

TRIBHUBAN UNIVERSITY

Redefining the Conflict between Religion and Science in Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons*

**A thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Science
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the
Degree of Masters of Arts in English**

By

Suraj Budhathoki

Central Department of English

Kritipur, Kathmandu

April 2010

Tribhuban University
Kritipur, Kathmandu
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. suraj Budhathoki has completed his thesis entitled “Redefining the Conflict between Religion and Science in Dan Brown’s *Angels and Demons*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from October 12, 2009 to April 18, 2010. I hereby recommended his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

Mr. Baikuntha Poudyal

Lecturer

Department of English

Date: 18 April 2010

Tribhuban University
Faculties of Humanities and Social Science
Central department of English

A letter of Approval

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “Redefining the Conflict between Religion and Science in Dan Brown’s *Angels and Demons*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuban University, by Mr. Suraj Budhathoki has been approved by the undersigned numbers of research committee:

Members of Research Committee:

.....

.....

Internal Examiner

.....

.....

External Examiner

.....

.....

Head/ Coordinator

Central Department of English

Date:.....

Acknowledgements

In this profound hour of happiness I would, first of all, express my sincerest gratitude to my respected teacher Baikuntha Poudyal for providing me scholarly suggestions and invaluable guidance, without whose companionship my thesis would not have come to this form of completion.

My true reverence also goes to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of CDE, for his words of encouragement. I also take this moment to thank Dr. Arun Gupto, Mr. Badri Acharya who not only provide me with genuine suggestions on my research but also guided me with valuable remarks.

At this moment of profound pleasure, I would like to remember my loving parents, father Binaya Budhathoki and mother Suvadra Devi Budhathoki without whose perennial support and encouragement my dream of Master's Degree would not have come true.

I also take this moment to remember my friends and brothers Bikram, Subash, Nitesh, Jiwan, Sanjay, Suman, Prafulla, Rajendra, Rishi, Yogen, Dikendra and Prabhat without whose academic help this thesis would not be completed.

April 2010

Suraj Budhathoki

Abstract

The conflict between science and religion has been focus point in most of the literary writing in contemporary times. Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons* revolve around the same issues of religion and science. It tries to bring the conflict into the new level. It does not totally reject the conflict that exists between religion and science rather it tries to show the conflict as a part of historical process. In every historical process there is the exercise of power by those who hold the power in the society and while exercising power there is certainly some conflict which always pave the way for the new possibility. So the conflict between religion and science is nothing more than the demand of new possibility where science can purify religion from conservativeness and religion can purify science from its false absoluteness. And Brown presenting the characters like Leonardo Vetra, who being the scientist tries to prove the Biblical account of the universe and Late Pope, who being a pope of Vatican city admires the progress of the science and birth of a test tube baby tries to indicate towards the same possibility.

Contents

Acknowledgement	
Abstract	
I. Issues about science and religion	1
II Religion and Science	8
Faith and Evidences	16
Mitchel Foucault: Discourse and Power/Knowledge	18
III. Redefining the Conflict between Religion and Science in Dan Brown's <i>Angels and Demons</i>	22
IV Conclusion	41
Works Cited	

I. Issues about Science and Religion

The novel *Angels and Demons* dismantles the previously uprooted belief that religion and science has been in fierce conflict from history to the present and the reconciliation between them is almost impossible. The novel tries to synthesize the religion and science to uplift our society to the position where science can purify religion from errors and superstition and religion can purify science from idolatry and false absolutes. The conflict between religion and science has been highlighted by some conservatives and orthodox people from both sides to show themselves superior than another. Some orthodox peoples from religious institution still take science as the serpent which is eating up the faith of the people. Similarly some peoples from science part also think in the same way and take religion as a conservative part of the society neglecting all its spiritual implication in the society. Such view propagated by some conservatives of both parts is creating hindrance to the development of the society. And this text is trying to pave the way for the synthesization of these two different institutions for the development of the mankind.

Science and religion are two most powerful institutions of the society. Both of them have their own doctrine with which they present themselves in the society. Science holds the intellectual aspects of the society. It means science works with the reasoning. Everything science achieved till now is due to the logic and use of reason similarly religion is the spiritual aspect of the society. Religion is based on the faith and having faith means the suspension of logic. If we said science is related to mind faculty we can also said that religion is related to the faculty of heart. Just as a human being can not act properly without co-ordination of mind and heart or he/she might turns into the state of madness so as our society might turns into the state of anarchy if we ignore any of these institutions (religion and science).

As stated above there is the doctrinal differences between these two institutions as they have to deal with the two separate faculty of the society. But such doctrinal differences do not mean that they always stand opposite to another. The conflict which has always been highlighted can be brought into the point of resolution. Here, resolution does not mean that they should discard their doctrinal essence but they can change themselves to the point from where they can move the society forward without opposing another. My research also deals with the same issues of religion and science. Talking Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons* as my source of evidences, it tried to redefine the conflict which has always been highlighted.

With the mega success and controversies of *The Da Vinci Code* (2003), Dan Brown becomes famous worldwide. Previous to that he had published three novels which later became best seller as well: *Digital Fortress* (1998), *Angels and Demons* (2000) and *Deception Point* (2001). His latest release is *The Lost Symbols* (2007) which also topped the best seller list on the *New York Times* best seller list for six weeks. All his novels share the same concepts and structure: each is a thriller that takes place in 24 hours; each involves a conspiracy (sometimes around famous organizations ranging from NASA and the Vatican to the Knight Templar, the Opus Dei, and the Illuminati); each includes advanced science and each involves scholars and has a young, beautiful and high IQ female who plays a primary role in the story.

Four of his five novels are prefaced with a 'Fact' page that presents major idea of the book as facts. The reader is therefore led to believe that these novels, although work of fiction have been so thoroughly researched that one should take every bit as truth, however surprising or unheard it may be. However, due to the religiously explosive thesis of *The Da Vinci code*(that Jesus had married marry Magdalene, had a

child with her, and was preparing her to lead Christendom after his disappearance), several researchers produced books and documentaries trying to prove that various part of the book, from trivial factoid to major historical events, has been misrepresented by Brown. So a shadow has been cast over his novels and their contents. Dan brown's second novel *Angels and Demons* is the closest and most similar of the novel to the Da Vinci code: the same religious symbology scholar (Robert Langdon) is the hero of the books; the second hero in each case is the ideal woman (smart, beautiful and enlightened) who in each case happened to be the daughter of the scholar who get murdered in the first scene; Christianity (through the Jesus marry Magdalene story or through the Vatican) plays the central role in the story, etc. In *Angels and Demons*, moreover, science is the another major actor, who is all the way accused and prosecuted. In fact, whole plot is build around the science religion tug of war.

The main theme that connects both novels is mystery and adventure. Both *Angels and Demons* and *The Da Vinci Code* are centered on solving a series of clues and solving a murder which than leads to a more extensive plot. Both book combine science versus religion. *The Da Vinci Code* tackles with Jesus divinity and bloodline, while *Angels and Demons* wrestles with technology and Big Bang. These things are of high interest in the today's society; we are always searching for the truth of our origins and questioning religion as well as science. "Science is the new god. It shattered god's world into pieces in quest of meaning and what it finds is more question" (420). What makes *Angels and Demons* and *The Da Vinci code* so hard to put down is the question it poses and forces us to think about our own belief.

