

Christianity, science, & postmodernism

Some theologians see postmodernism as the answer to the dominance of the modernist worldview epitomised by the enlightenment and the rise of science.¹ They believe that science is now discredited and, because we live in a postmodern world, Christians need to articulate the faith from a postmodernist point of view. This paper argues that this view is mistaken.

Science may not be the flavour of the month, but it is alive and well. The phrase “we live in a postmodern world” does not reflect a society shift to postmodernism as such, but rather

reflects the sceptical view of the today’s hedonistic consumer society towards the given power and truth claims that previously had been taken for granted. Truth claims, such as those implicit in the Gospel, and claims of a Creator to whom we are responsible, fit uncomfortably within this sceptical worldview that sees truth as relative and power structures as suspect. While postmodernism may have provided some intellectual tools to question truth and authority claims, the root of this scepticism is deeper. At one time truths were received from our betters; those in authority over us. But, as science undermined the credibility of the received truths about the natural world, all received truths; whether embodied in the institutional structures of the day, the Church, or even science itself, become fair game. Rejection of the received truth became in effect the rejection of the power of the truth giver.

Nevertheless, Christians must articulate the Gospel in a way that speaks to this sceptical world where truth is now seen to be relative or

uncertain, and authority claims suspect. However, this article suggests that framing theology from the perspective of Western postmodernism will have little impact on the dominance of the scientific worldview as few, sceptical as they are about truth and power claims, find the postmodernist view of the world meaningful. Any reliance on a postmodernist theology

“No matter how troublesome the scientific world view is to Christian apologists, in contrast to postmodernism, science does not exclude an overarching explanation of human existence.”

will undermine the Christian’s ability to engage with the world outside the confines of academia. Engineers, scientists, computer experts, and business people are finding that emerging theological understandings, framed in postmodernist language, do not address their life situation. Christians in these areas find it difficult to witness to a faith articulated in a way that seems to them full of meaningless phrases without any real connection to the world they live in.

Furthermore, while postmodernism, may well provide some insights into the human situation, it neither has sufficient understanding of science nor the intellectual grunt to challenge the increasing power of science. 21st Century science is now more capable than ever before of making sense of our world. The enculturation of Christianity in a postmodern framework will weaken the long term survival chances of Christianity in the Western world because, at its core, postmodernism opposes any

metanarrative or overarching explanation of human existence.

No matter how troublesome the scientific worldview is to Christian apologists, in contrast to postmodernism, science does not exclude an overarching explanation of human existence. For example, Karl Popper writes: “But hardly anybody, not even the most uncritical and naïve rationalist,

would contest the assertion that nothing of importance can be proved, and that all that can be proved consists, at most, of mathematical and logical truisms”.² A significant number of scientists accept that the substance

of belief is not amenable to scientific inquiry. (One notable exception is Richard Dawkins. However Eagleton’s review³ of Dawkin’s new book “The God Delusion”⁴ demonstrates the weakness of Dawkin’s position.) Indeed many internationally recognised scientists are Christians, Jews, Moslems, or Buddhists.

The emergence of postmodernism

Postmodernism cannot easily be defined in conventional thought categories. Rather, it is a way of viewing the world that evolved as a response to the disillusionment of what is termed the “modernist” worldview – the over optimistic worldview that followed the intellectual developments of the enlightenment. This worldview is characterised by the emergence of science, a belief that the universe can be rationally understood and that progress is an inevitable consequence of the systematic application of human reason. Postmodernists would also argue that modernism provided the

rationale for the destructive movements of the 20th century and the emergence of technologies that can destroy the world through mass destruction and environmental degradation. In essence, postmodernism challenges the view that understandings arising from rational intellectual processes are truer than other understandings. They see that many of today's power structures and values (e.g. utilitarianism) are grounded in the same arrogant confidence of the enlightenment; an arrogance that consolidates power rather than liberates, and that marginalises other approaches to knowledge development.

It may come as a surprise that scientists would not disagree with most of these concerns,⁵ as any copy of the *New Scientist* would indicate. However, scientists would generally argue that the failure of the modern era was not a failure in the way humans think, but the failure of human society to live up to the knowledge that they have uncovered. Furthermore, scientists distinguish the intellectual activity of science from the application of technology which is a societal responsibility. For example scientists would see a society that blames science for nuclear weapons, but fails to take responsibility for developing nuclear weaponry, as seriously dysfunctional.

