articulated and objectively reappraised.

The Position of some Scientists and Theologians on the conflict

The events that took place in Europe especially at the time of the experience of Galileo Galilei during the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment Age led scholars like John Draper to postulate the thesis conflict. This holds that religion and science conflict in respect of methodology and also factually and politically. Other contemporary scientists advanced the conflict thesis. They include Richard Dawkins, Steven Weinberg and Carl Sagan. There were other scientists who also supported the conflict thesis. These were actually creationists (Russel, 2002; Shapin, 1996; Brooke, 1991 and Ferngren, 2002).

The above position is further articulated by Bailey (2014). This is encapsulated by the declaration he made concerning the position of some theologians and scientists. He argued:

Just as the public broadly perceives scientists as completely opposed to religion; many also believe that major theologians are utterly opposed to science in general and to evolution in particular. While some theologians still see science as the mortal enemy of religion, numerous other theologians see no fundamental conflict with science in general, or with evolution and the creation scriptures in particular.

The position of some theologians with respect to the conflict between science and religion was highlighted by Bailey (2014). Some of the theologians include: Ian Barbour, a Presbyterian scholar and recipient of the Templeton Prize. In his submission, he declared that science and religion are often seen as enemies locked in mortal conflict. According to him, some people in both camps are aggressively continuing the warfare, particularly on the topic of evolution. But the conflict can be avoided. The two kinds of inquiry offer complementary perspectives on the world, separate and independent from each other and not in conflict. The second one is John Haight, a popular American philosopher who is also a Roman Catholic. In expressing his position concerning the conflict, he declared that, both science and religion ultimately flow out of the same radical eros for truth which lies at the heart of our existence. In other words, he opined that it is as a result of their shared origin in this fundamental concern for the truth that we may never allow them simply to go their separate ways. On his part, John Polkinghorne, an Anglican Priest, a physicist and a British theologian, argued that science and theology share one fundamental aim, which will always make them worthy of the attention of those imbued with intellectual integrity and the desire to understand; in their different ways and in their different domains, each is concerned with the search for truth. In itself that is sufficient to guarantee that there will be a fruitful developing dialogue between them.

The position also canvassed by Pope John Paul 11, concerning the conflict is quite instructive. He surmised that, the Bible itself speaks to us of the origin of the universe and its make-up, not in order to provide us with a scientific treatise, but in order to state the correct relationships of man with God and with the universe. Another Anglican Priest and a British Philosopher, Keith Ward, concluded that, claims on both the religious and scientific sides to give an all-encompassing and exclusive view of truth will bring religion and science into conflict. The above positions identified by

Bailey (2014) represent the perspective of some theologians and scientists concerning the conflict between science and religion.

It is appropriate to examine the position of some scientists who also shared outstanding religious inclination. Their religious linings had great effect on their perception of science, consequently, their position with respect to the conflict between religious and science. In addressing their position, Brown (2014) examined the following: The first to be considered among them is Robert Boyle. His gas law is very familiar to students of chemistry and physics. He was a fellow of the British Royal Society, and was known for his piety, benevolence and promotion of the circulation of the Bible. In spite of his scientific activities, he published five major religious works and instituted lectures annually in defense of Christianity. It is on record that Boyle stated that the “vastness, beauty, orderliness of the heavenly bodies, the excellent structure of animals and plants, and the other phenomena of nature justly induce an intelligent and just observer to conclude a supremely powerful and just author.” This is a clear indication that Boyle believed in God, thus was religious.