Dan Brown makes the real world seem mysterious and invokes the adventures side in the reader. *Angels and demons* discuss how society is leaning towards science

over religion but it is costing our humanity. The message of how science has destroyed humanity is of high relevance in today's society, even with all our technology, we have wars, hungers and evils in our world. We are meant to be advancing by the way of science but all it done is turns us against each other and make more question than answers.

Dan brown's *Angels and Demons* mostly highlights the controversial issues of religion and science. He is trying to explore he relationship between religion and science bringing history in to the action of his plot for which he is famous. He brought the ancient enemy of religion called 'illuminatti' in to action to show the conflict that exists between religion and science from history to present. In the novel, 'illuminatti' is described as a group of scientists who opposes the teaching process of the church. He present Galileo as a member of illuminatti and also described how he was persecuted for his thought that challenges the church's belief.

Dan Brown's characterization plays a vital role while showing the relation between religion and science. The conflict- relation in his novel fits because he has written rich characters that represent the exteme positions. Maximilian kohler, the head of the CERN, is dedicated to pure science and perceives all religion to be a cancer. In fact he believes that science will shortly provide answers to all questions including "what are we doing here?" and "what is the meaning of the universe?"(22). Similarly, the Pontiff Camerlango gradually revealed himself to be sceptical of scientific research that's not subject to church authority. He considers science as a enemy of religion and blamed it for destroying the beautiful world of the God. With the help of these character's perspectives, we can get the issues of conflict from both the sides with equally forcefulness and persuasion.

Numbers of intellectuals, theologians and professors have given their own interpretation and analysis of the novel *Angels and Demons* since its publication in 2000. Especially Catholic Church had been very conscious about the popularity of the book and had put great deal of energy in responding to it. Though this book is just a work of fiction, it is crafted with lots of evidences that make us believe about the truthfulness of the ideas presented in the novel. Moreover this book presents the argument about the religion, science, church and their treatment to each other.

After the publication of the novel, there has been much controversial speculation about the topic of authenticity of its historical foregrounding. The controversies presented in the novel have become the topic of numerous articles, T.V. shows. While Brown also seems to want his readers' own judgement on the topic of fact and fiction, and their own logic, because in the beginning of the novel itself, Brown has presented some evidential facts. In the "Authors Note" of the novel, he mentions, "references to all work of art, tombs, tunnels, and architecture in Rome are entirely factual(as are their exact locations). They can still be seen today. The brotherhood of illuminatti is also factual." So from these very statement of Brown himself, before the prologue of the novel *Angels and Demons*, puts readers in dilemma on the author's perspective on the fact and fiction and they are left alone, with their own judgement, reason and logic to distinct the blurring line between act and fiction on the novel.

Brown seems wanting to create controversies and environment of suspense among the readers to create thrill, mystery or the publicity of the fact that are remained unknown from the long time. But the readers are left wondering because at the very end of the all the whirlwind created by Brown is calmed down and everything seems to be in harmony with the general environment.

As stated above there are many scholars who have shed light of their intellect and discussed *Angels and Demons* from their own perspectives. Some scholars criticized *Angels and Demons* for presenting the falsified version of the history in the name presenting the factual data. In this context Nidhal Guessoum in his review of this book writes:

Perhaps, one might counter that it is not expected of a popular novel to be that scientifically accurate; my response is that first the errors i have pointed out are fundamental and huge, and I have left out many little trivial slips ups, and secondly such huge blunder cast a very long shadow on the “research” that Dan Brown presumably puts into his works of fiction and the description of organization he puts into his novel. (3)

Here, Guessoum is dismantling the Brown’s claim of accuracy of the novel and the data. He is attacking this novel for making lots of errors while describing the history and organizing them.

Similarly critics have also praised *Angels and Demons* for arousing the spiritual awareness and religious ethos to the public through mediatisation. Stig Hjarvard in his essay *The Mediatisation of Religion* writes:

Dan brown’s novel display rather different patterns compare to others. His books are more prone to encourage an interest in the spiritual and even more so, in the institutionalized bearing of religion, than any of the other media product. More than half of the respondents reported an increased interest in religious issues after those novels. (22)

These distinguished scholars have given their idea on the novel and the relation between religion and science. While the present research, breaking away from all

these perspective, is trying to redefine the conflict between religion and science bringing all the evidences from the text itself. Basing all argument in the character's discussion and their personal views about the religion and science and their conflict, the present research is trying to shed light on how the conflictual relation between religion and science has been highlighted in the past and why there is need of synthesization between them and how it is possible.

II. Religion and Science

Science refers to a highly skilled technique or practice which seeks to observe, discover, and understand the nature and principle that govern our universe, our world and us. Our lives have been shaped according to the new evolution in the field of science. According to *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, the definition of science is "knowledge attained through study or practice," or "knowledge covering general truths of the operation of general laws, esp. as obtained and tested through scientific method [and] concerned with the physical world". Science refers to a system of acquiring knowledge. This system uses observation and experimentation to describe and explain natural phenomena. The term science also refers to the organized body of knowledge people have gained using that system. Less formally, the word science often describes any systematic field of study or the knowledge gained from it. Science has entered in to the every vein of the society so we can no longer imagine to live a single moment discarding ourselves from the science. Science has become for many a new god.

Religion is a system of human thought which usually includes a set of narratives, symbols, beliefs and practices that give meaning to the practitioner's experiences of life through reference to a higher power, deity or deities, or ultimate truth. Regarding religion *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* says "Religion is a belief in the existence of a god or gods, especially the belief that they created the universe and gave human beings a spiritual nature which continues to exist after the death of the body" (988). Generally God is supposed to have created the universe and, is seen as the creator. The existence of god can not be proven but it can be felt by those who have faith. Religion is matter of faith not of experience and observation. Though some theories, especially Charles Darwin's (1809-1882) *The Origin of*

Species does weaken the power of God in the process of creation as Darwin explain the evolutionary theory without the mention of God as its cause. But according to Christians, Darwin's theory of evolution, in no way disapprove the existence of God instead, many Christian take it as the best explanation of how plants, animals and human beings came to be as they are: they believed that God created the mechanism of evolution itself. Religion has affinity with faith and faith insists on understanding life in term of reality. So, religion should be granted in term of faith and piety. Judging religion from the point of view of reason and logic creates topsy-turvy and concludes in useless achievement. Binary opposition in religion like grace and sin, heaven and hell, salvation and damnation are the heart of most religion. These concepts are the real cause of human belief or disbelief on religion.

Human beings from their ancient time have been seeking for meaning in life primarily through two channels- science and religion. History is full of stories, writings and influence of religious belief upon societies. Temples dedicated to various gods are all over the world. Even though science has not replaced religion in all areas, it offers a justifiable reason to deny God's sovereignty. Before the invention of the science people turned to religion for explanation of human things.

The relation between religion and science has been focus to the scholars from different corners of the world. Varieties of historical, philosophical and scientific arguments have been put forth in favor of the idea that science and religion are in conflict. Science and religion have been in conflict continuously throughout history was popularized in the nineteenth century by John William Drapper and Andrew Dickson White. Draper was invited to write a *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1874), replying to contemporary papal edicts such as the doctrine of infallibility, and mostly criticizing the anti-intellectualism of Roman Catholicism, yet

he assessed that Islam and Protestantism had little conflict with science. Draper's preface summarizes the conflict thesis:

The history of Science is not a mere record of isolated discoveries; it is a narrative of the conflict of two contending powers, the expansive force of the human intellect on one side, and the compression arising from traditionary faith and human interests on the other. (06)

Draper, here, states the conflictual relationship between religion and science.