Nevertheless, it was the arrogance of those who used the success of the scientific mode of thinking to push an ill informed humanist agenda that created the postmodernist reaction. Even so, while modernism depended on the advance of science to give it credibility, science does not depend on modernism as an ideology.

Postmodernist thought

Effectively, postmodernism denies the validity of the intellectual core of the modernist view on the basis that modernity cannot be defended using its own methodologies. Leading postmodernists seem to believe that the postmodern knowledge structure is ultimately more fundamental than the scientific, evidence-based

knowledge building system. Postmodernism, by coming at issues related to language and subjectivity from "left field", throws up the relationships and interconnections between the way we "language" and the power structures that such languaging supports. Things are not what they seem. In asking: "For what and whom we are speaking?" alternative meanings can emerge. Poststructuralism counters the view that the signifiers (i.e. the symbols) in a text have defined meanings. Understanding meaning is analogous to searching for definitions in a dictionary, where the definitions refer to other words in a circular fashion. Ultimately, meaning only has significance to the interpreter, not the author. Derrida⁶ has developed the concept of deconstruction to unpack the hidden meanings and power claims of particular texts – what is in the margin – what is left out. For example, labelling someone as a "worker" may define his or her status as inferior because of the implicit contrast between "worker" and "boss". Truth statements have no validity. Foucault argues that truth is contextual; emerging from a power/knowledge relationship.⁷ Rorty sees truth as the "intersubjective agreement" within a community.⁸

Postmodernists reject metanarratives; those foundational narratives⁹ that provide a framework for discerning meaning. For Lyotard metanarratives are universal rules used to legitimate questionable beliefs or actions. Instead of appealing to foundational knowledge, postmodernists believe that each community develops its own narrative capturing its own truth that permits its members to speak a common language and establish a commonly accepted reality. No narrative, such as the Christian narrative, is more foundational than another.

The works of leading postmodernists, such as Derrida and Foucault, provide interesting perspective on power and control, within social structures and language. Their approaches give

permission for people to question and challenge the modernist and other social agenda. However, as is outlined below, postmodernism does not seem to have the ability to critique itself. Even the process of deconstruction may be anything but neutral as a metanarrative may be implicit in the deconstruction process. A feminist might, for example deconstruct a gospel writer's attitude to women by highlighting implicit contrasts in the text. However because, in all likelihood, this deconstruction would take place within a 21st Century feminist worldview, this worldview, rather than the text, will determine the outcome of the deconstruction.

In the case of science, postmodernism might claim to offer insights, but much of what it offers is ill informed, failing to see science as it is. When I started scientific research in the 1960s, we students parodied the bizarre conclusion of the positivists – positivism was seen to be a joke. Habgood said in 1964 that few would hold such an extreme position.¹⁰ Positivism was repudiated by Einstein and others some 30 years before. I cringe therefore when I see phrases such as "positivism", "reductionism", and "Kuhn showed that..." bandied about as representing science. The postmodernist use of these categories indicates a propensity to regurgitate prejudices that have the same intellectual validity as calling social reformer a Marxist. Indeed, I have not found a valid postmodernist insight on science that was not already part of the fabric of the scientific community's understanding of itself. Quite simply, as discussed later, science has sufficient flexibility and diversity within itself to articulate the boundaries and difficulties of scientific sense making. For example, the following quotations represent my experience of the views of the scientific community.

Most scientists recognise that any scientific understanding is provisional: "Our ignorance is sobering and boundless. . . With each step forward, with each

problem which we solve, we not only discover new and unsolved problems, but we also discover that where we believed that we were standing on firm and safe ground, all things are, in truth, insecure and in a state of flux".¹¹

Science attempts to minimise the interaction between the observer and the observed; i.e. be objective. But this is impossible as Popper stated: "Almost 40 years ago I stressed that even observations and reports of observations are under the sway of theories.....there is no such thing as an uninterpreted observation, an observation that is not theory impregnated".¹²

Scientists are no more objective than others, but the science critical process minimises individual bias. Popper 1970¹³ stated: "Thus the natural scientists are not more objectively minded than social scientist. Nor are they more critical. If there is more objectivity in the natural sciences, this is because there is a better tradition and higher stands of clarity and rational criticism."