Another notable scientist was Michael Faraday. He is the acclaimed originator of much of the knowledge we have about electricity. Faraday is said to have made a public profession of the Christian faith at the age of thirty. To authenticate his faith, Faraday, at the close of his life, declared: “I am not resting my dying head on guess work. I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that He is able to guard that which I have committed unto Him against that day.” In the opinion of the writer, this is a clear indication that Faraday had a robust relationship with God. Consequently, it can be rightly concluded that he was not against religion. In the same vein, Brown (2014) submitted that Sir Isaac Newton was another notable scientist who also accepted religion. Newton is considered by most scientists as one of the greatest minds that the human race has ever produced. He did many noble works in physics, hence physics is said to be seen as science due to his work. From the religious sphere, he is said to have written several divine tracts. He also wrote six major theological works, which included a complete church history and both *Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*. These books were popular and often used as reference materials by other theologians.

The list of other notable scientists who embraced religion also included James Clerk Maxwell. He is adjudged as the one who gave the world the mathematical theories of electricity and magnetism. It is on his invention that most modern electrical communication is based. His words could be clearly seen as his motto. He declared: “The only desire which I can have is like David, to serve my own generation, by the will of God.” Maxwell was definitely deeply religious even as a scientist. Another notable scientist was Lord Kelvin. His name appeared in most introductory and advanced textbooks on electricity and thermodynamics. Though a scientist, Kelvin was a devout Christian.

The list of notable scientists who also embraced religion is in exhaustive. Others include Charles P. Steinmetz, R.A. Millikan and A.H. Compton (Brown, 2014). They all expressed outstanding faith in God. This is exemplified by the statements accredited to them with regards to religion. Steinmetz, General Electric Company scientist did the pioneering work on alternating current electric power equipment. He also authored several textbooks on standard electrical engineering. In spite of the accolades he won as a scientist, Steinmetz was a devout man. He declared: “The greatest power of all is in our midst unscratched today. I refer to spiritual power that comes through right living and worship.” Following after his heel is Millikan. He won the Nobel Prize in 1923. He did not allow his scientific achievements to dwarf his belief in the divine power of God. Another scientist, who also won the Nobel Prize in 1927, was Compton. He was highly religious. He demonstrated this in his description of the atom. He exclaimed: “A God who can control the universe like that is too great for comprehension.”

The writer wonders why any conflict should exist between religion and science, especially with the position maintained by the scientists who were considered earlier on. It is obvious that their scientific prowess and achievements did not contradict their religious inclinations and persuasions. To some extent they could be said to have acknowledged the fact that their inspiration and scientific achievements could rightly be tied to the divine. The writer is of the opinion that the entire conflict may have resulted from the extreme position canvassed by some men of science and theology. It is suspected that they both took extreme and uncompromising positions. This would have likely pitched science against religion and religion against science. The nature of the conflict would be addressed in the subsequent section.

The Conflict between Science and Religion.

It was established earlier on that science is concerned with objective observation and verification of physical reality, while religion is based on subjective belief system which is based on faith. The writer is of the opinion that the different approaches employed by science and religion in unraveling the reality and the universe may have pitched them against each other. According to Hall and Hall (2014), “science and religion are diametrically opposed at their philosophical levels. And because the two worldviews make claims to the same intellectual territory—that of the universe and humankind’s relationship to it—conflict is inevitable.” This position presupposes that that difference in approach and paradigms has continued to enhance the deep dichotomy between religion and science. Does this claim actually elucidate the entire situation? In other words, could it also be accepted as a genuine justification for the conflict?

There is the popular view that it was about the 1800s that the relationship between science and religion became a formal topic of discourse. Before this time, no one actually pitched religion against science or science against religion. However, Haarsma (2014) opined that the idea that science and religion are fundamentally in conflict with each other has been around for well over a century. The following positions expressed by some advocates of science have fanned the ember of conflict between science and religion. It is arrogantly positioned by Atkins (1995) that “science and religion cannot be reconciled, and humanity should begin to appreciate the power of (science) and to beat off all attempts at compromise. Religion has failed, and its failures should be exposed. Science, with its currently successful pursuit of universal competence... should be acknowledged the king.” An attitude of opposition was also originally expressed by Draper (1875). He surmised, “A divine revelation must necessarily be intolerant of contradiction, it must repudiate all improvement in itself.” The position expressed by White (1896) puts the sharp conflict between science and religion, as held by some scientist, succinctly. He made his clear submission thus: “Hardly a generation since (Galileo) has not seen some ecclesiastic suppressing evidence, or turning expressions, or inventing theories to blacken the memory of Galileo”.

