MAN’S LONGING FOR IMMORTALITY SHALL ACHIEVE ITS REALIZATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the July 20, 1998, edition of U.S. News & World Report and an article from the July 20, 1998, edition of Newsweek be printed in the RECORD. The two articles are relevant to the speech that I delivered on Tuesday this week entitled “Man’s Longing for Immortality Shall Achieve Its Realization.”

I understand the Government Printing Office estimates it will cost approximately $1,283 to have these articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 20, 1998]

**SCIENTISTS AND THEOLOGIANS DISCOVER A COMMON GROUND**

Darwin, Freud, relativity, the mechanics of the atom, and evolution have been taken as supporting the modernistic conception of a change-based world in which forces devoid of meaning account for all outcomes. Theologians have maintained that the big-bang theory shows that no god was necessary at the creation. Intellectuals have wrung their hands in angst about how bang-caused cosmic expansion will result in an inescapable running down of the stars, proving existence to be pointless.

The mere existence of the universe figures prominently in the works of post-modern novelist Thomas Pynchon, who says he was “almost a practicing atheist as a boy,” was nagged by the idea that the world is much older it is (15 billion years or so). But through his observations of distance stars showed how fast the universe is expanding and how the universe was mostly hydrogen, the chief component of H. This made him to the conclusion that the world is much older than he thought.

The more deeply scientists see into the secrets of the universe, the more would God fade away from their hearts and minds. That is how it went for Allan Sandage. Sandage, who says John Polkinghorne, who had a distinguished career as a physicist at Cambridge University before becoming an Anglican priest in 1982, “that conceives to plant the

**HERESIES**

Not that long ago, such a comment from an establishment scientist would have been shocking. The mere existence of the organization that sponsored the Berkeley event, a well-regarded academic group called the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences, might have been snickered at. Today, “intellectuals are finally finding it respectable to talk about how physical law seems to favor life, notes Ian Barbour, a professor of both religion and physics at Carleton College, in Northfield, Minn.

In this vein, the recent book *Conscience* by Harvard biologist E.O. Wilson argues that there is no need to walk off scientific moral thought; rather, people should once again pursue the Enlightenment vision of reconciling the technical and the spiritual. A boom in religious and religious books with titles such as *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization and God: The Evidence* goes further, suggesting the unknowables of the big bang eventually will be related to other mystery.

If nothing else, the theological idea of creation ex nihilo—out of nothing—is looking better all the time as “inflation” theories (main story) increasingly suggest the universe emerged from a quantum source. The word “design,” rejected by most 20th-century scientists as a component in the context of cosmology or evolution, is even creeping back into the big-bang debate. Physicist Ernest Sternglass, among Ein-...
idea that the universe did not just happen, but that there must be a purpose behind it.”

Charles Townes, who shared the 1964 Nobel Prize in Physics for discovering the principles of the laser, says, “We believe that there is a feeling that somehow intelligence must have been involved in the law of the universe.” Although the very rationality of science often feels like an enemy of the spiritual, here, too, a new reading can sustain faith. For other believers, an appreciation of things is a feeling that somehow intelligence must have been involved in the law of the universe. Knowing how the universe functions is crucial to a religious person because this is the world He created.” Feit is not alone in this view.

Science is a new understanding of the cosmos. We are somehow tuned in to its truths. Since pure thought can penetrate the universe, this seems to mean that science is a tool that shows us that something about human consciousness is harmonious with the mind of God,” says Carl Feit, a cancer biologist at Yeah University in New York and Talumid scholar.

To most worshipers, a sense of the divine as an unseen presence behind the visible world is all well and good, but what they really yearn for is a God who acts in the world. Some scientists see an opening for this sort of god at the level of quantum or subatomic events. In this spooky world, the behavior of particles is unpredictable. In perhaps the most famous example, a radioactive element might have a half-life of, say, one hour. Half-life means that half of the atoms in a sample will decay in that time; half will not. But what if you have only a single atom? Then, in an hour, it has a 50-50 chance of decaying. And what if the experiment is arranged so that if the atom does decay, it releases poison gas? If you have a cat in the lab, will the cat be alive or dead after the hour? Some philosophers, in the words of physicist John Haught, who founded the George town Seminary, will say there is no way to determine, even in principle, what the atom would do. Some theologians view this as a point on which science and religion will never be truly reconciled. Perhaps they are right. "We are in a privileged place? Primack says, "It can have noth ing to do with science."

To Joel Primack, an astrophysicist at the University of California, Santa Cruz, "prac tically for the good of creation, says Michael Shermer, a director of the Skeptics Society, which debunks claims of the paranormal. "It can have nothing to say either way about whether there is a God or not. But if you have already found God, then you can say, from understanding science, 'Ah, I see what God has done in the world.'"

In one sense, science and religion will never be truly reconciled. Perhaps they should be. The default setting of science is to be skeptical; the core of scientific faith, says Ted Peters of Pacific Lutheran Seminary. Otherwise, says astronomer and Jesuit priest William Stoeger, religion is in danger of being seen, by people even minimally acquainted with science, "as an anachronism."