We have already seen how the early scientists assumed that they were discovering the nature of reality. The fact that their theories led to practical results was for them the proof that this was the way things really were. Many modern scientists take exactly the opposite view; they are not nearly so sure that they can say anything about reality at all. They regard their theories as useful guides, as tools which enable them to manipulate nature, whether they are true in any ultimate sense or not. According to such a view, truth is "what works".¹⁴

It was this distinction between the world as it appears to us and the world as it is, which was at the heart of Kant's philosophy. He realised that our knowledge of the world is always an interpretation of the information which comes to us. We fit this information into a framework which already exists in our minds.¹⁵

As these quotations represent views from a period prior to the flowering of postmodernism these insights cannot be claimed by postmodernists as their own.

Issues with science

Science is a knowledge game played on a restricted field. While individual scientists such as Richard Dawkins (e.g. in *A Devil's Chaplain*¹⁶ and *The God Delusion*¹⁷) might claim to have answers to questions outside of their direct scientific experience, science itself does not. On the contrary, it is not uncommon for high achieving scientists to acknowledge insights outside of science. For example, a number of scientists including 24 Nobel Prize winners in *Cosmos, Bios, and Theos*¹⁸ publicly articulate a belief in a reality that transcends the material world. More recently the eminent scientist Sir John Houghton, head of the international Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, affirms his Christian perspective in an interview in *Christianity Today*.¹⁹ While science works literally incredibly well within its sphere of operation, outside that area, as is often admitted, it has little to offer.

Postmodernism, like science, is also a knowledge game restricted to a narrow playing field. Despite its use as a universal knowledge system, (i.e. a metanarrative) postmodernism cannot provide meaning outside this restricted playing field. While postmodernism attempts to challenge science's position as an intellectual activity, its approach is ineffective as it relies on stereotypic myths about scientists and science (e.g. labelling science as positivist). For example, while postmodernism might be able to comment on the power structures in science, or the arrogance of scientists, it has no capability to comment on the effectiveness of science. For example, I was stunned when, over a cup of coffee, a postmodernist tried to persuade me that postmodernism had the capability to improve on the scientific principles of aircraft design.

Postmodernism's inability to confront science

For the above reasons, scientists do not take postmodernists seriously, seeing the approach as more ideological than insightful. While today's scientists recognise the misplaced optimism of the

enlightenment, they do not take responsibility for enlightenment thinkers. These thinkers were mainly social philosophers who were so impressed by science they believed that the methodologies of science could be applied well outside science's validity.

The core difficulty with the postmodernism conception of science is that, science is not some philosophical or intellectual position, whether this be that of the scientist Descartes, or the non scientists such as Francis Bacon or the positivist le Comte. Science is what scientists do. Indeed, individual scientists have many different philosophical positions. One should not label a chef as an empiricist or a critical realist because they taste a new recipe to see whether it works. When postmodernism comments on knowledge structures outside its core area of expertise it acts as if it has a privileged foundational narrative, falling into the same trap as the scientific positivists.

Science is now more comprehensive integrated and all embracing than when postmodernism first attempted to critique science. Barring an intellectual collapse of Western society, science will carry on becoming more and more influential and, if Christians refuse to engage with science, they will become more marginalised.

Science has honed the processes of traditional sense making into an extremely effective tool. It is, in my words a process of pondering on a problem then "sucking and seeing". Karl Popper's rather idealised version is that the science process first start with a problem that leads to a conjecture and the conjecture is critically examined in a way that leads to some understanding but invariably a new problem or problems arise. While in science, the conjectures may be more sophisticated because of the cumulative nature of knowledge, and while the critical examination involves experiment and argument, it is basically a simple process. Ultimately, the success of this

process, whether primitive or sophisticated, depends on whether the outcome makes sense of the world, not on whether it is tied in to some particular philosophical stream. One is never sure whether a theory is correct; only whether any inconsistency is apparent. The difference between science and other forms of effective sense-making is not so much the process itself, but that science restricts itself to the natural world where its tools are the most effective.

As ways of making sense, postmodernism and science are different. Postmodernism seems to have a rather optimistic view of human intellectual capabilities. It relies almost exclusively on intellectual argument to build on the positions of accepted philosophical thinkers. However,

for scientists, “sucking and seeing” trumps argument. Unfortunately postmodernist understanding of the natural sciences is primarily based on their experiences of the social sciences and the writings of Thomas Kuhn.²⁰ However their use of Kuhn is flawed for the following reasons.

