Beauty and the Existence of God.

Introduction.

Aesthetic arguments for the existence of God are traditionally subsumed under the category of design arguments. They generally take an inductive form of argument by analogy or to the best explanation, although there are several deductive aesthetic arguments. However, arguments from aesthetic value for the existence of God are rare. It is unusual to find any apologist devoting more than a couple of paragraphs to such arguments.[1] This is so much the case that major critiques of theistic arguments, such as J.L.Mackie's The Miracle of Theism, feel no need to respond to aesthetic arguments. Nevertheless, there is a wider, subtler and more powerful range of aesthetic arguments than is often realized.

I will begin by defining four categories of aesthetic argument. Beginning with arguments from aesthetic experience, I will present a number of aesthetic arguments for the existence of God advanced by the small but distinguished group of apologists who have used them. I will then consider some non-aesthetic design arguments, seeking to show how adding an aesthetic dimension to these arguments can provide valuable support for theism. I will close by examining several deductive ontological aesthetic arguments for the existence of God.

Four Categories of Aesthetic Argument

Aesthetic reality can be divided between our subjective awareness of beauty and the objective beauty of which we are aware. Aesthetic arguments may therefore focus either upon our ability to know beauty, or upon the existence of beauty. Aesthetic arguments that focus upon our knowledge of beauty are 'epistemological' arguments; those that focus upon the existence of beauty are 'ontological' arguments.

Some of the epistemological arguments work from the nature of our subjective aesthetic experience, seeking to interpret this experience as revelatory of divinity. Other epistemological arguments begin with the mere fact that we have aesthetic awareness, seeking to show that theism gains credibility by providing the best understanding of this capacity.

Epistemological aesthetic arguments reveal a God who values the appreciation of beauty as a good thing that provides some reason for the creation of an objectively beautiful cosmos with creatures capable of enjoying that beauty.

Some ontological aesthetic arguments ask how likely it is that non-teleological natural laws should produce the objective beauty that we find all around us. Other ontological aesthetic arguments propose the existence of God as the source and/or standard of objective aesthetic value.

Arguments from Aesthetic Experience

We begin with arguments from the nature of aesthetic experience (and with the shortest aesthetic

argument I know). In their Handbook of Christian Apologetics, Peter Kreeft and Ronald K. Tacelli provide an introductory overview of the subject at a popular level that is second to none. Kreeft & Tacelli present summaries of 'Twenty Arguments for the Existence of God', including argument number 17: 'The Argument from Aesthetic Experience.' Their brief 'argument' goes as follows:

> There is the music of Johann Sebastian Bach. Therefore there must be a God. You either see this one or you don't.[2]

In an end note they ask, 'Can you formulate argument 17 logically?'[3] Clearly we can, by adding the missing second premise. This could be something to the effect that unless God exists, the music of Bach could not exist. This addition produces a valid argument, but is of doubtful apologetic value.

Any sound cosmological argument would validate the truth of our additional premise, and hence of this argument, by showing that if God did not exist, nothing - including the music of J.S.Bach - would exist. However, this makes Kreeft & Tacelli's argument dependent upon the production of a convincing cosmological argument[4], and so strips it of any independent force.

Perhaps there is more going on in Kreeft & Tacelli's argument than first meets the eye. After all, they can hardly be unaware of the fact that they have failed to present an argument at all. When Kreeft & Tacelli say that, 'You either see this one or you don't'[5], they are gesturing towards an argument from aesthetic experience felt as an encounter with an aspect of the divine. This also seems to be suggested by their label of 'Argument from Aesthetic Experience.'[6] Kreeft relates elsewhere of this experiential aesthetic argument that: 'I personally know three ex-atheists who were swayed by this argument; two are philosophy professors and one is a monk.'[7] Indeed, these 'three intelligent, sensitive souls. . . were saved from atheism and despair only by the music of Bach.'[8] As physicist turned priest and theologian John Polkinghorne eloquently suggests:

> The physical world, whose rational order is revealed to us by science, is also a carrier of beauty, [and] the arena of moral decision. . . It is both significant and puzzling that there is this variety in our experience. The religious believer can perceive the divine unity that underlies and unites this. . . diversity: science is exploring the rational order of creation; our aesthetic pleasures are a sharing in God's joy in creation; our moral intuitions are intimations of God's will. . .[9]

Even the philosopher Anthony O'Hear, who is not a theist, writes that: 'in experiencing beauty we feel ourselves to be in contact with a deeper reality than the everyday.'[10], and passes the following observations upon this experience:

> Art can seem revelatory, just as it does seem to answer to objective standards. . . It is as if our. . . appreciation of things external to us. . . are reflecting a deep and pre-conscious harmony between us and the world. . . If this feeling is not simply an illusion. . . it may say something about the nature of reality itself, as responsive to human desires. . .
>
> But how could we think of an aesthetic justification of experience. . . unless our aesthetic experience was sustained by a divine will revealed in the universe, and particularly in our experience of it as beautiful? It is precisely at this point that many or even most will

> draw back. Aesthetic experience seems to produce the harmony between us and the world that would have to point to a religious resolution were it not to be an illusion.[11]

So far so good, but O'Hear himself draws back: 'But such a resolution is intellectually unsustainable, so aesthetic experience, however powerful, remains subjective and, in its full articulation, illusory. This is a dilemma I cannot solve or tackle head on.'[12] To summarily dismiss the 'religious resolution' as 'intellectually unsustainable' is an uncharitably off-handed failure to follow the evidence where it leads.

O'Hear's chapter on beauty in Beyond Evolution ends with the thought that, 'despite the problems of alienation thrown up by science and morality'[13] we nevertheless have a sense that we are (to some extent) at home in the world, and that nowhere do we meet this intuition quite so strongly as in aesthetic experience: 'From my point of view it is above all in aesthetic experience that we gain the fullest and most vividly lived sense that though we are creatures of Darwinian origin, our nature transcends our origin in tantalizing ways.'[14] (This is only to say that naturalistic evolution is incapable of adequately accounting for our aesthetic faculties.) Aesthetic experience, says O'Hear, promises to reconcile our particular and embedded aesthetic experiences 'to what might be thought of as our striving for some transcendent guarantee and consolation.'[15] For O'Hear, this tantalization is literal. The aesthetic experience that calls us home is an illusion, a 'whistling in the dark'[16] as he puts it (unless God is accepted after all), and this realization must leave us alone with our alienation.

O'Hear finds himself in exactly the same position as the author of *Ecclesiastes* who saw that everything was 'meaningless . . . under the sun [i.e. without reference to a transcendent God].' This is an experiential, existential aesthetic argument which works by proposing an integrated and intellectually satisfying world-view: 'Another satisfying insight of Theology', says John Polkinghorne, 'is the way in which it can tie together the diverse layers of our multivalued experience. . . We can see neither God nor electrons, but both make sense of the richness of reality.'[17]

Aesthetic Experience and Longing for God

If God exists and has designed us for relationship with Himself, as Christianity claims, one would expect people to find contentment only within such a relationship and to show signs of deprivation if such a relationship is lacking. That there is a deep need for God within the human heart was recognised by the biblical songwriter who wrote that 'As a deer longs for streams of cool water, so I long for you, O God.' (Psalm 42:1, GNB.) Christian writers through the ages have echoed this theme of longing. Augustine wrote in his Confessions that: 'You made us for yourself, O Lord, and our hearts are restless till they rest in you.'[18] Pascal wrote of how 'There is a god-shaped vacuum in the heart of every man, and only God can fill it.'[19]

Atheists also recognise the existence of a restless, unfulfilled desire for something more. Jean-Paul Satre admitted: 'my whole being cries out for God'. Bertrand Russell acknowledged that: 'The centre of me is always and eternally a terrible pain – a curious wild pain – a searching for something beyond what the world contains.'[20]

That the 'restless desire apart from God' predicted by the theistic hypothesis exists, and that

people who believe they have discovered relationship with God seem to have discovered the object that satiates this desire, is evidence in favour of the hypothesis; empirical confirmation of Jesus' claim that: 'this is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent' (John 17:3). As Pascal argued:

> Man tries unsuccessfully to fill this void with everything that surrounds him, seeking in absent things the help he cannot find in those that are present, but all are incapable of it. This infinite abyss can be filled only with an infinite. . . object. . . God himself.[21]

Pascal here perfectly describes secular culture in its futile search for fulfillment apart from God. As atheist Roger Scruton observes: 'The desolation of the god-forsaken city is proof of that higher world from which the soul descends.'[22]

This desire for God (which pulls against our fallen desire to be our own god) was discussed by Thomas Aquinas[23]and (though unpublished) by Pascal; but it was left to C.S.Lewis to present it as an argument for the Heaven of 'eternal life' with God:

> Creatures are not born with desires unless satisfaction for those desires exists. A baby feels hunger: well, there is such a thing as food. . . If I find in myself a desire which no experience in this world can satisfy, the most probable explanation is that I was made for another world.[24]

What has all this to do with aesthetic experience? Augustine provides our first clue: 'my sin was this, that I looked for pleasure, beauty, and truth not in him but in myself and his other creatures, and the search led me instead to pain, confusion, and error.'[25] Augustine's search eventually led to the discovery that God was the true object of his need, the true fountain of beauty (of all that is good, including truth and knowledge), and to the exclamation: 'Oh Beauty so old and so new! Too late have I loved thee!'