According to him, history of science is not only the record of discoveries in this field.

It is also the battle with another contending power, religion, which has always come on the way to the scientific march towards development. He takes religion as hindrance which always compressed the human intellect and science as the expansive force to it. Such description about religion and faith is the main reason behind highlighting the conflictual relationship between religion and science. Many critics have criticized this conflict thesis saying that religion is not hindrance towards the development of science rather it only wants science to realized the implication of their discoveries into the society and it wants to preserve the moral aspect of the society through faith.

Another reason for the myth of conflict continuing is because at the moment there is undoubtedly a conflict between one wing of Christianity and modern science over evolution. Although the Catholic Church and mainline Protestants have long ago reconciled themselves to Darwin's theory and modified their theology accordingly, many conservative Christians remain deeply suspicious about evolution and its alleged metaphysical implications. Unfortunately, the reaction of many who are defending evolution is to try and widen the gap between religion and science by using it to push non-scientific but anti-religious philosophical agendas. Some observers

would claim that now science holds the whip hand it is being not much less intolerant of dissent as the church once supposedly was. This would not be an accurate view as instead the argument over evolution is carried on vehemently by a small number of extremists on both sides while the rest of the community looks on rather bemused.

While it is undoubtedly true that science is based on empirical methods, but it does not disprove the existence of God. Instead, science, such as Cosmology, helps us to better understand the universe in which we live. Scientific findings may undermine belief that God's role is only to 'fill in the gaps'. For example, if you say that God created life on earth, because you could not explain it any other way, the theory of evolution will immediately threaten your belief in God the Creator of life. You would have to either modify your belief in God or discard it in the face of the evidence. However, if a religious believer holds the view that God is the Creator of life because God established the scientific laws that enabled life to evolve, then belief in God is not necessarily undermined by the theory of evolution.

Most contemporary historians of science now reject the conflict in its original form, arguing instead that it has been superseded by subsequent historical research indicating more nuanced understanding. In this matter, Gary Ferngren in *Science and Religion* says:

Although popular images of controversy continue to exemplify the supposed hostility of Christianity to new scientific theories, studies have shown that Christianity has often nurtured and encouraged scientific endeavour, while at other times the two have co-existed without either tension or attempts at harmonization. If Galileo and the Scopes trial come to mind as examples of conflict, they were the exceptions rather than the rule. (33)

Ferngren is giving answer to the conflict thesis and trying to preserve religion from accuse of being too strict and conservative. Religion didn't always persecute science rather it also nurture it. The controversies about their relationship have been highlighted by different critics like John William Drapper. But the issues about their attempt of harmonization from the both sides have been set aside. The relation between religion and science can't be judge only by the trail of Galileo and scopes. We should not forget the other side; the perspective of religion which is no longer brought into discussion.

Today much of the scholarship in which the conflict thesis was originally based is considered to be inaccurate. For instance, the claim that people of the middle age widely believed that the "earth was flat" was first propagated in the same period that originated the conflict thesis and still very common in popular culture. The misconception such as: 'the church prohibited autopsies and dissection during the middle age', 'the rise of Christianity killed off ancient science', 'the medieval Christian church suppressed the growth of natural sciences', are all reported by Numbers as examples of widely popular myths that still pass as historical truth, even though they are not supported by current historical research. They help maintain the popular image of "the warfare of science and religion". Stephen Jay Gould in his book *Rocks of Ages* said:

... I also do not understand why the two enterprises should experience any conflict. Science tries to document the factual character of the natural world, and to develop theories that co-ordinate and explain these facts. Religion, on the other hand, operates in the equally important, but utterly different, realm of human purposes, meanings and values - subjects that the factual domain of science might

illuminate, but can never resolve. Similarly, while scientists must operate with ethical principles, some specific to their practice, the validity of these principles can never be inferred from the actual discoveries of science. (11)

Here, Gould expresses his idea that there is no need of conflict between science and religion as both of the institutions have their own domain to operate themselves in the society. Science deals with the factual documentation of the natural world and religion with the ethical aspect of the society which science always illuminate. Science goes for fact and religion with faith. Science goes for developing the different equipments that help us in our day to day life and religion provides us awareness of its misuse. So, both of the institutes are equally necessary for us in our life.

However, today the climate has changed somewhat. In fact, there has been a growing “anti-science” movement over recent years. Many books have been written, particularly by ecologically minded folk of a new ages bent, blaming science for many of our problems. As it was Christianity that spawned science, it often blamed in the process.

Much has written over recent decades about what science can and can not do. This has been a healthy corrective to much of the thinking of what is called “The Enlightenment” of seventeenth and eighteenth century Europe. Central to Enlightenment thought was the celebration of power of reason- the power by which we understand the universe and improve our condition. This brought enormous progress in science, technology and medicine, but as much as it over emphasized the power of reason and ignore the divine revelation; it carried the seeds of its own destruction. The bible keeps a balance between the powers of our minds, and hence the capabilities of science, and need to humbly submit those minds to truth that god

has revealed about himself and our human condition. Firstly science can not meet the deepest need of human heart. Secondly science can not deal with the question of purpose. It can not answer such question as: why is the universe here? Is there any great destiny for human beings?

Albert Einstein, the most revered scientist of the twentieth century in *Ideas and opinions* writes: “the scientific method can teach us nothing beyond how facts are related to and conditioned by each other...knowledge of what does not open the door directly to what should be” (09). Scientific method always goes for calculating the actual data of the things. It always deals with the logic and reasoning. But there is also another aspect of human being that is far beyond from their logic and reasoning that is the spiritual aspect of the human without which the world turns into storehouse of the machine. Human being is in the top of the universe not only because they have the capacity of reasoning but also because they have the sense of responsibility on being at the top. Spiritual aspect of the society provides solace to the people in despair and gives them the reason to live in the verge of frustration.

Einstein observed, “Science without religion is lame, Religion without science is blind”. He focused on the necessity of both in the human world. He also declared that anyone who is not in awe at the mind behind the universe is as good as a burnt-out candle. The discovery of modern science can greatly enhance our wonder and awe at the amazing complexity and size of the universe and manner in which it sustain our life on this planet, and hence the amazing greatness of god behind it all.

The conflictual relation between religion and science which has been highlighted by different critics now started to taken as a space to find new possibility in those fields. Some critics argued that the difference in those institutions paved the way for new possibility which will help the society on the way to development. In this

case, in the Essay on Western Intellectual Tradition Alfred North Whitehead under the title Religion and Science writes:

We should wait but we should not wait passively or in despair. The clash is a sign that there are wider truths and finer perspectives. Within which a reconciliation of deeper religion and more subtle science will be found....a mere logical contradiction can not in itself point to more than the necessity of some readjustment, possibly of a very minor character on both sides. (146)

The conflict between religion and science is a slight matter which has been unduly emphasized. The science is concerned with the general conditions which are observed to regulate physical phenomena; whereas religion is wholly wrapped up in the contemplation of moral and aesthetic values. Such clash in doctrines is not disaster rather it is an opportunity for deeper religion and more subtle science.