- Kuhn primarily talked about the sociology of science and its conservative power structures. On the whole he is correct in showing that science plays the same power games as other academic disciplines and, in so doing, explodes the myth of science as an objective search for truth. Practicing scientists are well aware of the power structures frustrating the “new boy on the block”. However this does not detract from science’s overall effectiveness as, in contrast to other disciplines, science holds itself up to the scrutiny of the evidence. An alternative medical practitioner cannot discredit the effectiveness of conventional medicine by arguing that conventional practitioners show human weaknesses.
- While Kuhn is not a recognised

authority on the intellectual practice of science by those close to science, postmodernists accept Kuhn as their guru, because they can read their stereotypes of science into Kuhn. E.g. a paper I am using in a strategy course claims: “It has been well established that scientists systematically ignore disconfirmatory evidence (Kuhn 1970)”.²¹ This misinterprets Kuhn. If it were well established, there would be many examples of credible theories that have been jettisoned. While scientist are conservative, taking a “doubtful until proven true” approach to

“As ways of making sense, postmodernism and science are different.”

any new theory. As Kuhn points out, this is a strength, enhancing science’s effectiveness by protecting it from unnecessary side tracks.

- Unfortunately Kuhn over simplifies in the way he is seen to distinguish a “paradigm” from “normal science”. The former is a rare scientific breakthrough that is not comparable (incommensurate) with previous understanding. This is unrepresentative of science as a whole, e.g. molecular biology, with its overwhelming insights into the functioning of living systems would be just normal mundane science because it depends on the paradigms underpinning chemistry and biology. In science most paradigms are nested within higher level paradigms, with innovative ideas forming at each level of nesting. Indeed, Kuhn never meant the word “normal” to be taken to mean mundane, which is how he is interpreted. Later Kuhn stated that he preferred the word “exemplar” to avoid the misunderstanding of his use of paradigm.

- Even as Kuhn was writing, science was becoming more integrated, holistic and wider in scope. In the intervening 40 year, we have seen the emergence of ecological science, systems science (e.g. biosystems), chaos, complexity, and the integration of chemistry and biology. Modern science bears little resemblance to the Kuhnian view, which was based on physics and chemistry.

Kuhn does not have a postmodernist view of science. He claims that of any human enterprise, science produces “The greatest and most original bursts of creativity”.²²

Indeed, he is bitter about the way his views about science, which were meant to be realistic and positive, have been so misinterpreted.²³ Kuhn believed that the later scientific theories were

superior to earlier understandings and he supports Popper’s argument, that different scientific frameworks can be compared.²⁴ As mentioned, through ignorance and for ideological reasons, postmodernists, use Kuhn, without understanding the context of Kuhn’s argument.

Scientists use the word “truth” quite differently from postmodernists. When a scientist says, “The earth is round,” she knows it is flatter at the poles and has a bumpy surface. Roundness is just a better category than “squareness”. One seldom sees the word “truth” in a scientific paper as scientists. The two greatest achievements in the world of physics have been relativity and quantum physics. Relativity provides an extraordinarily accurate understanding of cosmic events while quantum physics is extraordinarily accurate in explaining the micro world. No other human understanding can be relied on with such precision; yet, relativity and quantum physics are inconsistent – neither of them can be true. Nevertheless, scientists use both theories with confidence because they understand their limits.

Postmodernist gurus, such as Derrida and Foucault, offer interesting insights. Derrida draws attention to language traps that disempower, while Foucault draws attention to social structures. These plausible understandings of sociological issues fall into the conjecture stage of sense making and, where the evidence supports these conjectures, better understandings can arise. Postmodernism also gives permission and provides the tools to question views that are locked in by social history. While I can appreciate what Derrida, Foucault or others say, I find the comments on science of Lyotard in his book *The Post Modern Condition*,²⁵ bizarre. He claims; "it is well known that" the demoralisation caused by science reached explosive proportions amongst students in the developed world in the 1960s.²⁶ He shows his ignorance of science by claiming that science is becoming more fragmented when at that time it was becoming more coherent and integrated across disciplines. In accusing others, Lyotard drips with metanarratives and truth statements. Incredibly he makes the claim that academics should decide their own budgets.²⁷ Surely this relies on a metanarrative to legitimise academic privilege over lesser mortals? As postmodernists seem unable to apply their sense making tools to their own works (e.g. Lyotard), they demonstrate that they have little capacity to make progress through self criticism.