This same search for that transcendent something sensed within or through aesthetic experience was a golden-thread running through the life of C.S.Lewis:

> . . .if a man diligently followed this desire, pursuing the false objects until their falsity appeared and then resolutely abandoning them, he must come at last to the clear knowledge that the human soul was made to enjoy some object that is never fully given. . . in our present mode of. . . experience. This desire was. . . as the seige Perilous in Arthur's castle – the chair in which only one could sit. And if nature makes nothing in vain, the One who can sit in this chair must exist.[26]

As a literary scholar, Lewis picked up on the Romantic term Sehnucht to describe a family of emotional responses to the world (melancholy, wonder, yearning, etc.) which are linked by a sense of displacement or alienation from the object of desire. 'Sehnucht', writes Corbin Scott Carnell, 'may be said to represent just as much a basic theme in literature as love.'[27] The closest English translation for Sehnucht is probably 'nostalgic longing', and it arises when experience of something within the world awakens a desire for something beyond what the natural world can offer as a corresponding

object of desire. Sehnucht therefore directs our attention towards the transcendent, that which 'goes beyond' our present experience. The power of fairy-tales lie in their ability to transport us into a world transparently imbued with Sehnucht.[28] Peter Kreeft points to music, 'so powerful, the ancients spontaneously ascribed it to the gods'[29], as perhaps the most powerful producer of Sehnucht. However:

> The books or the music in which we thought the beauty was located will betray us if we trust them; it was not in them, it only came through them, and what came through them was longing. . . Do what we will, then, we remain conscious of a desire which no natural happiness will satisfy.[30]

This desire points, then, towards the existence of a supernatural happiness. Is there really any reason to suppose that reality offers satisfaction to this desire? Being hungry doesn't prove that we will get fed. True, but such a criticism misses the point. A man's hunger does not prove that he will get any food; he might die of starvation. But surely hunger proves that a man comes from a race which needs to eat and inhabits a world where edible substances exist: 'In the same way,' says Lewis, 'though I do not believe (I wish I did) that my desire for Paradise proves that I shall enjoy it, I think it a pretty good indication that such a thing exists and that some men will.'[31]

Lewis was impressed by Rudolph Otto's book The Idea of the Holy, in which 'the Numinous' is described as that which causes in those who perceive it a sense of awe. This sense of awe is not the fear that would be caused by believing a fierce animal was in the room with you, nor the supernatural dread of believing a ghost to be present, but the feeling of awe one might have if one simply believed that 'a great spirit' were present.[32] The Numinous is not the subjective experience, but the transcendent object about which one feels this sense of awe. The principle of credulity (that we should trust first impressions until given reason for doubt) encourages us to take the straight forward interpretation of such experience that the Numinous is an objective reality truly perceived.

The point of discussing the Numinous is the present context is that awe of the Numinous is one of that family of emotional states grouped together under the category of Sehnucht. Moreover, a sense of the Numinous often accompanies aesthetic experiences of the 'sublime' variety (i.e. the beauty of the great and majestic), such as a mountain or thunderstorm. This explains why mountains and climatic events feature so widely in the religious experience of the Jewish nation. Neither the aesthetic experience nor the immediate objects of that experience can be termed 'the Numinous'. The religious mind is quite capable, for example, of distinguishing between a burning bush and the presence of God mediated through the burning bush. Perception of the Numinous constitutes a whole new level or depth of experience.

Peter Kreeft writes of the human face as 'the most numinous, most magical matter in the world.'[33] Why? Because 'the surface of the face, like the appearance of the world, points. . . beyond the surface to. . . depths not of matter but of meaning.'[34] Kreeft explains that, like a poem, the face must both be and mean:

> A smile both is and means happiness; the word "happiness" only means it. There is no happiness in the word, as there is in the smile. . . A human face is more than a part of the body, an object; it is a part of the soul, a subject. . . It is the place where soul . . . transfigures

body. . .[35]

Like the face, the cosmos not only exists, but means: 'the whole world is a face.'[36] Kreeft distinguishes between the conventional sign, like letters in an alphabet that could have been different, and the natural sign that 'is a living example of what it signifies.'[37] For example, 'There is happiness in a smile, as there is not a curve ball in the catcher's two fingers signaling it.'[38] Just as the smile is a 'natural sign' of the happiness it signifies, so nature can be seen as a natural sign of the transcendent object of desire that makes itself immanent therein (nature does not appear to be a conventional sign). Is this seeing a true insight into ultimate reality, or a delusion? Again, in the absence of sufficient reason to doubt the existence of God, the principle of credulity would suggest that what seems to be the case is the case. One can easily explain how some people fail to 'read the sign', for we know that 'we can look at a sign instead of looking along it'[39] to that which it signifies.

Maybe it is due to a misplaced generalization of the scientific method, looking at the natural world rather than along it, that more people do not experience the world as a sign. (Of course, if the world is a sign, one must take into account its 'fallen' nature; this is why we only see 'through a glass, darkly'.) Some people set up scientific delectability as a metaphysical criterion of objective existence that thereby excludes God from their world-view as a window excludes wind from a room. However, such a criterion cannot pass its own test. How could it be proven scientifically that only scientifically knowable entities are objectively real? Science consciously restricts itself to the impersonal (although scientific data can ground rational conclusions about agents, as in forensic science and archaeology); but the person who declares that science disproves the existence of God is like a person who declares that windows disproves the existence of wind! Such a person would find no scientific category within which to place their own beliefs or personhood (Can matter be true or false about other matter?).[40] Perhaps we need to open the window a bit:

> Have you ever seen one of those picture puzzles that masks a face as jungle leaves or bushes? "Find the man in the picture." Once you do, the picture never looks the same again: it is not a jungle but a man. Once you see the face of God, the world is forever transformed into his features.[41]

How does sensitivity to the Numinous function as a variety of Sehnucht? I believe that part of the explanation lies with beauty functioning as a link to the divine source and standard of all goodness and beauty. That is, the link between objective beauty and objective goodness is the key to understanding the link between aesthetic and religious experience. It is therefore unsurprising to read atheist Roger Scruton affirming that 'When art and religion are healthy, they are also inseparable. . . for the aesthetic is rooted in the religious'[42] Nor does it come as a surprise to find him admitting that:

> In the sentiment of beauty we feel the purposiveness and intelligibility of everything that surrounds us, while in the sentiment of the sublime we seem to see beyond the world, to something overwhelming and inexpressible in which it is somehow grounded. . . it is in our feeling for beauty that the content, and even the truth, of religious doctrine is strangely and untranslatably intimated to us.[43]

Despite these observations, Scruton remains an atheist, recommending a 'let's pretend' philosophy of 'as if' to paper over the cracks of meaninglessness left in his secular world-view by the absence of God. High culture, says Scruton, 'teaches us to live as if our lives mattered eternally.'[44] This speaks for itself. I am inclined to agree with Peter Kreeft that 'Plato in the Symposium let the cat out of the bag. . . Only Beauty Itself, absolute, pure, unmixed, perfect and eternal, will satisfy the soul.'[45]

In aesthetic experience we find something which corresponds to an innate need for beauty, and yet the more beauty we experience, the more we notice the discrepancy between the beauty (and thus goodness) we perceive and our own ugliness of soul. From hence, as Aquinas wrote, 'reason tells us that because of the inadequacies we perceive in ourselves we need to subject ourselves to some superiour source of help and direction; and whatever that source might be, everybody calls it God.'[46]

Aesthetic experience gives us something we want, but only in part, satisfying our desire only to reveal within us a deeper need that no natural object seems to satisfy:

> . . .we want. . . something the books on aesthetics take little notice of. But the poets and the mythologies know all about it. We do not want merely to see beauty. . . We want something else which can hardly be put into words – to be united with the beauty we see. . . to receive it into ourselves. . . to become part of it. . . At present we are on the outside of the world, the wrong side of the door. We discern the freshness and purity of morning, but they do not make us feel fresh and pure. We cannot mingle with the splendours we see. But all the leaves of the New Testament are rustling with the rumour that it will not always be so. Some day, God willing, we shall get in. When human souls have become as perfect in voluntary obedience as the inanimate creation is in its lifeless obedience, then they will put on its glory, or rather that greater glory of which Nature is only the first sketch.[47]

Art and The Line of Despair

Christian apologist and evangelist Francis A. Shaeffer analysed modern culture in terms of the dichotomy it has set up between the rational realm of (objective, empirical) facts and the non-rational realm of (subjective, opinion relative) values. Shaeffer called the historical crossing-point after which this dichotomy arose 'the line of despair'.[48]

Shaeffer observed that a secular world-view that cuts a transcendent God out of its account of ultimate reality leads to the depersonalization of humanity in the realm of fact and the restriction of values (including moral goodness, beauty, and even truth) to the realm of subjective, relative, opinion. As a secular world-view grows, value is increasingly placed in the 'upper story' with a leap of blind faith required to avoid the obvious naturalistic conclusion that the 'death of God' leads to the 'death of value'.

While Shaeffer wrote in the 1970's, post-modernism was in its infancy, and culture as a whole still clung, though a non-rational leap of faith, to the existence of value. Today, the implications of the 'death of God', foreseen by Neiztche, has finally caught up with us:

> Where is God?' [cried the madman]. 'I shall tell you. We have killed him. . . All of us are his murderers. But how have we done this? . . . Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the horizon? What did we do to unchain this earth from its sun? . . . Where are we moving now? Away from all suns? Are we not plunging continually backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there any up or down left? Are we not straying through an infinite nothing?[49]

It is as if society has become exhausted with the attempt to hold on to objective value in the face of a world-view that provides no basis for their existence. Postmodern society is the result of the realisation that without the transcendent reference point provided by God, the 'upper story' of value has become nothing but an incoherent miscellany of subjective, relative opinions, governed more by fashion than common sense. Consider the similarities between the prophetic words of Neitzche and Roger Scruton's view of current post-modern culture:

> To understand the depth of the. . . 'as if' is to understand the condition of the modern soul. We know that we are animals, parts of the natural order, bound by laws which tie us to the material forces which govern everything. We believe that the gods are our invention, and that death is exactly what it seems. Our world has been disenchanted and our illusions destroyed. At the same time we cannot live as though that were the whole truth of our condition. Even modern people are compelled to praise and blame, love and hate, reward and punish. Even modern people. . . are aware of self, as the centre of their being; and even modern people try to connect to other selves around them. We therefore see others <u>as if</u> they were free beings, animated by a self. . . and with more than a worldly destiny. If we abandon that perception, then human relations dwindle into a machine-like parody. . . the world is voided of love, [moral] duty and [aesthetic] desire, and only the body remains. . .[50]

Briefly put, <u>Postmodernism necessitates an inconsistent life</u>. In the realm of fact we 'know' that people are the unintended products of material necessity, plus time, plus chance. We 'know' that God is a figment of our imagination. We 'know' that there is therefore no objective value in truth, goodness, or beauty. However, we cannot live as if all this were true (but then again, perhaps it isn't true!). Therefore, we must be inconsistent and live the lie of 'as if'.