"Science cannot prove the existence of God, let alone spy him at the end of a telescope. But to some believers, learning about the universe offers clues about what God might be like. As W. Mark Richardson of the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences says, "Science may not serve as an eyewitness of God the Creator, but it can serve as a character witness." One place to get a glimpse of God’s character, ironically, is in the workings of evolution. Arthur Peacocke, a biologist who is himself a member who has sneaked up on churches and is now shaping the liturgy, he predicts, "in 10 years science will be a major factor in how many ordinary religious people think.
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French Enlightenment in the 18th century, did the votaries of science and religion drift into separate ideological camps. And only in the 19th century, after Darwin, was the supposed gap between “God’s science” elevated to the status of cultural myth. History tells a different, more complicated story.

In the distant past, religious myth invested nature and the cosmos with divine emanations and powers. But this celestial pantheon shared an eerie echo with the scientific laws governing such a universe could not be contingent. In other words, it could have turned out other than it was. The “mechanical mechanisms” of Isaac Newton produced a god who designed a world machine and somehow sustained it in motion. Theology readily accepted whatever proofs for God’s existence the new science chose to give. The result was a diminished “god of the gaps” inhabiting whatever dark corners remained to rational light. In this way, says Jesuit theologian Michael Buckley of Boston College, theologians themselves cooperated in the advancement of modern atheism by relying on science to explain God and ignoring “the traditional sources of religious insight and experience that make belief in God intelligible.” By the 18th century, astronomer Pierre Laplace could explain nature as a sufficient mechanism. As for God, he told Emperor Napoleon, “I have no need of that hypothesis” to understand nature. And, did Darwin in his theory of evolution.

“I have no need of that hypothesis” to understand nature. And, did Darwin in his theory of evolution.

The Bible, of course, has its own creation myth. That story that naturally led scientists to realize that nature had to be discovered empirically and so fostered the development of science in the Christian West. The universe created by a rational God had to be rational and consistent—that much the Greeks already knew. But a universe created out of nothing, as Genesis describes, also had to be contingent. In other words, it could have turned out other than it did. It was only one of an infinite number of possibilities open to a wholly transcendent deity. Gradually, scientists realized that the laws governing such a universe could not be deduced from pure thought—as Aristotle supposed—but instead needed to be discovered through experiment. Thus was experimental science nurtured by religious doctrine.

When the scientific revolution did occur, in Europe early in the 17th century, and researchers for the first time began to regard the world as a mechanism whose workings they could probe through the scientific method, it wasn’t God’s existence that was thrown in doubt. Rather, it was Aristotle’s “sacred geography,” in which Earth and the heavenly bodies were fixed and eternal. Relying on Aristotle, medieval Christianity had invested nature and the cosmos with divine power and to issue edicts in a piercing wall, was born on Monday, July 27, at 3:20 p.m., weighing in at a healthy 7 pounds, 10 ounces. TED STEVENS’ third son, Ben.

Byrd. Mr. President, August is from the Latin Augustus, the eighth month of our calendar year, a time of harvest and of plenty, named after Augustus Caesar. Augustus Caesar, or, more correctly, Octavianus. He was the grand nephew of Julius Caesar, and he was the first emperor of Rome, from 27 B.C. through 14 A.D. Augustus also is an adjective, derived from the Latin verb meaning to increase, and in English meaning: to inspire awe and reverence, impose, something that is imposing and magnificent, or dignified and majestic. The adjective augustan refers also to the age of Augustus Caesar and his reign and anything that is of the age and só described is classical and elegant.

The term Augustan age specifically refers to a period of Latin literature during the reign of Augustus Caesar, when elegance and correctness were highly valued. Oh, that we might return to that age at least in one sense, when elegance and correctness—not political correctness—were highly valued.

Augustine, a diminutive form of Augustus, was the Bishop of Hippo (354-430 A.D.), a Latin church father and bishop of Hippo, in northern Africa, known for his “Confessions” and his work “The City of God.” The second Saint Augustine—the dates we are not sure of but we can believe that he lived until about 604 A.D. He was a Roman monk who went to spread Christianity among the English and who was the first Archbishop of Canterbury. See from this that the name Augustus is fraught with significance and with portent. It is a name that can be lived up to with great deeds and great learning. It is also the name conferred upon the newest member of Senator TED STEVENS’ growing family, Augustus Engleken Stevens. My guess would be the middle name is Anglo-Saxon. And this is the third child of Senator STEVENS’ third son, Ben.

It is also the tenth grandchild to join the impressive Stevens clan. This newest Caesar to rule with his chubby and imperious fist, and to issue edicts in a piercing wall, was born on Monday, July 27, at 3:20 p.m., weighing in at a healthy 7 pounds, 10 ounces. TED STEVENS’ third son, Ben.

In choosing a name as ancient and as illustrious as Augustus, his parents—I surmise—have high hopes and grand ambitions for their infant son. I am told that his grand parents—who see TED on the Senate floor, shepherding appropriations bills through contentious debate to final passage—fists pounding and voice booming—might not recognize Senator STEVENS in his happier and more serene role as grandfather. But to be a grandfather is to be a happy man.

And what feelings of immortality, to be a grandfather. Holding this youngest member of his family, born in the waning days of this second millennium, the namesake of one whose life spanned the opening days of the first millennium, and poised to come into his own birthright in the third millennium, Senator STEVENS can see history unfold into the coming ages. Through children and grandchildren, one has a glimpse of the glorious future, the immortality of the human spirit. And to be faced with the bittersweet sorrow of time passing too swiftly and of children who grow up much too quickly.