Religion and Science must work together, as some of today's thinkers are learning to do. Religion has served and will continue to serve a crucial role in the development of civilization. Nevertheless, it must recognize that its role is changing. Religion once provided satisfactory but temporary answers to the age-old questions to which science can now provide the real answers. Religion need not worry about such questions anymore; it can now concentrate its efforts on its most beneficial role, supporting and representing our civilization's social dimension. Similarly science should not neglect the role of religion in the development of human civilization. It should not try to destroy the 'faith', which is the binding element for all human being and solace for the tortured heart. If science neglects the infinite domain of religion and its importance where it largely began our problem in this world will be multiplied.

Faith and Evidences

Faith is the confident belief or trust in the truth or trustworthiness of a person, idea, or thing. The word faith can refer to a religion itself or religion in general. As with 'trust', faith involves a concept of future events or outcomes, and is used conversely for a belief not resting on logical proof or material evidence. Informal uses of the word 'faith' can be quite broad, and may be used in place of trust or belief.

Faith is the "persuasion of mind" that a certain statement is true. It is that state of mind which is awakens in men by the exhibition of the truth and by the influence of religious sympathy. Rationalists criticize religious faith arguing its irrationality, and see faith as ignorance of reality: a strong belief in something with no evidence and sometimes a strong belief in something even with evidence against it. Bertrand Russell in his book *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* noted, "Where there is evidence, no one speaks of 'faith'. We do not speak of faith that two and two are four or that the earth is round. We only speak of faith when we wish to substitute emotion for evidence (22). Evidences are considers to be the realm of mind and faith to the realm of heart.

What is the difference between science and religion? It is fair to say that one important difference is that science is based on evidence, whereas religion depends on faith and trust. From some philosophical quarters, this distinction has been criticized as naive, because science (like religion) also depends on certain fundamental beliefs that cannot be tested within the scientific enterprise. For example, science presumes that there is some correspondence between the material universe and our sensory perceptions of it. But science cannot actually prove that the world in which we live is "real". Therefore, this distinction between science and religion — between reliance on evidence and on faith — is an important one.

Science can only address natural forces in the material universe. In the work as Scientists, it must be assumed that what they observe obeys natural laws, and that no supernatural force or being plays tricks with their experiments. Otherwise, interpretation of nature becomes arbitrary. This basic assumption applies to all scientific fields, from nuclear physics and inorganic chemistry to molecular genetics and evolutionary biology. Science therefore is unable to prove, or disprove, the existence of a supernatural God. Thus, while science is based on evidence and religion depends on faith, the two can coexist compatibly in our lives precisely because of their essential difference.

It is sometimes argued that even scientific knowledge is dependent on 'faith'- for example, faith that a researcher responsible for an empirical conclusion is competent, and honest. Faith is something many people can understand. Compared to scientific theories with wave length and frequencies, the simplicity of having faith in a creator is much more straightforward to delegate. The world is scary place to live on. It is easy to become scared for when judgment day comes or when all of us, as a nation, will demolish and become nothing more than particles in the wind. Believing in something greater gives the world something to hold on to because people are scared of being alone. It is a way to compensate for love in other places or the lack thereof.

While showing the relationship between religion and science, we can associate Mitchel Foucault's concept of power and discourse which will help us to analyze how exercise of power in the society by those who are in power brought the suppression and resistance in the process of historical development.

Mitchel Foucault: Discourse and Power/Knowledge

One of the most profoundly influential thinkers of the second half of the twentieth century, the French philosopher and social theorist Mitchel Foucault, said relatively little with regard to the specific analysis of 'religion'. Unlike Marx, for example, Foucault made no attempt to theorize or explain religion as a social phenomenon. However, the breadth of his writing, which covered a range of ideas and institution-including bodies, sexuality, prisons, armies, hospitals, and the history (or archaeology) of knowledge-provides a range of perspectives that have a very concrete relevance to the study of religion and culture.

Although Marx influences on Foucault in his work, Foucault himself was far less interested in class division than Marx. That is Foucault pursued an analysis of power as a diffuse force operating in all social contexts, and at all levels of society. Thus in his highly influential introduction to his work *The History of Sexuality* (Foucault 1981) he set out his fundamental approach to the concept of power:

By power I do not mean 'power' as a group of institutions and mechanisms that ensure the subservience of citizens of a given state...[nor] a general system of domination exerted by one group over another...it seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relation eminent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them... power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere.(92)

This view is quite different from an idea of power being exerted by one group over another, and so it is not simply a matter of looking for the ways in which a ruling class exerts understood within a much wider matrix of power relations. This being the case, the concept of ideology as a tool of power relations becomes considerably more complicated.

Foucault's ideas can be taken further than this, however. Much of the discussion of his work has centered on three concepts of power, knowledge discourse. At its basic there is a simple equation that could be made: knowledge is power. But this statement is not as simple as it looks' because his concern is not so much with the idea of true knowledge, but rather the way in which what is taken to be 'knowledge' (or as 'truth') is used in political ways, to exert control over others. But this also work the other way around: what is taken to be knowledge is itself the product of power. Knowledge gives power and is derived from power. Thus we can ask a question deriving from this, posed by Talal Asad: 'how does (religious) power create (religious) truth?' (Asad 33).

This is where discourse comes in-discourses are the ways of talking about the world, a verbal means of describing how reality is seen. Such discourses are crucial, since human relies on language to communicate and to think, and thus to engage with 'the world' beyond them. Discourses do not simply describe our sense of reality, they gives us the means by which we experienced it. Discourse shape the world and make people act through their power. But discourses do not have the power in themselves, they are instead a means by which power relations are expressed and constructed.

During the middle ages, Christianity became more powerful than in the classical period. With the fall of Rome, the church emerged as the most powerful single institution, and it held that position throughout the middle ages. The Roman

Catholic Church was the successor to the Roman Empire and pope become the overlord of Western Europe. But along with the time the religion (Christianity) started to loose its grip from the society. In the nineteenth century, the things we recognized as the science formed and acquired their great cultural authority. The science developed in this context shaped by the French revolution, the industrial revolution, and the sweeping social and cultural changes of the century. Historians of science over the past year have come to see science not as something independent and distinct from culture and social life but as integral to other social concern and the part of culture itself. Such shift in power brought the collapse between two kinds of truths: the truths of religion and the truths created by science which has been formed by the power through discourse.

Thus power shapes discourses, and through these discourses knowledge is constructed. As a simple example, for centuries during the Middle Ages most people in European society talked about(engaged in discourse) the sun as a part of heavenly sphere, which circulated above the world (the earth). This was not simply way of talking – it was, for priest, kings, and peasant, taken to be truth. This truth is created by the power and it is created to fulfill the certain ideology of religion which at that time controls the realm of knowledge. But when the science attains its cultural authority in the society this truth is questioned. So in contemporary Europe there is a quite different way of talking about the position of the earth vis-à-vis the sun. But we cannot assume that the present discourse is less politically than the medieval catholic one. Rather we are more immersed in it, and so it is less easy to see the connections between the power and the knowledge that is produced. But we should not assume that the stress on discourse entails a notion of falsity. The analysis of discourse needs to put aside the basic question of whether it is true or not, science the assumption of

truth is itself a function of the power of the discourse. Truth is seen as truth because that is how the discourse is framed through the power relations, and that is how it is lived in.