Francis A. Shaeffer noted how some naturalists (such as Julian Huxley) admit that man 'functions better if he acts as through God is there', and he points out in a somewhat understated manner that: 'This is not an optimistic, happy, reasonable or brilliant answer. It is darkness and death.'[51] Allow me to illustrate matters from Roger Scruton's book, <u>An Intelligent Person's Guide to Modern Culture</u>, and from my own experience:

Although he is an atheist, Scruton's contention is that 'Culture. . . has a religious root and a religious meaning [such that] the point of being cultivated cannot, in the end, be explained without reference to the nature and value of religion.'[52] Scruton thinks that aesthetic objects invite us to place ourselves 'in relation to the thing considered', a search for a meaning that is not for practical benefit but 'for the insight which religion also provides: insight into the why and wither of our being here.'[53] With the rise of naturalism and secularism in the (so-called) Enlightenment art unsurprisingly came to the fore as a substitute religious experience: 'art became a redeeming enterprise, and the artist stepped into the place vacated by the prophet and the priest.'[54] Modernist culture rejected the

Medieval recognition of the 'face of God' in nature and art, but continued to seek the Numinous experience of Sehnsucht that it craved in an art devoid of transcendent reference point:

> The high culture of the Enlightenment. . . involved a noble and energetic attempt to rescue the ethical view of human life. . . which flourished spontaneously in the old religious culture. . . The rescue was a work of the imagination, in which the aesthetic attitude took over from religious worship as the source of intrinsic values.[55]

From the theistic point of view, one could say that the spiritual feelings of modernism were better than its philosophical thoughts. However, the rescue attempt (however noble in intent) was doomed from the start, and the theist has an explanation for this failure: God is the source of aesthetic value as well as ethical value. Cut off from its source, aesthetic value no less than ethical value was bound to wither and die. After the 'death of God' it would not be long before people realised this was so; but instead of preserving the meaning of spiritual experience by reacknowledging its transcendent source, post-modernism held on to naturalism and accepted the objective meaninglessness of all value. As Scruton says, 'When religion dies. . . the vision of man's higher nature is conserved by art. But art cannot be a substitute for religion, nor does it fill the void that is left by faith.'[56]

Walking through a Cambridge museum with a friend I was struck by the changing themes apparent in the historically ordered art collection.[57] Many of the earlier paintings had a religious theme, paintings of nature became more prominent as time went on, but the general impression produced by these art-works was one of artistic beauty and meaning. I could sense that the artists were saying 'Look, this person or event is important (often theologically so)', or 'Look, this is beautiful.' As we reached the Enlightenment, detailed still-life studies and portraits of wealthy people who had paid to be immortalised on canvas dominated the collection. Art had begun to serve man. Finally, we reached galleries of twentieth century art. The change of mood was even more pronounced and all the more disturbing, for this art clearly expressed a disturbed mindset. Images of pain and depression filled me with a sense of tragic compassion in stark contrast with the beauty and hope we had just seen filling the art of so many preceding centuries. I think that this decline of beauty in art and the decline of faith in God are linked; it's just too much of a coincidence otherwise.

If God exists, then to worship the beauty of art in the Enlightenment manner is to make art into an idol, to mistake the sign for the subject, the face for the person. As Peter Kreeft warns: 'Since an idol is not God, no matter how sincere or passionately it is treated as God, it is bound to break the heart of its worshipper, sooner or later. Good motives for idolatry cannot remove the objective fact that the idol is an unreality. . . You can't get blood out of a stone or divine joy from nondivine things.'[58]

If art begins to reveal our broken cultural heart, then this is some confirmation of the suggestion that art as idol has failed (as all idols must); but the pain of artistic mis-use should re-direct us towards art's healthy, religious use (and by 'religious use' I do not mean art with a liturgical function or an explicitly religious subject matter; but rather art produced within a religious context).

If, as Scruton claims, healthy art is inseparable from healthy religion, then either God exists and explains this connection, or God does not exist, and the world is absurd. Why absurd? Because a world in which aesthetic value depends upon the retention of belief in a non-existent God is a

world that asks us to hypocritically predicate value on a falsehood. Therefore, if the world is not thus absurd, God both exists and grounds aesthetic value.

The hypothesis that God is the only sufficient condition of the objectivity and meaningfulness of aesthetic value explains (what otherwise seems inexplicable) why the flowers of artistic high culture that flourished under the world-view of Christendom turn to rancor in a secular society: 'if you consider the high culture of modern times', writes Scruton, 'you will be struck by the theme of alienation which runs through so many of its products. . . the high culture of our society, having ceased to be a meditation on the common religion, has become instead a meditation on the lack of it.'[59] What is it that people miss so much that they devote a large proportion of our culture's artistic output to mourning its loss? The answer is simple: God.

Francis Shaeffer also pointed out how a naturalistic world-view leads to the denial of those aspects of personhood which is essential to the existence of meaningful aesthetic experience. The denial of any objective reality besides matter is the denial of what Shaeffer called 'the mannishness of man' (and which, in these more 'politically correct' times, we might call 'the personhood of persons'):

> Those aspects of man, such as significance, love, relationship, rationality and the fear of nonbeing, which mark him off from animals and machines and give evidence of his being created in the image of a personal God.[60]

In denying that any reality, let alone ultimate reality, is personal, the naturalist has no room for the 'mannishness of man'. For example, atheist Francis Crick writes that, 'You. . . your sense of personal identity and free-will, are in fact no more than the behaviour of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules.'[61] As Shaeffer put it: 'if man has been kicked up by chance out of what is only impersonal, then those things that make him man – hope of purpose and significance, love, motions of morality and rationality, beauty and verbal communication – are ultimately unfulfillable and are thus meaningless.'[62] Naturalism therefore leads to Nihilism, of which post-modernism is really an expression[63]: 'The existential vacuum which is the mass neurosis of the present time can be described as a private and personal form of nihilism' wrote psychiatrist Victor E. Frankl, 'for nihilism can be defined as the contention that being has no meaning.'[64]

No one, says Shaeffer, has ever worked out how to obtain the personal from the impersonal (a feat that would involve getting the greater from the lesser) so that theism, in which ultimate reality is personal, constitutes an eminently reasonable alternative to naturalism: 'Our generation longs for the reality of personality, but it cannot find it. But Christianity says personality is valid because personality has not just appeared in the universe, but rather is rooted in the personal God who has always been.'[65]

The relevancy of this line of argument to the validity of aesthetic experience is straight forward enough: only people can mean things or impart meaning to things, and so only through personality can art have any meaning. Aesthetic value is, I have argued, an objective reality that cannot be reduced to 'nothing but atoms in the void'. Therefore naturalism should not look like a good candidate for a world-view to anyone who wants to retain a reasonable belief in aesthetic value, and this gives one reason to prefer theism. Moreover, only persons can appreciate aesthetic value, since only persons can appreciate anything at all. Therefore, if one accepts that naturalism involves a

denial of the 'mannishness of man', then one ought to look favorably upon theism as a world-view capable of giving aesthetic appreciation a welcoming home.
Clark H. Pinnock

Pinnock is one of the few writers of a 'popular' apologetic to mention beauty as a 'clue' to the existence of God. There are two epistemological aesthetic arguments given by Pinnock. The first can be formalised as follows:

1) In our appreciation of works of human art we are familiar with the existence of beauty that has not been produced by accident or pure chance. Rather, we experience a 'form of communication'[66] through which we perceive 'intelligence, thought, and feeling'.[67]
2) We often have the same (or at least a similar) experience when we encounter the physical universe; we often find ourselves experiencing the universe 'as a work of art' that draws from us 'gratitude to the unseen Artist'[68]
3) Like causes (at least generally speaking) produce like effects.
4) Therefore, our experience of the physical universe as artistic beauty, being at least similar to our experience of human art, is reason to infer the existence of a human-like Artist with 'intelligence, thought, and feeling'[69] behind the universe.

Pinnock's second argument takes the following form:

1) From a secular standpoint, our capacity to appreciate beauty: 'must seem an unaccounted-for "extra" thrown in by chance. . . lacking as it does any survival value in terms of our evolution.'[70]
2) It would therefore be reasonable to accept any explanation of our capacity to appreciate beauty that made the existence of this capacity more likely than the secular explanation.
3) If our capacity to appreciate beauty derives from the creative activity of an un-evolved being with a capacity to appreciate beauty, then our possession of that capacity would be more likely than it is on the secular explanation.
4) Therefore, it is reasonable to think that our capacity to appreciate beauty derives from the creative (and therefore intelligent and purposive) activity of an un-evolved being with a capacity to appreciate beauty.

Professor H.E.Huntley in The Divine Proportion - A Study In Mathematical Beauty, pursues this evolutionary angle on the aesthetic argument. Huntley poses the evolutionary puzzle of our aesthetic sense thus:

> . . . we might begin by asking whether the universal human thirst for beauty serves a useful purpose. Physical hunger and thirst ensure our bodily survival. The sex drive takes care of the survival of the race. Fear has survival value. But - to put the question crudely - what is beauty for? What personal or evolutionary end is met by the appreciation of a rainbow, a flower or a symphony? At first sight, none."[71]

Huntley's partial answer goes like this:

> . . .part of the answer is that it serves as a lure to induce the mind to embark on creative activity. Beauty is a bait. This view seems to require the existence of "absolute" beauty, to demand that specimens of beauty antedate the human perception of them, although beauty in its subjective sense is called into existence only at the moment of its appreciation.[72]

Of course, if our appreciation of beauty does have an evolutionary (efficient) explanation, this does not exclude the possibility that our appreciation is also the result of divine (teleological) intention. As Stephen R. L. Clark writes:

> I am myself quite happy to agree that our desires and our rational evaluations are just what might be expected of a placental mammal with a lengthy infancy, sexual dimorphism, and the gift of the gab. This is not inconsistent with the thought that we are that sort of placental mammal because we were intended to be rational lovers of the good, the beautiful and the true. . . My own conclusion is that the Beautiful is indeed a constraint on what can happen, and that natural selection and engineering efficiency have generated - because so they were intended - creatures that can look directly towards the Beautiful. . .[73]

W.S.Rhodes also agrees with Pinnock, although he is a little more circumspect:

> The sense of beauty in human beings. . . has no obvious survival value. Human sensitivity to beauty cannot be accounted for on materialist lines and the beauty of the world only partly so. Unless there is an intelligence sensitive to beauty in some way directing the course of things the facts must remain without full explanation.[74]

Even Anthony O'Hear concurs with Pinnock et al that: 'from a Darwinian perspective, truth, goodness, and beauty and our care for them are very hard to explain.' He goes on to say that, 'For some, speculation about the origin of our non-Darwinian concerns would take a religious direction.'[75] O'Hear does not take this direction himself, but gives no reason for his refusal. Huntley's analysis nevertheless suggests that Pinnock's reasons for asserting that our capacity to appreciate beauty lacks any survival value is, at the very least, rather too summary.