How a Christian can make sense of it all?

While the worldview of scientists who are conservative Christian believers has been shaped by the culture and the scientific understandings of the past 300 years, these Christians have not been modernists in the sense that postmodernists understand the word. They have come to a workable resolution of the dilemmas associated with science and faith and have been able to integrate their faith into a more scientific approach to knowledge building. These Christians have never believed that

science and rational thought alone will solve all world's problems. Christians have always had the wider view that we exist primarily to fulfil the purposes of a loving Creator and that the deep questions of human existence can only be addressed by recognising this. These scientists find it confusing that their insights and experiences about science are marginalised in the postmodern theological world.

Stanley Grenz has attempted to articulate the Christian faith from a postmodernist view point in his book *The Post Modern Primer*.²⁸ But he fails to recognise that postmodernism suffers from the same flaws as science. Grenz argues that the shift to a postmodern world is seen in how later series of Star Trek replace the character of Dr Spock with DATA, an android who wants to be human. However the analogy does not stack up. The pseudo-rational character of Spock denigrates science and rational processes, while the more human DATA is not postmodernist. He is based on Andrew the Robot, a creation of the arch modernist Isaac Asimov in 1973.²⁹ This poignant story, illustrating the dilemma of technological process, is about a self aware android, who fights for recognition over two centuries, finally to become fully human by allowing himself to die. Grenz's conclusions about how to articulate the faith ring true, but by framing these within a postmodernist worldview, he locks the faith into a vulnerable intellectual framework.

Another attempt, to provide an apologetic basis for the faith is Radical Orthodoxy. However Radical Orthodoxy is locked into an Augustinian framework and is so incomprehensible and convoluted that it will have little traction, particularly amongst scientists.

Postmodernism is right to affirm that intellectual systems other than science can contribute to sense making. But, any challenge to the over optimism of the enlightenment that is not intellectually rigorous will be ineffective. Postmodernism's diagnosis of modernism fails to recognise that postmodernism itself is similarly flawed. Modernism,

science, and postmodernism all fail, not because of flawed thought structures, but because fallen creatures misuse their intellectual gifts. Any knowledge system that does not recognise the inability of humans to live in harmony with themselves and their Creator can never provide a truthful or useful understanding of human existence and its purpose. It is Christianity, not postmodernism, or science, that is able to offer understanding of the failure of human society

Science has shown that the human mind is not wired like a computer. Indeed, human rationality is somewhat of a scientific surprise. Humans also make sense of the world and communicate this sense through story, song and art; effectively bypassing the propositional rational processes of the mind. Indeed, Grenz³⁰ and McGrath³¹ both argue that, in order to respond to the challenges of science, Christian apologetics has perhaps excessively relied on rational argument, treating the Bible as a source of propositional statements about God. Yet, the stories of Jesus and the story of Jesus, while not irrational, give us meaning about our existence that goes beyond completely rational processes. This kind of sense making process is far more universal than the postmodernist understanding of the narrative concept, as the stories resonate with life experience of all cultures. Maori, for example at Parihaka, showed a greater understanding of the Jesus story than those who, from a culture of imperialism, passed the story to them. The redemption stories of the people of God re-enacted in the Passover and the Lord's Supper convey universal truths about love and purpose that go beyond philosophical discussions.

Nevertheless, as science is becoming more dominant, more coherent, more integrated, and more embracing, it is potentially more dangerous. As postmodernism relies on historic myths about science, it neither has an adequate comprehension of science nor the intellectual capability to challenge science's power. Those familiar with science will never turn to

postmodernism for insights; if they are to find any insights they will need to find them within the tradition of science itself.

Conclusion

Christians would be mistaken to use a postmodernist framework to defend Christianity against science as ultimately they will fail to effectively engage with a dominant and credible worldview. However, Christians can hold their own against scientism, the extreme view of science, if they hang on to the following key points.