Thus, my dissertation is all about to dig out the controversial aspect of religion and science and to explore the relationship between these two different institutions, we, till now, have discussed and analyzed the relation between religion and science with the help of different critics. We also defined faith and its need to the human being no matter they are men of religion or science. Similarly we also brought Foucault's concept of power and discourse to show how it plays a major role to construct such relationship. From here onwards, we will analyze how Dan Brown treats the controversial aspects of religion and science in his novel angels and demons and will explore the relation between them being totally based in his novel.

III. Redefining the Conflict between Science and Religion in Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons*

Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons* is filled with the discussion about the religion and science and their changing relation in the modern world where science lead people to the moon which has been worshiped as the god. In this novel science and religion and their relation has been discussed and analyzed in different ways by different characters that have different perspective about these two different institutions. Such different views about religion and science foregrounded in this novel itself shows some aspects of conflict about their relation and this present dissertation has been made to analyze those aspects of conflict about their relation and to take them into the position where both can support each other by the enlargement of their boundary. Though brown is not a historicist in all his intend and purpose but the close reading of his book reveals the historical implication of his discussion in the book. He tries to dig beneath the surface to dig out those issues which has been darkened previously.

Brown presents the rich characters that represent extreme positions which help to fits his story to show the relation between religion and science. Most of the characters presented in the novel are from rich background and are specialists in their own field. They have their own stand point to judge the things and can engaged themselves in the discussion with their scholarly intellect. This enables brown to forward the ideas about religion and science with equal forcefulness and with equal persuasive power. It also benefited reader for the analysis of the relation between these two different institutions. It helps us to start our analysis with the thought and perspective of the characters themselves.

The novel opens with a murdered scientist, Leonardo Vetra who is found branded in his chest with an illuminate ambigram in his CERN office. It turns out that the scientist is also a catholic priest, and he has been working on a project (matter-antimatter project) that can prove the 'Scientific Validity' of the genesis biblical account of the creation. Later it is found that he had succeed in creating and storing substantial amount of anti matter, and the canister which contains the antimatter has been stolen and taken to inside the Vatican, where it will explode in less than 24 hours, pulverizing the whole city. Harvard professor Robert Langdon is called to find the canister and to understand the illuminati plan.

Robert Langdon is protagonist and mouth piece of the brown through who brown present his idea about history of science and religion and their relation. The character was created by Dan Brown as a fictional alter ego of himself or "the man he wishes he could be". His discussion with other characters in the novel reveals lots of controversial issues about the religion and science. As professor at Harvard University, he teaches Religious Iconology and (the fictional field) Symbology. Langdon also mentioned he was raised a Catholic but that he will never understand God and also said that faith is a gift he has yet to receive. He introduces himself as:

Although he had studied religion for years, Langdon was not a religious man. He respected the power of faith, the benevolence of churches, the strength religion gave so many people...and yet for him, the intellectual suspension of disbelief that was imperative if one were truly going to 'believe' had always proved too big an obstacle for his academic mind. (132)

He likes to present himself as an academic who had studied many religious book and have respect for them but can't cling into it. He respects the power of faith and

benevolence of church. He respects religious faith for abiding so many people into a single threat. But he does not like to live by a specific code, “I don’t live by a specific code I will go to hell, I can’t imagine a god who would rule that way” (132).

Vittoria Vetra is a daughter of Leonardo Vetra, who had been killed and branded by some unseen enemy, is a scientist and worked with her father in matter antimatter project. She has her own perspective towards religion. She considers ‘religion is like a dress’ (134). She thought that we gravitate towards the practices with which we were raised and in the end though “we are all proclaiming the same thing that life has meaning. That we are grateful to the power that created us” (134). She believes whether we are Buddhist, Christian, or Muslim we are subject to the environment where we were born.

In the discussion with Langdon about the faith and the belief and disbelief towards the god she said that ‘faith is universal’ (134). No one can discard faith, our specific method for understanding it are arbitrary. Some of us pray to Jesus, some of us go to Mecca, some of us study sub atomic particles. In the end we are all searching for truth that which is greater than ourselves. And she further adds: “science tells me God must exist. My mind tells me I will never understand God. And my heart tell me I am not mean to” (134). She, though, being a scientist can’t reject the grandeur of God. She believes in centered power which ruled the universe. One may or may not agree fully but it is very cogent, rational and reasonable, and the closest that Brown has come to balancing faith and reason, science and religion, god and man.

Most of the characters presented in the novel hold their own view about religion and science. They have their own stand to judge these two different institutions. Leonardo Vetra is the best example who is a devoid catholic and a physicist too. He considers physics as “God’s Natural Law” (63). He claimed God’s

handwriting was visible in the natural order all around us. He thought that the symmetry we see around us is itself a proof of higher power that has been benefited us since the day the universe is created. Vittoria with the discussion with the Maximilian Kohler, who is the director general of the CERN said that “rectifying science with religion has been my father life’s dream...he hoped to prove that science and religion are totally compatible fields – two different approaches to finding the same truth” (83). Leonardo Vetra did not think science and religion as the two poles which do not have meeting points rather he thought that they were the two point off a circle which surely going to meet. Though they were moving towards two different direction but they were searching for the same truth.

Vetra was busy on matter-anti matter project and he hoped that his experiment would settle down the bitter conflict in the history, the conflict about how the universe has began. So he recreates the Big Bang to prove the scientific validity of the Genesis, Biblical account of the creation of the universe. Vetra wants to bring science to a higher level where science supports the concept of God. Vetra is presented as the man who wants to bridge the gap between science and religion. The late pop (describe if needed) also interested in Vetra’s project because he too wants to bridge those gaps and wants Vetra to go public with his discovery.

Similarly Brown also presents another character with equal craftsmanship, Camarlango Carlo Ventresca who is the main antagonist of the book. Carlo Ventresca is the Camerlengo and faithful servant to the Roman Catholic Church during the papal conclave in the Vatican City. Though he has been presented as the antagonistic force in the novel but his idea presented in the novel have got equal power to move the reader. He is a devoid catholic and blamed science for dismantling the faith of the people. He believes god is the only way to get salvation from this mechanical world

where science had already eaten the core of the people. Camerlango is all a way believers of God and its magical power. He respect faith and committed himself with all his afford to preserve the faith which he believes is declining due to the scientific evasion. He believes faith as:

When we as species abandon our trust in the power greater than us, we abandon our sense of accountability. Faith ...all faiths...are admonitions that there is something we can not understand, something to which we are accountable...with faith we are accountable to each other, to ourselves and to a higher truth. (423)

Camerlango believes faith as belief in higher power; belief in something greater than us. He thought that though human being are exploring this universe day after day but still there is something that are not accountable to us and faith is something that account for those unaccountability. It means for the survival of the faith there should be some unaccountability in this world.

Camerlango is too worried about the declined of faith and he wants people to join with him and makes the world full of God and its prayers. He believes faith as the human instinct and it can't be erased from human only its manifestation can be changed. With the discussion with the illumitati's messenger in the telephone, he said:

You are misguided. The church is more than a mortar and stone. You can not simply erase the two thousand years of faith...any faith. You can not churched faith by simply removing its earthly manifestation. The Catholic Church will continue with or without the Vatican City. (184)

Camerlango believes faith as a universal. And he said it can't be destroyed by destroying the Vatican city or any kind of church because it is not bound inside the

Vatican city rather it is within the heart of every individual of the world either he believes in god or not.