J.P.Moreland

Moreland's Scaling The Secular City, carries endorsements from such luminaries as William Lane Craig, Norman L. Geisler and Dallas Willard and his over-all defence of the design argument, within which he defends some aesthetic arguments, is of the first order.

Moreland begins by suggesting that 'two different orders of beauty are used in the design argument: the beauty of the world itself and some of its aspects, and the beauty of the theories which accurately describe the world and some of its aspects.'[76] Such a duality in the aesthetic realm is not a unique proposition in the literature, although there seems to be no agreement upon the content assigned to the aesthetic classes thus produced.

Moreland affirms that features of the world such as 'a sun-set, fall in Vermont, the human body, the Rocky Mountains [and] the singing of birds. . . all exhibit real, objective beauty.'[77] He also says that 'if one denies the objectivity of beauty, then this sort of design will not be of use in arguing for a designer.'[78] It is therefore rather disappointing that for Moreland, 'Space does not allow for a defence of the objectivity of beauty.'[79]

I do not see why Moreland produces the conclusion that only objective beauty is of use to the apologist. F.R.Tennant contradicts Moreland, saying that whether the beauty of nature is to be 'subjectively constituted' or is 'wholly objective and literally intrinsic', 'these controversial questions are here immaterial. . .'[80]; for:

> If we minimize phenomenal Nature's gift by denying that her beauty is intrinsic. . . we must allow to ontal Nature an intrinsic constitution such that minds can make beauty. . . out of it. And the more we magnify man's part in this making, phenominalising, and appreciating, the more motivation have we to believe that Nature comes to herself in man, has a significance for man that exists not for herself, and without man is a broken circle. Theologically expressed, this is the belief that Nature is meaningless and valueless without God behind it and man in front. . .[81]

If beauty is not objective, then clearly it is either subjective or non-existent. Since beauty patently exists, the only choice is to give it objective or subjective characterisation. However, Tennant seems to me to demonstrate that inductive forms of aesthetic argument operate independently of questions about the objectivity or subjectivity of beauty.

Moreland argues that: 'the beauty in the examples cannot be accounted for in terms of survival value, natural selection, and the like.'[82] For this conclusion he gives the following reasons:

> . . .some of the examples (the Rocky Mountains) are not biological organisms. Further, even when one considers biological organisms (the human body) it is not clear that the beauty of those organisms is related to their survival. Since science does not deal with value qualities (aesthetic or moral) in its descriptions of the world, then beauty as an aesthetic property is not a part of evolutionary theory.[83]

The thought underlying these comments, which Moreland leaves undeveloped, is this: Since naturalistic explanations of the world give no a priori reason to expect beauty to arise in either the biological or non-biological realm, a theistic explanation, which can invoke teleology to explain this fact, gains a measure of credibility. As W.S.Rhodes says, 'It is difficult to believe that so many beautiful things came into being without any kind of direction by a power sensitive to beauty.'[84]

Attributing biological beauty to a naturalistic evolutionary process hardly accounts for the overwhelming amount and degree of beauty produced, since it doesn't explain why there should be a connection between beauty and survival value. W.S.Rhodes argues from the beauty of flowers:

> . . .pollination by insects may be the means by which beautiful forms and colours are selected. We have then to suppose that the remarkable beauty of form and colour has developed because insects are attracted to these characteristics. They can be shown to be

> attracted to bright colours. But the point here is not the brightness of the colour, but its delicacy as compared. . . with the crudity of artificial ones.[85]

(As Rev'd Garth Barber suggested to me in conversation, it might be thought rather an interesting observation that 'Nature's colours never clash.')

It can hardly be imagined that insects appreciate beauty in the flowers whose evolution they have helped to shape. I doubt that bees, for instance, are conscious; let alone self-conscious. Rather, these insects are attracted to certain wavelengths of light, beyond those visible to the human eye, which are reflected by flowers. The naturalistic evolutionary explanation does not explain why the evolutionary pressure of insects unconcerned with beauty should lead to the existence of flowers which, purely as a side-effect of their insect-attracting ultra-violet colouring possess beautiful colours in the very spectrum of light visible to the creatures capable of appreciating that beauty; creatures who played no role in the evolution of the beauty they appreciate. It may be possible that the interplay of chance gene mutation and environmental pressure should produce such a fortuitous 'side-effect', but it does not seem a very likely, elegant, or neat explanation of the facts.

Nor, as Moreland says, can the theory of evolution account for the beauty of objects, like the Rocky Mountains, which did not evolve. As Aristotle noted: 'it is unlikely that fire, earth, or any such element [i.e. that any material cause or the efficient causes thereof] should be why things manifest goodness and beauty.'[86]

Augustine's remarks on this subject have lost none of their relevance to the discovery of evolution:

> And even if we take out of account the necessary functions of the parts, there is a harmonious congruence between them, a beauty in their equality and correspondence, so much so that one would be at a loss to say whether utility or beauty is the major consideration in their creation. . . There is no visible part of the body which is merely adapted to its function without being also of aesthetic value. . . Hence it can, I think, readily be inferred that in the design of the human body dignity was a more important consideration than utility."[87]

This is not a matter of arguing for a 'God-of-the-gaps', because the explanatory gap being referred to is one inherent to the structure of scientific explanation. As John Polkinghorne testifies, 'Beauty slips through the scientist's net.'[88] The metaphysical explanation for beauty available to the theist does not rule out scientific explanation, but rather subsumes it within a wider explanatory teleology which seems capable of providing a more adequate (though more complex) account of the place of beauty in the cosmos. The theistic hypothesis, as Keith Ward argues, makes sense of the fact that: 'scientists often do appeal to teleological reasons, to a sense of beauty and elegance, in choosing ultimate theories.'[89]

Moreland adduces aesthetic arguments from each of the two orders of beauty he delineates, the beauty of the world, and the beauty of the theories that describe that world. The first of these arguments is that: 'some would argue that the beauty of the world and many of its aspects points to the existence of a grand Artist.'[90] The second argument is that: 'Beautiful theories or systems of thought which are mere inventions get their beauty from the superior human intellect which formed them. Similarly, beautiful theories, which are discovered and which accurately reflect the way the

world is, get their beauty from the Mind which formed them.'[91]

In support of this contention Moreland notes that 'Philosophers of science have often pointed out that one of the criteria for a true (or rational) scientific theory is its elegance or beauty'"[92] For example, 'Stanley L. Jaki points out that Albert Einstein and Erwin Shrodinger were guided by the conviction, borne out by previous scientific discoveries, that a good scientific theory would safeguard the beauty of nature and would itself be formally or mathematically beautiful.'[93]

Physicist Paul Davies notes that: 'It is widely believed among scientists that beauty is a reliable guide to truth, and many advances in theoretical physics have been made by the theorist demanding mathematical elegance of a new theory.'[94] 'Sometimes', says Davies, 'when laboratory tests are difficult, these aesthetic criteria are considered even more important than experiment.'[95]

Responding to the proposal that our capacity to know beauty can be accounted for by natural selection, Davies seems to be on to something when he responds thus:

> If beauty is entirely biologically programmed, selected for its survival value alone, it is all the more surprising to see it re-emerge in the esoteric world of fundamental physics, which has no direct connection with biology. On the other hand, if beauty is more than mere biology at work, if our aesthetic appreciation stems from contact with something firmer and more pervasive, then it is surely a fact of major significance that the fundamental laws of the universe seem to reflect this "something".[96]

Either way, 'the unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics', as Eugene Wigner called this conundrum, can be seen as lending itself to theistic interpretation.

Moreland's arguments boil down to the same general suggestion: that the analogy between examples of beauty produced by humans and the beauty discovered by humans both in the cosmos itself and in accurate descriptions thereof, may reasonably lead us to infer the existence of a human-like 'grand artist' or 'mind' behind that cosmos. After all, 'cosmos' is a Greek word meaning 'ordered beauty'. Aesthetic arguments seek to suggest that this term is applicable in its most literal sense.

John Polkinghorne has written extensively about the place of beauty in the mathematics employed by physicists, and the implications of this fact for natural theology. He argues that:

> We live in a world whose physical fabric is endowed with transparent rational beauty. . . There is no a priori reason why beautiful equations should prove to be the clue to understanding nature. . . It is a contingent fact that this is true. . . but it does not seem sufficient simply to regard it as a happy accident.[97]

In Polkinghorne's most accessible book, quarks, chaos & christianity, he summarises his thoughts on mathematical beauty and natural theology: 'I'm not saying, 'Science works, therefore God exists. QED'. . . I am saying, that the existence of the Creator would explain why the world is so profoundly intelligible, and I can't see any other explanation that works half as well.'[98]

F.R.Tennant

'The beauty and sublimity of Nature have been made the basis of a special teleological argument; and if, as standing by itself, this argument falls short of cogency, the facts from which it sets out may be said to form a link in the chain of evidence which comprehensive teleology presents.'
- F.R.Tennant.[99]

Tennant discusses the apologetic value of beauty in his now classic chapter on 'Cosmic Teleology' in volume two of his Philosophical Theology, first published in 1930. Tennant begins by ciriticising the analogical aesthetic argument: 'The weak spot in what purports to be a special proof of theism lies', says Tennant, 'in the assumption that, since in human art a beautiful or sublime production is the outcome of human design, similar effects must everywhere be due to design.'[100] He suggests that this generalization 'is all too precarious'[101], since 'it can hardly be maintained that arrangements of matter, accounted beautiful, humanly caused but not contrived or selectively constructed with a view to exciting aesthetic admiration, never occur.'[102] He admits that we may deem 'such explanation to be natural and reasonable; but it is hardly necessitated by the considerations on which this would-be coercive argument relies.'[103]

Tennant's criticism of aesthetic argument of the type employed by Moreland and Pinnock seems to me to be overplayed. This argument has no pretense of being a 'coercive argument'. The fact that Moreland's presentation of the aesthetic argument is so brief indicates that he puts little store by the argument, even as part of a multi-stranded design argument. For his part, Pinnock only claims that his argument provides a 'clue' to the existence of God. As W.S.Rhodes says, 'the argument from beauty has some force. It is not in itself compelling but contributes to the cumulative argument for the reality of the Divine.'[104] This is an approach to theistic arguments endorsed by philosophers like Brian Davies and Richard Swinburne. While Tennant is right that 'it can hardly be maintained that arrangements of matter, accounted beautiful, humanly caused but not contrived or selectively constructed with a view to exciting aesthetic admiration, never occur."[105], such accidental arrangements are at least rare, which is all the argument requires. Such arrangements do at least speak of the beauty of the parts involved and/or (at the very least) their suitability for the production of beauty; a suitability that we might attribute to design as we attribute the suitability of Lego for building diverse objects to design.