In the writer’s opinion, the conflict that exists between science and religion, be it perceived or real, could be said to have been orchestrated by some of the statements attributed to the proponents of the existing divide. The above statements are some clear examples. The notable irony in the entire scenario is that some people hold the opinion that the tension is real, while others believe that it is an illusion. These positions are clearly captured by Sappington (1991). He posited that “since the time of Copernicus, people have talked of a tension between science and religion. Some, who believe that a true religion should be supported by science, believe the tension is real. Others believe that the tension is illusory and based upon a misunderstanding about the nature of both science and religion.” No matter the position presented by the different proponents, there is the clear indication that a seeming conflict exist between religion and science.

The above argument is further supported by Haarsma (2003). He posited that, it is necessary to acknowledge that there have been, and continue to be, some conflicts between scientific and religious claims. Although he tried to exonerate religion from the treatment meted against Galileo by the church, it is no gainsaying the fact that, this, to a large extent, was one of the major events that marked the turning point in the hostility between science and religion. This is attested to by the position of Russel (2002), Shapin (1996), Brooke (1991) and Ferngren (2002). They put their argument succinctly: “Events in Europe such as the Galileo affair, associated with the scientific revolution and the Age of Enlightenment, led scholars such as John William Draper to postulate a conflict thesis, holding that religion and science conflict methodologically, factually and politically. This thesis is advanced by contemporary scientists such as Richard Dawkins, Steven Weinberg and Carl Sagan, and proposed by many creationists.” It is important to mention, however that most scientists, theologians and philosophers do not feel there is any conflict between their faith and science. Does their position in any way negate the existence of a conflict between religion and science?

It is common knowledge that in the seventeenth century there arose a significant conflict between science and religion. This was centered on Galileo Galilei. The commonly held opinion was that the earth was at the centre of the universe. However, Galileo’s study of motion and other observations, with his microscope, led him to advocate the same idea with Copernicus. He postulated that the sun was at the centre and both the earth and other planets revolved round the sun. The contrary view which had held sway for a long time within the church was held as the correct one, while both the position of Copernicus and Galileo were seen as heretical (Brown, 2014). On examination by the Inquisition under

the menace of torture, as instituted by the Holy Office of the papal church, Galileo was made to recant his Copernican views and sentenced to imprisonment at the pleasure of the tribunal. It should be noted that, although the threatened imprisonment was not carried out, Galileo, spent the last years of his life in strict seclusion (Brown, 2014). This level of dogmatic religion may have overtly contributed to the conflict between religion and science.

Another notable event that may have orchestrated the conflict between religion and science was the position maintained by Charles Darwin. In a simple sense, Darwin postulated that there was natural selection and this accounted for the different organisms both animals and plant. This view was seen as a great negation of the creation account in the Bible. The ideas of Darwin, in the nineteenth century definitely precipitated a notable conflict between scientists and religious proponents. As a naturalist, Darwin inclined his position to nature, where he laid emphasis on the book of nature, which to a large extent was contrary to the position held by religionists. Although it is not within the scope of this paper to discourse Darwin's theory, suffice it to say that he emphasized on survival of the fittest, and the advancement from simple to complex. This gives an incline, that though Darwin did not out rightly discuss evolution, but his theory shares some commonalities with evolution. It is the view of the writer that the church took a very oppressive attitude towards Darwin's theory, and this further widened the gap of 'friendship' between religion and science.

