data, and how you interpret your results.

Think of a pendulum, a weight on a swing, moving slowly back and forth. If you're Aristotle, you see that eventually it comes to rest, hanging straight up and down, and you conclude that all things in nature seek a natural resting place. If you're Galileo, you notice that the period of the pendulum stays constant, even as it swings less and less. If you're Newton, you see that there are outside forces, friction in the string or in the air, that slow down the pendulum; without those external forces, there'd be nothing to stop the pendulum from swinging forever. Same pendulum: three completely different interpretations.

Does that mean that science is not objectively true? Well... yes, to some degree. Does it mean that science is invalid? Absolutely not. For one thing, it works — if not perfectly, then good enough. You can use

maker, the Christ who chose a particular time and place and manner to enter into creation, intending not to save humanity, but to save you and me and each of us individuals, one by one. I see the same familiar workman's hand at work, creating individual electrons and individual souls.

That's one of the joys I get from doing science as a Jesuit; by playing with the Universe I play with God, and thus I get to know God, I get to see his quirks and his personality, His way of doing things; his special brand of subtlety, that is His sense of humour. That's my aesthetic; that is what has trained my sense of the elegant.

But just as every scientist must bring their personal aesthetic, personal philosophy, personal religion to bear on how they choose what they will study and how they judge one experiment or another to be in better taste, and thus their religion shapes their science; so likewise, every religious believer must believe their faith in the context of the particular universe their God has created. That particular God,