Moreover, all Tennant's supposed counter-example shows is that uncontrived beauty may occur without the intentional involvement of an agent; for how can a 'happy accident' occur without a background of intentional action? As Kreeft & Tacelli argue: 'we can understand chance only against a background of order. . . If you take away order and speak of chance alone as a kind of ultimate source, you have taken away the only background that allows us to speak meaningfully of chance at all.'[106]

I anticipate that this response will be accused of begging-the-question against the implicit suggestion that the beauty of nature does not necessitate the existence of a divine artist because it could be purely accidental. However, this accusation itself begs-the-question by assuming that simply because the activity of an agent can produce unintended beauty, examples of beauty can be produced in the absence of any and all intentional agents. While we know that beauty can be the by-product of an agent's actions, this does not in itself show that beauty can occur without either being the product or by-product of an agent's actions. Even if beauty can occur without being either the product or byproduct of agents, one could still argue that this was not very likely, and that attributing

beauty to an agent is therefore a better explanation than attributing it to luck.

Tennant says that 'The aesthetic argument for theism becomes more persuasive when it renounces all claim to proof and appeal to alogical probability.'[107], but alogical probability is all the analogical aesthetic argument has ever claimed. In the end, Tennant admits that 'We may deem such explanation [in terms of an artistic deity whose existence is inferred by analogy or best explanation] to be natural and reasonable'[108], and this is all that the argument requires.

Having criticized (unsuccessfully as it seems to me) one form of the aesthetic argument, Tennant goes on to produce his own versions of the genre. He starts with the obvious assertion that 'Nature is sublime or beautiful, and the exceptions do but prove the rule.'[109] Again, 'Nature elicits aesthetic sentiment from men severally and collectively; and the more fastidious becomes this taste, the more poignantly and the more lavishly does she gratify it.'[110] And once again, 'The universality of Nature's beauty. . . is a generalization roughly comparable with the uniformity of natural law. That natural objects evoke aesthetic sentiment is as much a fact about them as that they obey the laws of motion. . .'[111]

Tennant's next premise is that: 'In general, man's productions (other than professed works of art), and almost only they, are aesthetically vile [ugly]. . . We might almost say the one [human agency] never achieves, while the other [nature] never misses, the beautiful.'[112]

This generalization applies, says Tennant, both to the products and productive processes of humanity and nature: 'Compare, *e.*g., "the rattling looms and the hammering noise of human workshops" with Nature's silent or musical constructiveness; or the devastating stinks of chemical works with Nature's fragrant distillations.'[113] Richard Swinburne would agree, for he writes that:

> If one thinks of ugliness as a negative quality, as opposed to being the mere absence of beauty, one would be hard put to think of any part of the pre-human world which is ugly; ugliness in this sense seems to arrive with the arrival of humans, who, knowingly or unknowingly, make something which could be beautiful ugly instead.[114]

Then comes the conclusion: 'If "God made the country" whereas man made the town - and the black country - we have a possible explanation of these things; but if the theism contained in this saying be rejected, explanation does not seem to be forthcoming.'[115] The beauty of nature, argues Tennant, cannot be co-extensive with either nature's 'mechanicalness', or its (supposed) lack of aesthetic design, 'as man's utilitarian productions shew.'[116] Concrete car parks, for example, are very utilitarian, but ugly.

Tennant is certainly on to something here, for as W.S.Rhodes writes:

> Beauty may be associated with fitness for function. . . Economy and precision in design gives one kind of aesthetic satisfaction. So it is with certain living things. . . Their form. . has been developed to meet functional needs and we judge it beautiful. Yet things exactly suited to their function are not necessarily beautiful. . . It is only in certain cases that fitness for function is sufficient to account for the beauty of an object. And it is only in certain cases that the beauty of living things can be attributed to fitness for function.[117]

Or as Tennant writes: 'we may still ask why Nature's mechanism affects us in such wise that we

deem her sublime and beautiful, since mere mechanism, as such, is under no universal necessity to do so, and what we may call human mechanisms [produced on purely utilitarian lines] usually fail to do so.'[118] Yet, 'this potency, describable as the Objective factor in beauty, belongs to Nature's very texture.'[119]

Tennant's second Aesthetic argument covers the same ground as Pinnock's second aesthetic argument, namely, our awareness of beauty in the light of evolutionary theory:

> . . . in so far as the mechanical stability and the analytic intelligibility of the inorganic world are concerned, beauty is a superfluity. . . in the organic world aesthetic pleasingness of colour, etc., seems to possess survival-value on but a limited scale, and then is not to be identified with the complex and intellectualised aesthetic sentiments of humanity, which apparently have no survival value. From the point of view of science, beauty. . . is, in both its subjective and its objective factors, . . . a biologically superfluous accompaniment of the cosmic process. Once more then lucky accidents and coincidences bewilderingly accumulate until the idea of purposiveness, already lying to hand as indispensable within the sphere of human conduct, is applied to effect the substitution of reasonable. . . probability for groundless contingency. If we do apply this category of design to the whole time-process, the beauty of Nature may not only be assigned a cause but also a meaning, or a revelational function. It may then be regarded as no mere by-product, like physical evil, in a teleologically ordered world whose raison d'etre is the realisation of other values - the moral and the religious.[120]

This version of the evolutionary aesthetic argument is stronger than Pinnock's because it takes into account some measure of survival value attributed to our appreciation of beauty.

Tennant produces a third aesthetic argument that picks up where the second argument left off: 'Indeed Nature's potency to evoke aesthetic sentiment. . . is efficient in the world's rapport with man. From its very origination religious experience seems to have been conditioned by the impressiveness of the awesomeness of natural phenomena, suggestive of an invisible and mysterious presence.'[121] He goes on:

> Aesthetic values are closely associated. . . with ethico-religious values. God reveals Himself. . . in many ways; and some men enter His Temple by Gate Beautiful. Values alone can provide guidance as to the world's meaning, structure being unable to suggest more than intellectual power. And beauty may well be a meaning. That is the element of sense contained in the romanticist's paradox, beauty is truth, or truth is beauty. . . .If Nature's beauty embody a purpose of God, it would seem to be a purpose *for* man, and to bespeak that God "is mindful of him". Theistically regarded, Nature's beauty is of a piece with the world's intelligibility and with its being a theatre for moral life; and thus far the case for theism is strengthened by aesthetic considerations.[122]

Keith Ward

'What gives life significance are experiences of intrinsic value.' – Keith Ward.[123]

Evolution, notes Ward, has produced 'consciousness, which can appreciate, interpret, understand and shape the physical world so as to realise new forms of value [including beauty] which can be enjoyed and shared with other conscious beings.'[124] 'For an extreme Darwinian', says Ward, this 'must always be an odd mischance, the incredible result of a million small errors in replication. . .'[125] How incredible that an outcome of such value should emerge from so many cosmic mistakes: 'How much more plausible it is to suppose that the whole emergent process is set up precisely so that the universe could come to generate communities of beings capable of self-knowledge and self-control [and of appreciating and creating beauty].'[126]

This argument combines wonder at the beauty of the world with wonder at our capacity for appreciating and contributing to that beauty. The crucial question to answer in this context is: 'Does the universe exhibit pitiless indifference to value, or is it essentially directed towards the free realisation of truth, beauty and goodness?'[127]

Ward picks up on the argument from aesthetic experience, saying that, '. . . religion is a positive response to intimations of purpose, of truth, beauty and goodness in the universe, and a pursuit of those things by a self-transforming acceptance of their magisterial authority. . .'[128]

Ward agrees with Tennant in seeing beauty as one factor which contributes to the rationality of believing the cosmos to have been created with a view to the instantiation of goodness by a divine being: 'If the universe is created by God, it clearly has a purpose, and I have briefly construed this purpose as the creation and contemplation of beauty and various forms of goodness, both by God and by finite minds.'[129] As W.R.Sorley put it, 'Without ideas of value, we may be able to answer the questions what? and How?, but only through them can we expect an answer to the question why?'[130]

Ward also suggests that, implicit within the work of scientists who appeal to teleological reasons and to their sense of beauty and elegance when picking ultimate theories, is a commitment 'to saying that the universe exists because it is beautiful, and that might be an ultimate reason for its existence.'[131] He sees this as a natural progression beyond strictly scientific explanation, when facing questions such as 'Why are there laws of nature?':

> At that point, the obvious sort of reason to offer is precisely a teleological reason, which would state how the initial state and the laws together are well formed to actualise states of value. As John Leslie says, the ultimate reason why things are as they are is likely to be: because they actualise great and distinctive values.[132]

Another contemporary philosopher who takes up Tennant's suggestion that beauty provides a motive, meaning, and purpose for creation, is Richard Swinburne. . .[133]

Richard Swinburne

Richard Swinburne devoted two paragraphs in his noted book The Existence of God to an inductive aesthetic argument, and continued its defence in Is There A God? On both occasions he subsumed the aesthetic argument under the design argument since, for Swinburne, 'Beauty consists in patterns

of order.'[134] Swinburne's inclusion of aesthetic argument under the heading of the design argument indicates that he views it of apologetic value only when considered as one indicator of Gods existence among many (indeed, this is Swinburne's apologetic approach overall). I will supplement these two texts with material from Swinburne's latest work, Providence and the Problem of Evil.