The question of religion and its relation with science (in the past and the present) gets a good attention in the novel. From the outset, Brown sets religion and science as historical arch-enemies who have been trying to remove one another from society. Brown writes: “since the beginning of history, a deep rift has existed between science and religion. Outspoken scientists like Giordano Bruno- was murdered...by the church for revealing truth” (50). Brown brought the historical brotherhood of illuminati to highlight the historical relationship between religion and science. The protagonist of the novel Robert Langdon is called for help to find the murderer and diffuse the plan of the illuminati because he is the symbologist and knows lots of about illuminati who have been suspected for the murder of Leonardo Vetra. Langdon describes illuminate as:

...in the 1500s, a group of men in Rome fought back against the church. Some of Italy’s most enlightened men – physicist, mathematicians, and astronomers – began meeting secretly to share their concerns about the church inaccurate teachings. They feared that the church monopoly on “truth” threatened academic enlightenment around the world. They founded the world’s first scientific think tank, calling themselves “the enlightened ones”. (50)

Illuminati is a group of scientist who is not satisfied with the teaching process of church and tries to form a group against such teaching. They were the Italy’s most enlightened men who first started to question the truths of church. But it is said that they were haunted ruthlessly by the Catholic Church. So these scholars remain under

mask to hide themselves from the people. And these illuminati supposed to reactivate them to take revenge against religion.

Langdon does not believe that illuminati will resurface to take such cruel revenge because he thought that they were not killers. He includes Galileo in the group of illuminatus. Langdon, about illuminatus, states that:

Galileo was an illuminatus. And he was also a devout catholic. He tries to soften the church's position on science by proclaiming that science did not undermined the existence of God, but rather reinforced it... he held that science and religion are not enemies, but rather allies- two different languages telling the same story, a story of symmetry and balance and balance...heaven and hell, night and day, hot and cold, God and Satan. (51)

Langdon presents Galileo as illuminatus and he said that Galileo tried to unify the religion and science rather than undermining the religious belief. He does not take science and religion as enemies but rather allies. Galileo tried to balance between these two different institutions. Here Brown tried to discard the supposed hostility between and science by bringing the example of a renowned scientist Galileo Galilee.

Langdon further said that Galileo's attempt of unification between religion and science was not what the church wanted. Catholic Church thought that "union would have nullified the church claim as the sole vessel through which man would understand God" (51). So Galileo was put under permanent house arrest. Langdon further said that church had discovered other four members and interrogated but they don't tell them anything under torture so they were brutally murdered and their bodies were dropped in the streets of Rome as a warning to other thinking of joining the illuminati. Langdon's description of illuminati and church's treatment to their thought

to some extent clarify the ongoing conflict between some branch of Christianity and some scientist. But it would be flawed to generalize this to the universal level that means whole religion and science.

A view that is often found in books to explain the relationship between science and religion is one that suggests that religion explains 'why' the universe exists or 'why' humans exist, while science explains 'how' things happen as they do. This 'How' / 'Why' distinction is often repeated but it is an oversimplification. When the Big Bang model was first suggested by the Jesuit priest Georges Le Maitre it was greeted with a certain amount of skepticism and the atheist Fred Hoyle coined the phrase 'Big Bang' intending to be derogatory. His atheism also blinded him to the inadequacies of his steady state theory which one suspects he only came up with to avoid the uncomfortable metaphysical implications of a universe with a beginning. Atheist scientists have now come to terms with the big bang and adjusted their metaphysics accordingly, much like most Christians, after some debate, accepted evolution and twiddled their theology. However, it is interesting to hear today's atheists declaring that God must have a creator when their predecessors were quite happy for the universe not to have one. All this seems to demonstrate that when it comes to science, both sides find things they do not like and both sides argue against them until the evidence becomes impossible to deny. Dan brown also forwarded this through his character, Vittoria Vetra in her discussion with Langdon about Big Bang said:

When Lemaitre first proposes the Big Bang theory...scientist claimed it was utterly ridiculous. Matter, science said, could not create out of nothing. So when Hubble shocked the world by scientifically proving

the Big Bang was accurate, the church claimed victory, heralding this proof that the Bible was scientifically accurate. (90)

Here, Vittoria Vetra wants to tell that scientist did not appreciate their discoveries used by church to promote the religion, so they immediately mathmaticized the Big Bang theory which was first proposed by the Lemaitre who is the member of Catholic Church. Science at first oppose this ideas but later they mathmaticized the same theory re moving all religious overtones and claims it of their own. Such view of science towards the religion has been vehemently criticized by the Vittoria in those lines.

The relationship of science and religion is a continuing and ongoing area of debate in the modern world. What is worth noting is that there are scientists who are both atheist and theist, just as some religious people accept the findings of modern science and others do not. Furthermore, the intolerance of religion for science as reflected in some creationists' ideas is mirrored by the rejection of religion by some scientists. While some scientists argue that religion is undermined by modern science, others do not. Brown presents a balancing view on science. Some characters like Leonardo Vetra and late pop though being a devoid catholic wants the adaptation of science and wants to create a world where science will uplift the religious belief and on the other hand people like Camerlango blamed science for ruining the faith of the people. After the revelation of the illuminati's plan of pulverizing the whole Vatican City placing the bomb at the heart of the city. Camerlango had addressed to the public in BBC, he said:

Science may have alleviated the miseries of disease and drudgery and provided an array of gadgetry for our entertainment and convenience, but it has left us in a world without wonder. Our sunsets have been

reduced to a wave length and frequencies. The complexities of the universe have been shredded into mathematical equation. Even our self worth as human being has been destroyed (419)

Camerlango blamed science for destroying the sense of wonder to the people. He said science may have made our life convenience by providing us some machine but their discoveries have ruined the people sense of wonder. Sun, whom we worship as god and source of power, has been reduced to wavelength. Everything is drag down to the mathematical equation. Even the self worth of human has been destroyed by the science.

Though Camerlango has been speaking in rage and he is presented as the antagonistic force in the novel, his ideas are a kind of awareness to the general people. The invasion of science to the mysteries is the main cause behind the demolishment of faith in modern world. Mechanical advancement is taking man to the newer and newer area and enabling us with lots of power but along with the gadgetry it is also leading us to the destruction. Science has been rebuking for destroying the essence of the things by dividing the god's world into smaller and smaller pieces in quest of meaning and all it finds is more questions. In the modern era science has left religion behind. The development in the field of science is expanding like the sun rays. It took long time to progress from wheel to car but it takes only decades from car to space. Such hasty movement in the field of science is leading us towards the destruction of the world. It is proven fact that every beginning has its end. And our universe also contains its end with its beginning and science is leading us to the end with the rocket. If we walk on foot the end will certainly pushed farther. In this context, Camerlango said:

Science, you say, will save us. Science I say has destroyed us. Since the days of Galileo, the church has tried to slow down the relentless march of science; sometimes with misguided means but always benevolent intention...the promises of science have not been kept. Promises of efficiency and simplicity have bred nothing but pollution and chaos. We are fractured and frantic species ...moving down a path of destruction. (421-22)

Camerlango is trying to clarify the religious attempt of rebuking science. He is saying that religion is not against the development of mankind, it only wants to slow down the relentless march of science. It only wants to push the end a bit far by slowing it down.