Categorizing the interactions between Science and Religion

There is the possibility of building different level of interactions between religion and science. The level of interaction and perception would determine the state of conflict and its intensity. A notable theologian, an Anglican priest and a scientist, John Polkinghorne, postulated four major categories of the level of interactions between science and religion. According to him they include the following: conflict between science and religion, independence of both positions, dialogue between them and integration of both into one field (Polkinghorne, 1998). There were other notable scientists and theologians who drew different typologies with regards to the relationship between science and religion. Some of them include Barbour (2002), Haught (1995) and Peacocke (1981) among others. Their position gave rise to distinct categorization that would be considered by the writer subsequently.

The following typologies have been identified with respect to the conflict between science and religion. It is important to note that the categorization is in exhaustive, as there are other forms. However, they all converge at similar categories as the one identified herein:

1) Incompatibility: This typology commonly holds that both science and religion are incompatible. According to Tyson (2014), there exist a central difference between science and religion, and these claims are irreconcilable. He argued that science relies on experimental verification, while religion relies on faith, and both are irreconcilable paths to knowledge. This position is supported by Stenger (2000). He posited that science and religion are incompatible due basically to the conflict between approaches of knowledge. The approach of Dawkins to the depth of incompatibility is quit aggressive. Dawkins declared that "he is hostile to fundamentalist religion because it actively debauches the scientific enterprise. This, according to him means that religion subverts science and saps the intellect" (Dawkins, 2006). The extreme of incompatibility between religion and science, in the opinion of the writer, would continue to widen the gulf between them.

2) Conflict theory: This theory was made popular in the nineteenth century by John William Draper and Andrew Dickson White. Their positions that religion and science has been in conflict continuously throughout history (Numbers, 2009). This position pitted science against religion and religion against science. It often justifies its position on account of the trial of Galileo Galilei by the church, and the attitude towards Darwin's theory of natural selection.

3) Independence theory: This view was made popular by Gould (1999) and Stace (1952). In his view, Gould declared that science and religion deal fundamentally with different aspects of man's experience, therefore when they remain in their different domains, they can then co-exist peacefully. However, Gould's view was from the perspective of science. On his part, Stace viewed the independence from the perspective of philosophy of religion. He maintained that when science and religion are viewed from their different domains they are both consistent and complete.

4) Both have parallel methods: In an attempt to establish his position on the aspect of parallels in method between science and religion, Barbour (1968), asserted that that science is made up of paradigms based on cultural traditions and this is similar to the view on religion. In other words, Polanyi opined that science operates within moral commitments similar to those

found in religion. (Barbour, 1968). Another parallel can be seen in the act of research by the scientist. It is actually faith that keeps the scientist during his research and investigation. According to Mckinlay (2010), it is natural often times for man to reason according to presupposition. This means that those who are engaged in scientific investigations base their results on assumptions, and their conceptions are based on their preconceptions. It can be concluded, on the strength of this argument that assumptions are simply faith, by another name. The scientist also demonstrates faith, which is a core part of religion, in his investigation of reality and phenomena. The writer believes that this is a strong demonstration of parallel method between religion and science.

5) Dialogue theory: This has grown in a formidable community of scientists, priests, theologians and clergymen. They believe in the intersection between science and religion. Their efforts have led to prominent role by institution and journals have also been developed to address the relationship between science and religion. According to Hefner (2008) and Scott (1998), there is the need to incorporate theologians and others who have healthy respect for science. The writer argued that this should also be extended fully to scientists who express morbid antagonism towards religion.

It can be inferred from the typologies examined above that the level of antagonism between science and religion is contingent on the level of interaction acceptable to the different proponents. The writer is of the opinion that any attempt to also assess one typology above the other may engender another form of conflict. What then is the way out of the imbroglio? The writer believes that it is possible to build a formidable consonance between science and religion. Accessing this possibility is the main concern of the subsequent section.

Building an enduring consonance between Science and Religion.