Swinburne argues that, if God exists, then He has

> . . .apparently overriding reason, for making, not merely an orderly world. . . but a beautiful world - at any rate to the extent to which it lies outside the control of creatures. (And he has reason too, I would suggest, even in whatever respects the world does lie within the control of creatures, to give them experience of beauty to develop, and perhaps some ugliness to annihilate.)[135]

In other worlds, the world looks much as we should expect it to look if it were created by God, because 'God has reason to make a basically beautiful world', and because 'he would seem to have overriding reason not to make a basically ugly world beyond the powers of creatures to improve.'[136]

This remains true, says Swinburne, 'whether or not anyone ever observes [the beauty of the world], but certainly if only one person ever observes it.'[137] Swinburne says that, 'it is also good that people admire what is beautiful; but the beauty of the beautiful does not depend on being recognized. How could it? For recognition of beauty, as of anything else, depends upon the existence of the feature before and independently of being recognized.'[138]

Even if this is not so, Swinburne argues that 'God has a very good reason for making a beautiful Universe, namely that he himself will admire it (not admire it because he made it, of course; but because what he made is admirable.)'[139] Keith Ward agrees, saying that 'if God is the imaginative creator, the cosmic artist, then of course God will know and appreciate the whole cosmic process.'[140]

Moreover, the goodness of subjective, enjoyed beauty constitutes one reason for God to create creatures with an aesthetic sense. As Augustine wrote: 'Then there is the beauty and utility of the natural creation, which the divine generosity has bestowed on man, for him to behold. . .'[141] So, there are two reason why God might be expected to make a world such as ours: that He may appreciate its beauty, and that creatures such as ourselves may appreciate the beauty both of God and of God's Creation. God's reason for making a basically beautiful world is that 'beauty is a good thing.'[142] The conclusion Swinburne draws is that 'if there is a God there is more reason to expect a basically beautiful world than a basically ugly one. . .'[143]

The next step in Swinburne's argument is to assert that 'A priori. . . there is no particular reason for expecting a basically beautiful rather than a basically ugly world.'[144] The conclusion to be drawn from this observation is that, 'if the world is [basically] beautiful, that fact would be evidence for God's existence.'[145] It only remains for Swinburne to point out that the world is indeed basically beautiful to complete his argument. While the judgement whether or not that the world is basically beautiful is one that every individual must make for themselves, agreeing that it is rounds off an apparently sound aesthetic argument for the existence of God.

Swinburne's best defence - or perhaps 'persuasive exemplification' would be a better description of his method - of the basic beauty of the world, and of the claim that the creation of beauty provides God with an overriding reason to make a world such as ours, comes in Providence

and the Problem of Evil:

> The existence of all concrete things. . . is good in itself. The more [things], the better. And better that they be arranged in a beautiful way. Could anyone who has come to admire sculpture possibly deny that? But better still is a moving sculpture - a process whereby trillions of concrete things emerge from simple beginnings. Could anyone who has come to admire dance possibly deny that? And good that they should come in kinds with marvelous patterns of colour, new kinds emerging from old - a living painting. The goodness of the existence and beauty of the non-conscious world. . . is so obvious, and yet it needs a poet to bring it alive. . . But is it not obvious that a good God would seek to bring about such beauty?[146]

Anthony O'Hear joins Swinburne's line of thought, observing that:

> Kant is very clear about what the. . . significance of the aesthetic judgement would be if it were. . . objective, particularly in respect of nature: that in perceiving part of the natural world as beautiful we would be 'pleading eloquently on the side of the realism of the aesthetic faculty in nature' - that is, that beneath our perception of beauty, nature is organized in our interest. . . If nature has been designed for our taste, then presumably much else in it must be for *us*. Continuing the thought, artistic beauty, too, involves a humanization of our surroundings, which is so much whistling in the dark if. . . our world is not humanized or humanizable. (It is no coincidence that the ugly in art, and the trivial, goes hand in hand with irreligion.)[147]

While this argument can only carry the strength appropriate to an argument to the best explanation (as all Swinburne's theistic arguments are), I agree that 'The argument surely works.'[148]

Many of the above arguments are inductive arguments making their appeal by analogy or by argument to the best explanation (which includes argument from the improbability of certain Facts given a naturalistic world-view). As such, these arguments only claim to provide probability for their conclusions, and are best seen in the context of the 'wider teleology' advanced by F.R.Tennant and Richard Swinburne, who undoubtedly provide the most sophisticated examples of inductive aesthetic arguments.

Beauty and the Design Argument

Analogical aesthetic argument is of course open to the same sorts of criticism leveled against the more common analogical design argument. Several criticisms have been made upon the analogical design argument, most notoriously by the sceptical Scottish philosopher David Hume. I will take a brief look at two of these criticisms, suggesting that they do not destroy the analogical design argument, and hence that they do not destroy the aesthetic version thereof. Indeed, I will argue that the aesthetic version of the analogical design argument may have the edge over, and provide support for, its apologetic cousin. I will also call upon the support of non-analogical design arguments,

seeking to show how they can be considered from an aesthetic angle.

It is popularly thought that the theory of evolution by natural selection decimated that analogical design argument (e.g. The eye resembles a watch in the intricate interplay of parts assembled to fulfil a function, watches have designers, so the eye probably has a designer). The universe, or objects within the universe, may indeed resemble a watch; but the 'watch' (which stands for any complex object of inter-related parts), we now know, was made by a natural process without teleological direction. Pre-Darwinian apologists may be forgiven for mistaking eyes and such-like for the products of intelligent design, but now science has stepped into the explanatory gap, and swept away the 'God-of-the-gaps'. So the critic might say.

But against this: The theist needn't deny that a natural process made objects such as the eye, but they can easily deny that this process was non-teleological. Besides, evolution is incapable of explaining all examples of order, because, as Dallas Willard reminds us, evolution: 'presupposes the existence of certain entities with specific potential behaviors and an environment of some specific kind that operates upon those entities in some specifically ordered fashion.'[149] That is, 'any sort of evolution of order of any kind will always presuppose preexisting order and preexisting entities governed by it.'[150]

If the universe produces 'watches' through a natural process then it seems eminently reasonable to construe that process itself as the product of design. After all, humans can build automated watch-making factories, so perhaps deity has built an automated life-making factory. Evolution may account for complex arrangements of matter such as eye-balls; but evolution is itself a complicated process involving raw materials being worked upon by the laws of natural selection (the mutation of genes, a changing environment, the survival of the fittest, etc.). Evolution, then, does not destroy the analogical design argument, it merely pushes it back a step, from the objects that make up the world, to the substances and processes that make the objects that make up the world. As Richard Swinburne says, 'Nature. . . is a machine-making machine. . . men make not only machines, but machine making machines. They may therefore naturally infer form nature which produces animals and plants, to a creator of nature similar to men who make machine-making machines.'[151]

Indeed, evidence is mounting that suggests that the emergence of biological life is 'written into' the laws of nature. Non-Christian scientists like Paul Davies and Michael J. Denton have in recent years written books that relate how their scientific studies have convinced them that the universe must be 'a put up job' precisely because it seems 'fine tuned' to produce sentient beings like ourselves.[152] The anthropic principle of 'Big Bang' cosmology is descending from the stars and into the realm of biology, right down into the biochemistry of life.

American biochemist Michael Behe, a Catholic with no theological objections to evolution, argues in Darwin's Black-Box that the biomolecular level of life is so full of 'irreducibly complex' molecular machines that it could not have evolved by step by step Darwinian natural selection. Irreducible complex systems, such as the paddling cilia cells, are composed of a number of mutually interdependent parts, each of which is functionally useless on its own (and indeed a drain on resources, therefore constituting an evolutionary disadvantage). The chances of random mutations throwing up all the necessary parts of an irreducibly complex system at the same time, and in the necessary co-ordinated way, are so astronomically high as to beggar belief. (We might also note that biochemistry reveals a world of literal machines, made primarily out of proteins, which strengthens the watchmaker analogy; but this is not the main drift of Behe's argument.)

Behe seems to draw the conclusion that the origin of life must have been the result of some special, miraculous act of creation (he is happy to accept evolution thereafter, an old earth, and the theory of a common ancestor), but his results seem to me to admit of another interpretation; namely that DNA was programmed with instructions to construct these irreducible complex systems. This programming might even have taken place through natural laws. My preferred response to Behe's argument is to see it as an extension of the anthropic principle into the realm of biochemistry.

Faced with such apparent 'fine tuning', we can make one of several responses. One is to say, 'How lucky for us that as a one-off fluke the only universe there is just happened to have those laws which led to the evolution of sentient beings.' (Pointing out that only in a universe such as ours would there be anyone to ponder the anthropic principle does nothing to lessen the surprise that a universe such as ours should exist in the first place.) Such a scenario is perhaps logically possible, but it seems implausible.

Another response is to say that there must be a great many different universes, all with different natural laws. This proposition is designed to lessen the implausibility of our fruitful universe existing, since there are many unfruitful universes 'out there'. The problem with this is, What explains the differentiation of many universes all with slightly different physical laws? What stops all those other universes having identical, or very similar, physical laws? 'Good luck' is again a possible but unreasonable answer, while the alternative is to say that there is some law which ensures 'universe law differentiation'. If so, that law itself seems to be 'fine tuned' to lead to the existence of at least one universe 'fine tuned' for the existence of sentient life. In response to that 'fine tuning' one cannot reply that perhaps it is only one such law among many, without entering into an infinite regress of explanation.

A plausible response then, in the face of the single 'fine tuned' universe we know exists (or to a posited 'fine tuned' law which ensures the existence of at least one 'fine tuned' universe among many), is that the universe (or the law that ensured its existence) was 'tuned' by an intelligent 'tuner'; God. As Keith Ward put it, "How much more plausible it is to suppose that the whole emergent process is set up precisely so that the universe could come to generate communities of beings capable of self-knowledge and self-control [and of appreciating and creating Beauty]."[153]

This 'fine tuning' is just as necessary to the existence of a cosmos as beautiful as ours, and to the existence of sentient beings capable of appreciating that beauty, as it is to the existence of sentient beings per se. This might suggest that one of God's purposes in creating a 'fine tuned' universe was the production of beauty and beings able to enjoy it. Indeed, Swinburne writes that 'the beauty of the evolution of the inanimate world from the Big Bang. . . would be quite enough of a reason for producing it, even if God were the only person to have observed it.'[154]

Another major charge leveled against the analogical design argument is that it does not provide unique warrant for the existence of a single designer. As David Hume put the objection, 'A great number of men join in building a house or a ship, in rearing a city, in framing a commonwealth, why may not several deities combine in framing a world?'[155]

But against this: First, Occam's razor compels us to postulate the least number of entities necessary to explain the available data, and in this instance that number is one.