The role of power also plays a great role to form the conflictual relationship between religion and science. This book claimed Catholic Church used its power to censor certain books that questioned its power, allowing it to completely regulate its ideology. It also suggests how church had treated the development of science when it is in the power. The general concept of power is centralization within the system of hierarchy. The absolute power is conceived as the centre from where things around are dominated and ruled. In this pattern power is practised for more power. Furthermore the exercised of power always tends to be in the favour of its masters simply for their benefits to rule in everlasting way. Church used its power to control the ideas of the people and in forming the discourse according to suit it; with the purpose of gaining power and authority over the subjects. Here, we can see the cyclical relationship of power and discourse. Inside the novel, we can see how one discourse is forming the truth and power while at the same time this power is used to control the resistance and create other discourses. While again with the use of power

new discourse is formed which in long term generates power and authority, in the case of angels and demons to the Roman Catholic Church. It had suppressed the new scientific ideas which challenged their discourses. In the novel, Langdon explains such facts to Vittoria Vetra. He said:

In the early 1630s, Galileo wanted to publish a book endorsing the Copernican heliocentric model of the solar system but the Vatican would not permit the book's release unless Galileo includes equally persuasive evidence for the church geocentric model- a model Galileo knew to be dead wrong. Galileo had no choice but to acquiesce to the church demand and publish a book giving equal time to both accurate and inaccurate models. (226)

According to Langdon, Galileo wanted to publish a book describing the Copernican model of solar system which claims sun as the centre of universe and earth round the sun. This claim challenged the privileging discourse of the church which claims earth as the centre and everything round the earth. So church as they were the centre of power forced him to include their geocentric model although Galileo knew it was inaccurate. Here we can see how power operates in the society to serve the discourse of those who hold the power. In a way, we can say that history is all about the discourse of the power holders and in every history there is the suppression and resistance. When religion was in power there was the suppression of antithetical discourses like science and there is also resistance from those sides too. But we should not take such resistance and suppression as a historical conflict rather we should take it as a historical process for progression.

The exercise of power to form the discourses to serve the ideology of those who hold the power in the society is not only applied to the past. It also equally applied

in the contemporary times only power has been shift from one to another. Now science holds the power so they formed the discourse which serves their interest. In the novel, when the church conspiracy has been spread to the public, Langdon overheard the news broadcasting in the television. The news is as follows:

Faith does not protect you. Medicine and airbags...those are things that protect you. God does not protect you. Intelligence protects you. Enlightenment. Put your faith in something with tangible result...modern miracles belongs to science...computers, vaccines, spaces, stations...even the divine miracle of creation. Matter from nothing...in a lab. Who needs God? No! Science is God. (202)

Here we can see how the media has been playing its role to form the discourse which fulfills their interest. The news broadcasting in the news is trying to manipulate the people against religion and replacing power of god with the power of science. Nowadays media becomes the main source to operate power and form the discourse in the society. With the help of media, the discourse in the society is formed and practiced according to the interest of those who holds the power in the society.

As science is the new power holder in the society, it used its power to form the discourse in the society which serves their interest. As religion, in the past, exercise their power to form the discourse in the society so as science does nowadays. All the knowledge that we perceive as truth these days is also come from the same process. So the conflict between science and religion is nothing more than the exercise of power which is the part of historical process.

The present states of religion among the European races have been decaying day by day. During many generations there has been a gradual decay of religious influence in European civilization. The average curve marks a steady fall in religious

tone. In some countries the interest in religion is higher than other. But in those countries where the interest is relatively high, it still falls as generation pass. Such decaying of religious values in contemporary time is shown by the messenger of the illuminate in the novel. He said:

Church attendance is at all time low- down forty –six percent in the last decade. Donation are half what they were only seven years ago. Fewer and fewer men are entering the seminary. Although you will not admit it your church is dying. Consider this chance to go out with a bang. (185)

Messenger of the illumitati in the telephone is stating how church position is loosing its position in the contemporary society. People are so busy on the scientific gadgets that they don't have time to go to the church. They are loosing their faith towards the god. The messenger is expressing his ideas with a data which church always tries not to go to the public.

The fading of religious interest in contemporary times is because is because religious institution is still cling on to the bygone aspect of the religion which is no longer applicable to the modern time. Religious appeal is directed to excite the fear of an all powerful arbitrary tyrant behind the unknown force of the nature. This appeal to the reactionary instinct of brute force is loosing its force. It lacks directness of response, because modern science and modern condition f life have taught us to meet occasion of apprehension by a critical analysis of their cause and condition not by the fear. In the novel Camerlengo, in the discussion with Langdon said:

Look how they lock tonight. Fear has brought them home. Forge modern demons for modern men. Apathy is dead. Show them the face of evil- Satanist lurking among us- running our banks, our school,

threatening to obliterate the very house of God with their misguided science. (587)

Church had always tried to rule by arousing fear to the general people. Camerlengo does the same. He arranged a plan and tries to show that illuminati by resurfacing themselves from the history want to take revenge with religion by destroying the faith of the people. He wants to show the face of Satan to the people so that people will come to God. But that is a traditional way. It is not going to work in modern world. To bring the people to the god religion had to discard such traditional concept and should widen their boundary.

Religion is tending to degenerate into a decent formula wherewith to embellish a comfortable life. With each discovery in the field of science, it is sad that science got triumph against the religious thought. We always ignore another part that every new discovery has brought the defeat for previous ideas of science. When Darwin and Einstein proclaim theories which modify our ideas, it is a victory for science; we do not go about saying that there is another defeat for science, because its old ideas have been abandoned. In this context Camerlango states:

We are exhausted from trying to be your signposts. Our resources are drying up from our campaign to be the voice of balances you plow blindly on in you quest for smaller chips and larger profits. We ask not why you will not govern yourselves, but how can you? Your worlds move so fast that if you stop even for an instant to consider the implications of your action, someone more efficient will whip past you n a blur. (422)

Camberlango, being a devoid catholic expressing his view about the science. He is furious about making everything as a tool to experiment and science is doing same to

the religion from many decades. He further said that science is in continuous movement and it can't stop for a second to consider what they have done till now. In other words they don't have time to think about the implication of their discoveries. They don't have time think about the moral effect of their action in the society. They have a fear that if they stopped they will be whipped past by another. They are making weapon for mass destruction but don't think about where these weapon are being used. Science is keep on discovering machines to enable people to do work more efficiently and in no time. Against its expectation with each discovery in the field of science people are being mechanized and pushed farther from the naturalness which man are born to be.

The religion has been on the defensive and on a weak defensive from centuries. It will not regain its power until it can face change in the same spirit as science does. Its principle may be eternal, but the expression of those principles requires continual development. This evolution of religion is in the main disengagement of its own proper ideas from the adventitious notion which has crept into it by reason of the expression of its own ideas in term of the imaginative picture of the world entertained in the previous ages. Religious institution are in fear to loose its essence by expanding its boundary but it is necessary to explained, expand and restated their ideology so that it can gain its power in this changing 21st century. In the novel late pope was shown as a person who wants to embrace the new development of science along with the preference of religious belief. He is positive towards the Leonardo Vetra's experimentation and belief that it will help religion to uplift their status in the society. In course of the novel, Mortati, one of the honourable priest and member of the devil advocacy of the Vatican City, states that:

Holiness has always had affection for the sciences. He felt he owed a debt to science. Science let him experience the joys of fatherhood without breaking his vow of celibacy. His holiness told me he had no regret except one- that his advancing stature in the church prohibited him from being with the woman he loved and seeing his infant grow up. (595)

Mortati reveals a truth about the late pope which was hidden because of some conservative ideology of the church. He said that late pope, when he was just a priest, was in love with a young nun. But both of them had taken vow of celibacy and never even consider breaking their convent to god. Though they could resist the temptation of the flesh, they had desire to participate in the god's ultimate miracle of creation- a child. Later they both had fulfilled their longing with the help of science without violating their vow. So pope was too grateful to the miracle of the science. But he still has regret for not being able to father his child himself. We can take his step as an evolutionary which is most in contemporary time. Like pope, religious personality should modify their thought and widened the boundary of the religion so that religion can walk along with the religion to uplift the society from being morally bankrupt.