It can be logically argued that lack of uniformity should and must not necessarily lead to disunity or acrimony and rancor. The fact that religion and science employ different methodologies in arriving at the truth and reality should not be explored as an alibi for engendering conflict and rancor. The writer believes that both can exist side by side and also benefit from each other. The attempt in this closing part would be to advance some panaceas that would serve as precursors for the desired relationship and friendship between science and religion. This would cement the seeming gulf of conflict between them. The followings should be considered:

1) There is the need for consistent dialogue between the proponents of science and those of religion. This will enable each to demonstrate tolerance and respect for each other's position.

2) They can learn from each other, as they appreciate their individuality, yet in a unique relationship.

3) Religious proponents should seek to apply the dynamics of science towards the expression of their religious beliefs. This means that the contemporary reality demands that our faith must embrace "works." This means a demonstration of tangible reality.

4) There is the need to eschew dogmatism in order to have a clearer comprehension of the dynamics of religious reality. Genuine questions should be tolerated by religion and she should be humble enough to concede that she may not have answers to some realities.

5) Science should humbly concede that she is not the harbinger of all wisdom and knowledge. There are definitely some levels of knowledge that can sincerely be addressed by religion alone.

6) Science should appreciate the fact that the major difference between her and religion is the methodology towards establishing the truth or reality. The consequence of this is that though their methods may differ, both science and religion are working towards unraveling the truth. This would consequently establish the knowledge they seek to propound.

7) There no gainsaying the fact that some religious experiences cannot be exposed to the scrutinizing of scientific empiricism. This means that most religious experiences cannot be taken to the laboratory for empirical analysis. They can only be appreciated under divine and subjective comprehension and appreciation.

8) As a follow-up to above consideration, it should be conceded by science that that because something is improvable does not necessarily means that it is untrue. The religious teaching often describes the spirit realm, which is inhabited by spirit creatures. This can neither be proved nor disproved. In most cases it subsists at the realm of faith.

9) Religion must appreciate that science affect the way man views the world. Science is definitely a part of our daily life. This ranges from medicine to engineering and others.

Conclusion.

As the author canvasses a continuous compromise between religion and science, it is instructive to consider the position aptly expressed by Nelson (2011). He submitted that: "Science and true religion complement each other rather than contradict each other. Both science and religion involve the search for the truth." He further argued that "Science helps us discover the world's magnificent design. While true religion helps make these discoveries more meaningful by teaching of a creator that lies behind the design." It is appropriate to declare that religion and science should eschew all forms of conflict and work towards an enduring consonance. This definitely would lead to a symbiotic co-existence. This definitely would likely engender scientific progress bathed in moral fiber. This position had been canvassed by some scientists and theologians that were considered earlier on.

References:

