

process of thinking occurs. Bennett and Hacker, by denying that the brain as locus is a viable candidate for psychological predicates, cannot offer a coherent account of the fact that thinking and perceiving occur at a specific space-time location.

There is much in this book to mull over. I do not cover here their debate over the concept of qualia, the nature and application of grammars, Bennett and Hacker's full responses, or Robinson's insightful conclusion. The ideas are provocative and the various positions are clearly developed. Insights gleaned from this debate can fruitfully be applied to other areas in the philosophy of mind and may even help to advance debates that have stagnated. There is no doubt that careful thought concerning the conceptual framework deployed in the cognitive sciences will be beneficial to everyone involved. Those interested in these issues will find the dialogue between these eminent thinkers of great value.

DANIEL LIM
Cambridge University
Free School Lane
Cambridge CB2 3RH

Beauty in Science and Spirit. By Paul H. Carr. Center Ossipee, N.H.: Beech River Books, 2007. xxii + 171 pages. \$18.00 (paper).

It is refreshing to see in the vast literature that constitutes the science-and-religion dialogue a work about beauty. It has puzzled me why one characteristic of the universe—it is beautiful—and one of the divine names of God—Beauty—have played such a small role in the science-and-religion dialogue. If ever a term could be an interconnecting nexus between the two, Beauty would be that term. Yet, even if mentioned, Beauty has scarcely been used as a serious perspective to understand both the bridges and the chasms between science and religion. Therefore, it was with great delight that I received a copy of Paul Carr's *Beauty in Science and Spirit*.

Carr, a retired physicist who led an AF research laboratory for many years, takes a sustained look at the role Beauty plays between science and spirituality. His thesis, I believe, is expressed in these remarks: "Spirituality, the independent source of the world's religious traditions and wisdom, provides the 'why,' which beautifully complements the 'how' of science. Science, unraveling the intricacy of nature, and spirituality, revealing its ultimate purpose and meaning, have complementary beauty" (p.37). The complementary beauty of science and spirit lead to a "New Story" of cosmic import, a story that "transcends national and cultural differences" (p. 37). Carr attempts to tease out this thesis by demonstrating how the "mystical beauty" of spirituality nurtures and helps the "mathematical beauty" of science to emerge. He does this by reflections on art, intelligent design, the Music of the Spheres, the Big Bang, evolution, fractals, the Holy Land, technology, and the environment. These reflections lead to a proposal for a new paradigm between science and spirituality.

Taking a cue from Paul Tillich's famous work *The Courage to Be* (Yale Univ. Press, 1952), Carr proposes the courage to create Beauty as a way for science and spirituality to find common ground. As he puts it, "scientific insight and spiritual

revelation are both creative. Nevertheless, creativity can lead to tension with established paradigms and conflict with organized religion. . . . Conflict met with courage blazes a path for the creativity of others. Conflict met with courage results in dialogue between science and spirituality” (pp. 124–25). And when science and spirituality enter into dialogue, “the integration of science and spirituality is giving birth to a beautiful New Story . . . that transcends national and cultural differences” (p. 125).

What is this New Story? It is a story of mathematical beauty nurtured by the mystical beauty of ancient stories of spiritual beauty. It is a story in which theology and technology can interact with beauty and power. It is a story “of increasing complexity, specialization, and beauty emerging from simple beginnings. It is a story of increasingly interdependent communities and ultimately humans, who are conscious of beauty, have a moral conscience, and are creative” (p. 131).

Carr’s thesis and proposal is admirably sustained and focused in his book. Each chapter reinforces his thesis and works toward his proposal of a New Story. Does he succeed? This is difficult to answer. As one would expect, Carr is stronger in the science and less adept with the theological and philosophical implications of his proposal. Beauty is one of the most subtle of philosophical and theological subjects. For example, Carr speaks of several beauties—spiritual, mystical, mathematical, scientific, subjective, and objective—yet never gives a precise account of his distinctions. To say that “tons of makeup, 1,484 tubes of lipstick, and 2,055 jars of skin care products” are measurable indices of the yearning “for the essential beauty of the human body symbolized by such sculptures as *Venus de Milo* and Michelangelo’s *David*” (p.7) seems rather reductionistic of both beauty per se and the beauty of *David*. More subtle yet is the nature of scientific beauty. Does Carr mean that scientific beauty is the beauty of its theories or the beauty of nature herself? Is scientific theory beautiful in itself or is it beautiful because it reflects the beauty of nature? These distinctions are not addressed.

Theologically, Carr seems to base much of his thesis on the theology of Tillich, whose definition of religion as that of ultimate concern informs Carr’s understanding of spirituality. In doing so, Carr seems to use religion and spirituality synonymously, which breeds confusion, at least to Roman Catholics who have a different understanding of spirituality. He tends to treat theological proposals cavalierly such as in his critique of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Chardin’s Omega point, he tells us, violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Yet Carr’s New Story sounds a lot like Chardin’s law of complexification and interiority. Does not the New Story also violate the Second Law? Also, the claim that Chardin’s system is an example of the Protestant principle seems a bit amateurish.

Nonetheless, there is something of great value in Carr’s thesis: a sure instinct that takes him to the heart of the relationship between science and theology, namely Beauty. In this, I find him insightful. I am convinced by him that Beauty is the key to understand how religion and science relate. That Carr had the courage to enter into this thesis given the tremendous complexity of the task shows an author who practices what he preaches: the courage to create Beauty.

ALEJANDRO GARCIA-RIVERA
 Professor of Systematic Theology
 Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University