It is considered that religion holds the moral aspect of the society and science holds the intellectual aspects. In other words we can say that religion and faith are considered to be the realm of heart and science to the brain. "Science by definition is soulless. Divorced from the heart" (585). Sometimes religious institution rebuked science for being soulless and ignoring the spiritual and moral aspect of the society. Camerlango states same in these lines:

Man's morality is not advancing as man's science. Mankind was not spiritually evolved enough for the power he possessed. We have never

created a weapon we have not used... man could already destroy. Man learned to kill long ago. And his mother blood rained down. (584)

The moral aspect of the Man is not advancing as fast as science is advancing itself. In such condition, every discovery in the field of science can cause the misuse of that discovery. Men are not morally aware of the use of those things. So mankind might lead itself towards the massacre because Man had already learned to kill. So Camerlango is asking for man to give attention to the moral aspect of the society, religion so that they will be able to use the things in the right way.

Similarly men of science too have their own perspective towards the religion. Few centuries ago, religion had the got the sole authority in the society. Religious institution was considered to be the one and only way to get knowledge and meaning in life. But with the development of science everything has been changed. Religion started to feel their decline of power so they are fearful these days about their positions in the society. They are fearful that people will go for another way to find the new God. .in course of the novel, Vittoria Vetra rebuked religion for its ideology and states that:

It is doubt that brings souls to you. Our need to know that life has meaning. Man's insecurity and need for an enlightened soul on the planet! We all seek God in different ways. What are you afraid of?

That god will show himself somewhere other than inside these walls?

That people find him in their own life and leave your antiquated rituals behind? (585)

Here, religion has been attacked for being too conservative and for being fearful of loosing its status. Man turned to get meaning in the life and to enlighten the soul but church is not the only way to enlighten the soul rather people can take different ways

if they like. Religion must broaden their area and should not be fearful for losing their previous rituals rather they should modify it and walk freely along with the religion. Heart and mind should co-operate each other rather than being at odds to reach to the fruitful conclusion.

IV. Conclusion

Religion and science has been in conflict and they have been fighting with each other from history to the present is widely spreaded cliché in the contemporary media. Articles in newspaper, internet and in some fictional writing, this relationship has been highly discussed and analyzed. The two most powerful forces of the society has been set against each other. The controversialist of both sides brought these forces to the state from where there is no escape either they have to abandoned the teaching process of science or abandoned the clear teaching of religion. But what is still neglecting the is the fact that though science and religion are two different institutions having their own ideologies, they can be brought into the single roof if we expand their boundary a little bit more.

We all know that nothing is fixed in this universe. We have already experienced the fact that every new discovery dismantles the previously uprooted belief in the field of science itself. Similarly religion is also expanding its boundary in course of the time. If such be the case why should be there overemphasized about the conflictual relation between religion and science.

Dan Brown, who is famous for his writing about the historical issues and religion, set this novel around the relationship between religion and science. Langdon summarize the major tension of the plot: science and religion are 'oil and water', arch enemies. He says that a deep rift has existed between science and religion. But is it really that simple? If we defined religion as irrational superstition then perhaps, but the truth is western science emerge from within a religious cultural context. Galileo was a devoid catholic and Isaac Newton is certainly a fervent believer. Both had their problem with church authority and orthodoxy, but they were undoubtedly religious.

So conflict is not the only option. In fact, there are several proposed typologies that try to make sense of the complex relationship.

He brought the ancient enemy of religion 'illumanatti' in to the action to show the conflict relation that exists between religion and science. He brought the illuminatti to show how science and religion were engaged in the conflict and to show how religion has persecuted scientists like Galileo for his disagreement for the teaching process of the church. Along with that he also shows how science is eating up the morality of the people in the world where religious belief has been declining day by day. Dan Brown's characterization in the novel is the most important aspect for the analysis of the relationship between religion and science. Brown presents the character with high intellectual background whose discussion with other characters reveals us the both sides of the conflict. And we can judge what really the conflict really is.

But along with these facts about conflict there is another side which has always been darkened that is the approach for the synthesization. By the work of Leonardo Vetra about the matter-antimatter and late pop's violation of the church's strict rules about papacy, we can get the hint about the need of change in both sides.

Towards the end of the novel Mortati revealed a truth about the late pope which was hidden because of some conservatives' ideology of the church. He said that Late Pope was in love with a young nun. But both of them had taken the vow of celibacy. And never even consider breaking their convent to god. Though they can resist the temptation of flesh they had desired to participate in the god's ultimate creation so they both fulfill their longing with the help of science by giving birth to a test tube baby. We can take his step as evolutionary which is the most in the contemporary times. Taking him as an example, we can say that religious personality

should modify their thought and widen the boundary of religion so that religion can walk along with the science in the modern world to uplift the society.

Similarly Leonardo vetra, one of the greatest physist, was shown as a devoid catholic who was busy on matter anti matter project when he was murdered in the beginning of the novel. He wants to recreate the big bang to prove the scientific validity of the Genesis Biblical account of the creation of the universe. Vetra wants to bring to a higher level where science can support the concept of the world.

In a nutshell, we can say that there is obviously some doctrinal conflict between religion and science but we should not brought that conflict to the level of war which some controversialist of both fields are doing rather we should lead them to the position where science can purify religion from conservatism and religion can purify science from its false absoluteness.

Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard. Ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Asad, Talal. *Genealogies of Religion*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.
- Brown, Dan. *The Da Vinci Code*. Great Britain: Bantam Press, 2003.
- - -. *Angela and Demons*. Great Britain: Corgi Press, 2001.
- Draper, John William. *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 5th ed., 1875.
- Einstein, Albert. *Ideas and Opinion*. New York: Crown Publisher, 1954.
- Foucault, Mitchell. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. R. Hurley. New York: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Gary, Ferngren. *Science & Religion: A Historical Introduction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Gould, Stephen Gay. *Rocks of Ages*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1999.
- Guessoum, Nidhal. "Science and Religion in Dan Brown's *Angels and Demons*." New York: Oxford UP, 16.6(Spring2005). 5-10
- Harvard, Stij. "The Mediatisation of Religion: A Theory of the Media as an Agent of Religious Change." *Northon Lights* vol. 6 (august 2008) 18-23.
- Hornby, Albert Sydney. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary 7th ed.* Ed. Sally Wehmeir. London: Oxford University Press, 2007
- Russell, Bertrand. "Will Religious Faith Cure Our Troubles?" *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. New York: Mentor, 1962.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. "Religion and Science." *Essays on Western Intellectual Tradition*. Ed. Shreedhar Lohani and et al. Katmandu: M. K. Publishers & Distributors, 2008.