

Letters

1. McIntosh, A.C., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., Flood models: the need for an integrated approach, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):52–59, 2000.
2. Garton, M., The pattern of fossil tracks in the geological record, *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(1):82–100, Fig. 2, 1996.
3. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref 1, p. 57.

Correction

William Tompkins in his letter to the Editor¹ refers to reference 89 in my paper,² noting that it ‘seems to be a nonentity’.

The reference I gave was to *CEN Tech. J.* **9**(1):94. I have checked and found that the correct reference is:

Oard, M.J., Letters to the Editor, Precambrian rocks, *CEN Tech. J.* **6**(1):94.

M.J. Hunter
Charters Towers, Queensland
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Tompkins, W., The third day — Precambrian skeletons in the closet, Letters to the Editor, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):49, 2000.
2. Hunter, M.J., Is the pre-Flood/Flood boundary in the Earth’s mantle? *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(3):344–357, 1996.

Quotes

Lawless science

Men became scientific because they expected Law in Nature, and they expected Law in Nature because they believed in a Legislator. In most modern scientists this belief has died: it will be interesting to see how long their confidence in uniformity survives it. Two significant developments have already appeared—the hypothesis of a lawless sub-nature, and the surrender of the claim that science is true. We may be living nearer than we suppose to the end of the Scientific Age.

Lewis, C.S.,
Miracles: a preliminary study,
Collins, London, p. 110, 1947.

The religion of scientism

‘It is no more heretical to say the Universe displays purpose, as Hoyle has done, than to say that it is pointless, as Steven Weinberg has done. Both statements are metaphysical and outside science. Yet it seems that scientists are permitted by their own colleagues to say metaphysical things about lack of purpose and not the reverse. This suggests to me that science, in allowing this metaphysical notion, sees itself as religion and presumably as an atheistic religion (if you can have such a thing).’

Shallis M.
In the eye of a storm,
New Scientist
January 19, 1984, pp. 42–43.