1. Atkins, P.W. (1995). "The Limitless Power of Science," in *Nature's Imagination: The Frontiers of Scientific Vision*, ed. J. Cornwell. U.K: Oxford University Press.
2. Bailey, D.A. (2014). *What do major theologians say about the "war" between science and religion?*. Retrieved on 10/4/2014. From [Leading Theologians on the War between Science and Religion.htm](#).
3. Barbour, I.G. (1968). "Science and Religion Today". In Ian Barbour (ed.). *Science and Religion: New Perspectives on the Dialogue* (1st ed.). New York, Evanston and London: Harper and Row. pp. 3-29.
4. Brooke, J.H. (1991). *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press. P.42.
5. Brown, R.H. (2014). *Conflicts between Science and Religion*. Retrieved on 12/4/2014. From <https://www.ministrymagazine.org/authors/brown-r-h>.
6. Craig, B. (2010). *What is the Relationship between Faith and Reason?* The Bible Answer Stand Ministry. Retrieved on 12th April, 2014. From Q&A: What is the relationship between faith and reason: <http://www.Bibleanswerstand.org/AQreason.htm>.
7. Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. U.K: Bantam Press.
8. Draper, J.W. (2002). *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. U.S.A: D. Appleton and Company.
9. Ferngren, G.B. (2002). Ferngren, G.B., ed. *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*. John Hopkins University Press. P. x.
10. Gould, S.J. (1999). *Rocks of Ages: Science and Religion in the fullness of life*. U.S: Ballantine Books.
11. Haarsma, L. (2003). *Christianity as a Foundation for Science Part 1: Science & Religion in Conflict?* Retrieved from <http://www.asa3.org/ASAeducation/origin/books-1h.htm>. On 11/4/2014.
12. Haught, J.f. (1995). *Science and Religion: From Conflict to Conversation*. U.K: Paulist Press.
13. Hefner, P. (2008). "Editorial: Religion –and-Science, the Third Community". *Zygon* 43(1): 3-7.
14. McKinlay, N.C. (2000). *Faith and Reason: The Relationship between Theology and Philosophy*. Retrieved 18/4/2014. From <http://homepage.mac.com/macfhion/FREUMH/cubaid/NMF/BEUR>
15. *Nature, Human Nature, and God*. Retrieved from: <http://books.google.com/books?>
16. Nelson, D. (2011). *Are Science and Religion in Conflict?* Retrieved from: [Are Science and Religion in Conflict Theology Religion Essay.htm](#). On 12/4/2014
17. Obilor, J.I. (2002). *The Problem of Language in Religious Education*. New York: Frank Furtham.
18. Odumuyiwa, E.A. (2006). "Religion and Child Development" in *Orisun: Journal of Religion and Human Values*. Vols. 4&5. Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago- Iwoye.
19. Omomia, O.A. (2011). "The Relevance of Religion in affirming Moral Equilibrium in the Nigerian Society" in *Journal of Philosophy and Development*. Vol. 12, Nos. 1&2, 2010/2011. Pp. 124-133.
20. Omoregbe, J. (1993). *A Philosophical Look at Religion*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers.
21. *Online Etymology Dictionary*. (2014). "Science." Retrieved 13/4/2014. From http://www.etymology.com/index.php?term=science&allowed_in_frame=0

22. Peacocke, A. R. (ed.) (1981). *The Sciences and Theology in the twentieth century*. University of Notre Dame Press.
23. Pokinghorne, J. (1998). *Science and Theology*. SPCK: Fortress Press.
24. Russel, C. A. (2002). Ferngren, G.B., ed. *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction*. Johns Hopkins University Press. P7.
25. *Sample essay on the relation between Science and Religion* (2014). Retrieved on 13/4/2014. From E:\\ Sample essay on the relation between Science and Religion.htm
26. Sappington, A.A. (1991). The Religion/Science Conflict. *Journal for the Study of Religion*. Vol. 30, No. 1, March, 1991. Pp.114-120.
27. Scott, E. (1998). "Science and Religion", Christian Scholarship", and Theistic Science. " <http://ncse.com/rncse/18/2/science-religion-christian-scholarship-theistic-science>. *Reports of the National Centre for Science Education* (National Centre for Science Education) 18(2). Retrieved 13/4/2014.
28. Shapin, S. (1996). *The Scientific Revolution*. University of Chicago Press. P. 195.
29. Stace, W.T. (1952). *Time and Eternity: an Essay in the philosophy of Religion*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
30. Stenger, V.J. (2000). *God and the folly of faith: the incompatibility of science and religion*. Amherst, N.Y: Prometheus Books.
31. Tyson, N. (1999). "Holy Wars." Retrieved from: <http://www.haydenplanetarium.org/tyson/read/1999/10/01/holy-wars>. On 12/4/2014
32. Vintage Wilson, E.O. (1998). *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Books.
33. White, A. (2002). *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. U.S.: Republished by Indypublish.Com.
34. Zimmermann, K.A. and Britt, R.R. (2012). *What is Science and the Scientific Method?* Retrieved on 12/4/2014. From TechMedia Network/Innovators. Google Search.