Second, this is a cosmos, a coherent structure of 'ordered beauty'. This is a universe, a unified whole. As J.P.Moreland writes, "One God is a simpler explanation that the polytheistic one and it makes more intelligible the fact that we live in a universe and not a plurality of universes."[156]

Most Cathedrals (let alone cities) are a conglomeration of architectural styles, renovations, innovations, and re-building. The cosmos, on the other hand, possesses a unity in both its physical 'engineering', and in its artistic facets. Here we already begin to see the aesthetic design argument taking part in a mutually supportive 'wider teleology'. As Richard Swinburne argues, 'If there were more than one deity responsible for the order [and, we might add, the beauty] of the universe, we should expect to see characteristic marks of the handiwork of different deities in different parts of the universe, just as we see different workmanship in the different houses of a city.'[157]

Finally, the aesthetic analogical argument may have an advantage over the common analogical design argument in that while machines and buildings generally do have, in our experience, several builders (although they also generally have only one designer or architect), the artistic creation of worlds is usually the work of one artist, both in its inception and in its execution. A Middle-Earth, a Narnia, a Discworld, are the product of a Tolkein, a Lewis, a Pratchett. Our cosmos is perhaps more like a Middle-Earth, a Narnia, or a Discworld than it is a watch, or even an automated watch-making factory. Consequently, the aesthetic, artistic analogy is perhaps stronger than the industrial, engineering analogy; and points more clearly to a single Creator.

Towards Deductive Ontological Aesthetic Arguments For God

Many of the epistemological and ontological versions of aesthetic arguments point to an instrumental relationship between the existence and appreciation of objective beauty as a good fact. Because it is good that beauty be known, God has created creatures capable of such knowledge, and a cosmos of such beauty to be known. Because beauty is itself a good thing, God has created a beautiful cosmos. The existence of a cosmos that is beautiful, to the overwhelming extent that our cosmos displays this quality, is down to the existence of God. The existence of creatures capable of knowing and thus enjoying this beauty, is likewise down to God.

However, these inductive arguments do not seek to uncover any closer ontological link between God and beauty. They do nothing to support the intuition that God is not merely the source of such beauty as there is in the cosmos, and of our capacity for knowledge of that beauty, but is also the ontological ground of beauty per-se. This closer link is something that only a deductive ontological aesthetic argument could demonstrate.

Augustine's Deductive Ontological Aesthetic Argument

In the City of God, Augustine provides the following deductive aesthetic argument:

> . . .beauty. . . can be appreciated only by the mind. This would be impossible, if this 'idea' of beauty were not found in the mind. . . But even here, if this 'idea' of beauty were not subject to change, one person would not be a better judge of. . . beauty than another. . . and the same person could not make progress towards better judgement than before. And it is obvious that anything which admits of increase or decrease is changeable.
>
> This consideration has readily persuaded men of ability and learning. . . that the

> original 'idea' is not to be found in this sphere, where it is shown to be subject to change. . . so they saw that there must be some being in which the original form resides, unchangeable, and therefore incomparable. And they rightly believed that it is there that the origin of things is to be found, in the uncreated, which is the source of all creation.[158]

Augustine's general line of argument (couched in terms of a Platonic metaphysics which I think can, in part at least, be dispensed with) seems to be this: Given that beauty is objective, then our judgements about beauty must be measured against some objective standard which the human mind apprehends and employs. This standard of beauty cannot be constituted by any individual finite mental state, or collection thereof, or else it would of necessity be a subjective standard; and objective aesthetic judgements cannot depend upon a subjective aesthetic standard. Therefore, there must exist an objective standard of beauty that is independent of finite minds. However, an aesthetic standard or ideal is not the sort of thing that could possibly exist in the physical world. Therefore the standard of beauty must exist neither in finite minds, nor in the physical world, but in an infinite Mind. This argument, unlike the inductive aesthetic arguments given previously, depends upon an objective definition of beauty. Fortunately, I have already defended such a definition.

Aquinas and the Fourth Way:

Augustine's argument can be seen as an ancestor of Aquinas' Fourth Way argument from degrees of perfection:

> [a] Among beings there are some more and some less good. . . and the like [including, more or less beautiful]. But more and less are predicated of different things according as they resemble in their different ways something which is the maximum. . . so that there is something which is truest, something best, something noblest [and something most beautiful]. . . [b] Now the maximum in any genus is the cause of all in that genus, as fire, which is the maximum of heat, is the cause of all hot things. . . Therefore there must also be something which is to all beings the cause of their being, goodness, and every other perfection [including beauty]; and this we call God.[159]

F.C.Copleston comments on the two argumentative threads [a & b] woven into the 'fourth way':

> Aquinas argues that. . . Different kinds of finite things possess different perfections in diverse limited degrees. He then argues not only that [a] if there are different degrees of perfection like goodness there is a supreme good to which other things approximate but also that [b] all limited degrees of goodness are caused by the supreme good. . . The Platonic doctrine of participation seems to be involved. . . [and so] if the line of thought represented by the fourth way [b] is to mean anything to the average modern reader, it has to be presented in a rather different manner from that in which it is expressed by Aquinas who was able to assume in his readers ideas and points of view which can no longer be presupposed.[160]

According to Grunwald, the example of heat and fire is an attempt to 'bring the proof down from the heights of idealism to the depths of Thomistic realism'[161] Noted Thomist Etienne Gilson writes that, 'St. Thomas's example of the more and less hot should cause no illusions. It is simply a comparison. . . to help us understand the principle thesis.'[162] After all, Aquinas does not intend his argument to lead to the conclusion that God embodies maximal hotness! Rather, the argument works with 'great making properties' of the sort analysed in chapter one.

The best I can make of the thought that the objective goodness in facts other than the supreme good is 'caused by the supreme good' (other than by appeal to cosmological argument), is that there could be no non-supreme objective goodness if there were no supreme objective good by which 'derivative goods' could be judged as such. In other words, the second line of thought within the 'fourth way' [argument b] boils down to the first [argument a].

Francis A. Shaeffer and God as Personal Universal

Augustine's argument can also be seen in Francis Shaeffer's suggestion (against Plato's impersonal theory of Forms) that only by beginning with a personal ultimate reality can we reasonably aspire to the use of the universal categories of value necessary to a meaningful existence: 'if you begin with the impersonal. . . there is no place for morals as morals [or beauty as beauty]. There is no standard in the universe which gives final meaning to such words as right and wrong [or beautiful and ugly]. If you begin with the impersonal, the universe is totally silent concerning any such words.'[163] This must be right, for if non-human reality is impersonal the only home for value is the finite, subjective individual: 'The Greeks understood that if we were really to know what was right and what was wrong [beautiful or ugly], we must have a universal to cover all the particulars.'[164] However, while the Greek gods 'were personal gods – in contrast to the Eastern gods, who include everything and are impersonal – they were not big enough. Consequently, because their gods were not big enough, the problem [of universal categories] remained unsolved for the Greeks.'[165] This is where God provides what the Greeks lacked, an objective (though particular) instantiation of maximal, perfect goodness and beauty by which worldly particulars can be judged.

Objective Beauty and the Moral Argument:

The objective definition of beauty provided in chapter four lends itself to a similar deductive argument for the existence of God. Since my proposed definition of beauty depends upon the existence of objective moral values, the moral argument for God's existence can easily be converted into an aesthetic argument, simply by adding an additional premise at its beginning; i.e: 'Objective beauty exists and as such is objectively good to appreciate.' The link this argument forges between divinity and objective beauty is the same as the link proposed by the Moral argument between objective goodness and divinity; namely, that without divinity - which necessarily exemplifies, as an intrinsic constituent of the divine nature and character, total objective goodness (and hence total objective beauty) - there would be no objective good, and without objective good, no objective

beauty, because nothing can be objectively beautiful that it is not objectively good to appreciate.

Just as Kreeft & Tacelli's deductive experiential aesthetic argument possessed no unique apologetic force, relying as it did upon a different class of argument (e.g. cosmological), so this deductive aesthetic argument has no unique apologetic force, relying as it does upon the Moral argument. However, the fact that objective beauty - construed in the manner that I have advocated - is dependent upon God being the objective exemplification of goodness that the Moral argument aims at proving, is of intrinsic interest.

Recommended Reading:

On Aesthetic Arguments in General:

Corbin Scott Carnell, Bright Shadow of Reality – Spiritual Longing in C.S.Lewis, (Eerdmans, 1999). (2)
Stephen R.L.Clark, God, Religion and Reality, (SPCK, 1998). (3)
Anthony O'Hear, Beyond Evolution, (Oxford). (3)
Peter Kreeft, Heaven, The Heart's deepest Longing, (Ignatius, 1989). (2)
C.S.Lewis, 'The Weight of Glory' in Screwtape Proposes a Toast – and other essays, (Fount). (1)
C.S.Lewis, Till We Have Faces, (Fount). (1)
Alister McGrath, 'C.S.Lewis: Longing for God' in A Cloud of Witnesses, (IVP, 1992). (1)
Clark H. Pinnock, Reason Enough, (Paternoster Press). (1)
John Polkinghorne, quarks, chaos & christianity, (Triangle, 1994). (1)
W.S.Rhodes, The Christian God, (ISPCK). (1)
Richard Swinburne, The Existence of God, (Oxford, 1991). (4)
Richard Swinburne, Is There A God?, (Oxford, 1996). (3)
Richard Swinburne, Providence and the Problem of Evil, (Oxford, 1998). (3)
F.R.Tennant, Philosophical Theology, volume two. (3)
Keith Ward, God, Chance, & Necessity, (OneWorld, 1996). (3)
Peter S. Williams: The Case For God, (Monarch, 1999), chapters four & seven. (2)

Design Arguments in General:

Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box, (Free Press). (3)
William A. Dembski, The Design Inference, (Cambridge, 1998). (4)
William A. Dembski ed., Mere Creation, Science, Faith & Intelligent Design, (IVP, 1998). (2-4)
Michael J. Denton, Nature's Destiny, (Free Press, 1998). (3)
Phillip E. Johnson, Testing Darwinism, (IVP, 1997). (1)
Peter Kreeft & Ronald Tacelli, Handbook of Christian Apologetics, (Monarch, 1995). (1)
J.P.Moreland, Scaling the Secular City, (Baker, 1987). (3)
Alvin Plantinga, Warrant and Proper Function, (Oxford, 1993). (4)
Richard Swinburne, The Existence of God, (Oxford, 1991). (4)
Richard Swinburne, Is There A God?, (Oxford, 1996). (3)
F.R.Tennant, Philosophical Theology, volume two. (3)

Keith Ward, God, Chance, & Necessity, (OneWorld, 1996). (3)
Peter S. Williams: The Case For God, (Monarch, 1999). (2)
Notes.