- Affirm the Christian position about the human condition; that human reason is uncertain as other agenda override a truly rational interpretation of the world. As scientists more or less accept the vulnerability of human thought process, even if couched within an evolutionary perspective, Christians can use this acceptance to counter the science type arguments that attack the faith.
- Recognise that science, by definition, excludes those valid explanations that are not accessible to the scientific approach. Christians need to challenge scientists, such as Richard Dawkins, who use pseudo-science arguments outside the domain of science.
- Affirm that other forms of sense making are more appropriate for questions that fall outside the arena of science and that these, if robust, are not inconsistent with science.

Christian academics need to dialog with postmodernists, and Christians can use postmodernist tools to inquire into social relationships and social structures. However, postmodernism's fundamental rejection of other metanarratives, while it implicitly claims universal status for itself, is a serious threat to the faith. Christians should refuse to be seduced by particular cultures and ideologies and return to their roots – an understanding of the purpose of existence in terms of a Creator who was revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Endnotes

1. This paper will use the word "science" to refer to the natural sciences rather than the social sciences.
2. Karl Popper, "Epistemology and Industrialisation," in *The Myth of the Framework*, ed. M. A. Notturmo (London and New York: Routledge, 1994). First published in 1965.
3. Terry Eagleton, "Lunging, Flailing, Mispunching," *The London Review of Books* 28 no 20 (2006). The text is available at <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n20/eagl01.html> [accessed 27 November 2006]. Eagleton, a lapsed postmodernist, highlights Dawkins' ignorance about religious belief using rational rather than postmodern arguments.
4. Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (New York, NY: Bantam Books 2006).
5. I am closely acquainted with a large number of New Zealand scientists as well as a number of international scientists. My views on science would be a reasonable representation of the science community.
6. For example see Stanley Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996), 138-151.
7. For example, A. McHoul and W. Grace, *A Foucault Primer* (Dunedin N.Z.:University of Otago Press, 1993), 60-87 and Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism*, 127-138.
8. Richard Rorty, *Solidarity or Objectivity, Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 21.
9. Foundational knowledge is the knowledge (meta) framework or the worldview, with its presuppositions, that underpins the sense making process.
10. John Habgood, *Religion and Science* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964), 137.
11. Karl Popper, "The Logic of the Social Sciences" in *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology* (NY: Harper and Row 1976). First published in German in 1969.
12. Karl Popper, "The Myth of the Framework" in *The Myth of the Framework*, 58.
13. Karl Popper, "Reason or Revolution" in *The Myth of the Framework*, 70.
14. Habgood, *Religion and Science*, 90
15. Habgood, *Religion and Science*, 45.
16. Richard Dawkins, *A Devil's Chaplain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2003).
17. Dawkins, *The God Delusion*.
18. H. Margenau and R.A. Varghese, *Cosmos, Bios, Theos: Scientists Reflect on*

Science, God, and the Origins of the Universe, Life, and Homo sapiens (Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Company, 2002).

19. John Houghton, "Looking After Creation," *Christianity Today* 50 no. 4 (2006).
20. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
21. A. Inkpen, and N. Choudry, "Seeking strategy where it is not: Toward a theory of strategy absence," *Strategic Management Journal* 16 no. 4, 313-323 (1995): 315.
22. John Horgan, *The End of Science: Facing the limits of human knowledge in the twilight of the scientific age* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Inc., 1996), 41.
23. Horgan, *The End of Science*, 45.
24. Popper, *The Myth of the Framework*, 63.
25. Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 7. The first five chapters are available at <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/lyotard.htm> [accessed 30 November 2006].
26. Presumably this refers to the 1968 student riots in Paris and the Berkley Free speech movement in 1964.
27. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, 50.
28. Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism*.
29. Isaac Asimov, *Bicentennial Man and Other Stories* (New York, NY: Doubleday Science Fiction, 1976).
30. Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism*, 161, 162.
31. Alister McGrath, *A Passion for Truth: The Intellectual Coherence of Evangelism* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966), 170-174.



Dr Sean Devine practised as a scientist in the DSIR. After studying economics in the 1980s, Sean became manager of the Public Good Science Fund and later Executive Director of the Association of Crown Research Institutes. He has been Chairman of a technological company in recent years. He is a research fellow at Victoria University with recent publications in the fields of complexity and innovation systems. Sean worships at St Paul's Waiwhetu, Lower Hutt.