---

[1] This is also the case with my own The Case for God, (Monarch, 1999), which I wrote before my MPhil research led me to investigate these arguments in greater depth.
[2] Peter Kreeft & Ronald Tacelli, Handbook of Christian Apologetics, (Monarch, 1995), P81.
[3] P88.
[4] I happen to think that this is possible, with an argument from Dependency of the type defended by David W. Beck the best philosophical bet (see: In Defence of Miracles, ed R. Douglas Geivett & Gary R. Habermas, Apollos, 1997). See also my The Case For God, (Monarch, 1999).
[5] Kreeft & Tacelli, op cit, p81.
[6] ibid, P81, My italics.
[7] Peter Kreeft, Does God Exist? The Debate between Theists & Atheists, (Prometheus, 1993), P27.
[8] Peter Kreeft, Heaven – The Heart's Deepest Longing, (Ignatius, 1989), p111.
[9] John Polkinghorne, Serious Talk, p56.
[10] Anthony O'Hear, Beyond Evolution, p195.
[11] ibid, *Beyond Evolution*, p199 & 201.
[12] ibid.
[13] ibid.
[14] ibid, p202.
[15] ibid, p214.
[16] ibid, p195.
[17] John Polkinghorne, Serious Talk, p56 & 111.
[18] Augustine, Confessions, (Oxford).
[19] Blaise Pascal, Pensees, (Oxford, 1995).
[20] Bertrand Russell, quoted by Philip Yancey, Disapointment with God, p253.
[21] Pascal, op chit, Penesse 181.
[22] Roger Scruton, An Intelligent Person's Guide To Modern Culture, (Duckworth, 1998), p74.
[23] See Summa Theologica, 1a, 2, 1, ad1. See also F.C.Copleston, Aquinas; & Peter S. Williams, The Case For God, (Monarch, 1999), p325-328.
[24] C.S.Lewis, Mere Christianity. This is the greatest conclusion of any argument I know, since it argues not only for the existence of God, but for the existence of Heaven as well, including thereby the possibility of personal immortality.
[25] Augustine, Confessions.
[26] C.S.Lewis, The Pilgrim's Regress, (Fount).
[27] Corbin Scott Carnell, Bright Shadow of Reality – Spiritual Longing in C.S.Lewis, (Eerdmans, 1999), p23.
[28] Consider Lewis Caroll's Alice in Wonderland & Through the Looking-glass; Ursula Le Guin's Earthsea books; Mervyn Peake's Gormenghast trilogy; & J.R.R.Tolkein's Lord of The Ring.
[29] ibid, p110-111.
[30] C.S.Lewis, 'The Weight of Glory'.
[31] ibid.

[32] This illustration closely follows that given by Lewis in The Problem of Pain, (Fount).
[33] Peter Kreeft, Heaven – The Heart's Deepest Longing, p99.
[34] ibid.
[35] ibid.
[36] ibid, p101.
[37] ibid, p115.
[38] ibid.
[39] ibid, p112. See C.S.Lewis, 'Meditation in a tool shed' in Compelling Reason, (Fount).
[40] For a critique of naturalism see C.S.Lewis, Miracles, (Fount), chapter three; & J.P.Moraland, Scaling the Secular City, (Baker, 1987), chapter three.
[41] Peter Kreeft, op cit, p119.
[42] Roger Scruton, op cit, p17 & 75.
[43] ibid, p29.
[44] ibid, p14.
[45] Peter Kreeft, op cit, p214.
[46] Thomas Aquinas, quoted by Timothy McDermott in Aquinas, Selected Philosophical Passages, Introduction.
[47] C.S.Lewis, 'The Weight of Glory'.
[48] See The Complete Works of Francis A. Shaeffer, volume 1, 'A Christian View of Philosophy And Culture', (Crossway Books, 1994).
[49] Frederick Nietzche, Gay Science.
[50] Roger Scruton, op cit, p68.
[51] ibid.
[52] ibid, Preface.
[53] ibid, p36.
[54] ibid, p37.
[55] ibid, p49.
[56] ibid, p61.
[57] That friend was Mr. David Bacon of Cambridge University to whom I should express thanks for conversation upon the theme in hand.
[58] Peter Kreeft, op cit, p21.
[59] Scruton, ibid, p17.
[60] Francis A. Shaeffer, The God Who Is There, Glossary.
[61] Francis Crick, The Astonishing Hypothesis, (Simon & Schuster, 1994).
[62] Francis A. Shaeffer, op cit..
[63] On this progression see James W. Sire's The Universe Next-Door, third edition, (IVP).
[64] Victor E. Frankl, Man's Search For Meaning, (Washington Square Press, 1984), p152.
[65] Francis A. Shaeffer, op cit.
[66] Clark H. Pinnock, Reason Enough, p64-65.
[67] ibid.
[68] ibid.
[69] ibid.

[70] ibid.
[71] H.E.Huntly, The Divine Proportion, p12.
[72] ibid, p153.
[73] Stephen R. L. Clark, God, Religion and Reality, p89, 93 & 94-95.
[74] Rhodes, The Christian God, p80-81.
[75] O'Hear, Beyond Evolution, p214.
[76] J.P.Moraland, Scaling the Secular City, p48.
[77] ibid.
[78] ibid, p48-49.
[79] ibid, 48.
[80] F.R.Tennant, Philosophical Theology, volume two, P89, my italics.
[81] F.R.Tennant, Philosophical Theology, volume two, P89, my italics.
[82] J.P.Moraland, p49.
[83] ibid.
[84] W.S.Rhodes, The Christian God, P77.
[85] The Christian God, p80.
[86] Aristotle, Quoted by John Leslie, Value & Existence, p205.
[87] Augustine, City of God, Book XXII, Chapter 24, p1073-1074, my italics.
[88] John Polkinghorne, The Way The World Is, p17.
[89] Keith Ward, God, Chance & Necessity, p22.
[90] Moreland, p49.
[91] ibid.
[92] ibid.
[93] ibid.
[94] Paul Davies, The Mind of God, p175.
[95] ibid, p175.
[96] ibid, p176.
[97] Polkinghorne, Belief In God In An Age of Science, p2.
[98] Polkinghorne, quarks, chaos & christianity, p23- 24, & 25.
[99] F.R.Tennant, Philosophical Theology, volume two, p89.
[100] ibid, p90.
[101] ibid.
[102] ibid, p90-91.
[103] ibid, p91.
[104] Rhodes, The Christian God, p81.
[105] Tennant, p90-91.
[106] Kreeft & Tacelli, Handbook. . ., p56.
[107] Tennant, p91.
[108] ibid.
[109] ibid.
[110] ibid.
[111] ibid, p92.

[112] ibid.
[113] ibid, p91.
[114] Swinburne, Providence and the Problem of Evil, p53.
[115] Tennant, p92.
[116] ibid.
[117] Rhodes, The Christian God, p79-80.
[118] Tennant, p92.
[119] ibid.
[120] ibid, p92-93.
[121] ibid, p93.
[122] ibid.
[123] Keith Ward, God, Faith & The New Millennium, p24.
[124] Keith Ward, God, Chance & Necessity, p60.
[125] ibid.
[126] ibid.
[127] ibid, p190-191, my italics.
[128] ibid, p188, my italics.
[129] ibid, p50, my italics.
[130] Quoted by John Leslie in, Value & Existence.
[131] Ward, God, Chance & Necessity, p22.
[132] God, Chance & Necessity.
[133] In *The Existence of God* Swinburne includes a footnote indicating that the reader should view F.R.Tennant's work on the argument for a fuller treatment.
[134] Swinburne, Is There A God?, p54. Order is certainly a good thing, and therefore a beautiful thing. I would not, however, restrict beauty to order.
[135] The Existence of God, p150.
[136] ibid.
[137] Swinburne, Is There A God?, p54.
[138] Swinburne, Providence and the Problem of Evil, p52.
[139] ibid.
[140] Ward, God, Faith & The New Millennium, p27.
[141] Augustine, City of God, Bk XXII, chapter 24, p1075.
[142] Swinburne, Is There A God?, p54.
[143] Swiburne, The Existence of God, p150.
[144] ibid.
[145] ibid.
[146] Swinburne, Providence and the Problem of Evil, p51.
[147] O'Hear, Beyond Evolution, p195.
[148] Swinburne, The Existence of God, p151.
[149] Dallas Willard, 'The Three-Stage Argument for the Existence of God', in Contemporary Perspectives on Religious Epistemology, p217.
[150] Dallas Willard, 'The Three-Stage Argument for the Existence of God', in Contemporary

Perspectives on Religious Epistemology, p217.
[151] Swinburne, The Existence of God.
[152] See Paul Davies' The Mind of God & The Fifth Miracle; and Michael J. Denton's, Nature's Destiny, (Free Press).
[153] Keith Ward, God, Chance & Necessity, p60. See Robin Collins, 'A Scientific Argument for the Existence of God: The Fine-Tuning Design Argument' in Michael J. Murray ed., Reason for the Hope Within, (Eerdmans, 1999).
[154] Richard Swinburne, Is There A God?, p63.
[155] David Hume, Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion, p39.
[156] J.P.Moreland, Scaling the Secular City, p65.
[157] Swinburne, 'The Argument for Design', in Contemporary Perspective on Religious Epistemology, p209-210.
[158] Augustine, City of God, Bk VIII, Chapter 8, P308, my italics.
[159] Aquinas, Summa Theologica.
[160] F.C.Copleston, Aquinas.
[161] Etienne Gilson, The Christian Philosophy of ST. Thomas Aquinas, p71.
[162] ibid, p73.
[163] Francis A. Shaeffer, He Is There and He Is Not Silent.
[164] ibid.
[165] ibid.