

THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS INQUIRY

by Henry Nelson Wieman

Religious thought today is undergoing profound reconstruction because human existence is undergoing revolutionary transformation. Rarely in human history has this combination of fluidity in religious thought and transformation of human existence been so propitious for creative developments in the field of religious inquiry.

A problem can be discussed profitably only if there is agreement on what the problem is. When there is no agreement on the issues to be discussed, the interchange resolves into confusion and controversy.

Religious discussion in great part has been of this sort because the participants are not concerned with the same questions. Some are concerned with what transcends all of time and space, others with a cosmic process that pervades all of time and space, still others with human ideals, still others with interpretation of the Bible, and still others with the nature of human existence.

The basic religious problem is commonly interpreted in such a way as to make these areas exclusive of one another so that the several fields of inquiry become controversial rather than contributory to one another. Searching what transcends all of time and space for answer to the religious question yields a very different answer from searching the fulness of all time and space, which is called the total cosmic process. Searching human ideals yields a very different answer from the two just mentioned; whereas if we search actual human existence as the only area where the answer can be found, what is found in the other three areas cannot be the answer sought. Human existence versus human ideals yields different answers depending on whether we search ideal possibility or the existential condition.

In considering these five different areas where answer to the religious question is sought, the case of the Bible is different from the others. If it is studied merely as one source of information, making a subordinate contribution along with other sources in solving the religious problem, it need not be considered as authoritative. When it is ac-

Henry Nelson Wieman is professor emeritus of Christian theology, University of Chicago. This paper was presented to a special convocation at Meadville Theological School in June, 1966, when he was awarded an honorary Doctorate of Divinity.

ZYGON

cepted as the supreme authority, its message must be constantly reinterpreted as our knowledge is expanded and our valuing consciousness is transformed.

The remaining four areas of inquiry—transcendence, cosmic process, ideals, and the creativity in human existence—will yield very different answers. They cannot all be right because they are contrary to one another. If one is accepted as the dominant guide in directing and shaping the thrust of human power, the consequences will determine the fate of man. This is so because power under human control, due to modern technology and techniques of social organization, has become gigantic and rapidly increasing. Consequently its wrong use will produce consequences beyond recovery.

This shows the paramount importance of religious inquiry in our time and consequently the importance of reaching some agreement on what is the central question to be answered and where this answer is to be sought if a true answer is to be found.

The first step in understanding any problem is to understand what generates it. So we ask: What generates the religious problem in the special form it assumes for our time?

WHAT GENERATES THE PROBLEM

What generates the religious problem in the special form it assumes for us today is the revolutionary transformation of human existence now occurring. The magnitude of this transformation makes it comparable to the change that brought forth civilization from the primitive tribal life that had been the form of human existence for over a million years. To indicate the significance of this present transformation, we are adopting the words of Kenneth Boulding, who calls it a transition from civilization to post-civilization.¹ The expression "post-civilization" is not intended to suggest the destruction of civilization but only to indicate the magnitude and significance of the change that is occurring in our lives.

Boulding recognizes that the great transition may not be consummated. A change so radical and so swift requires adaptive changes in the basic institutions that shape the conduct of human life. If these changes are not made, civilization will destroy itself and possibly all human life along with it. Boulding is chiefly concerned with required changes in the military and political institutions, the pace of economic development, and the control of population. He deals with the required change of religion in the form of what he calls ideology. But his special field of competence is not in religion, broad and profound as

his insights are with wide-ranging knowledge over the various concerns of human life.

The change from tribal life to civilization brought with it in the course of time the change from tribal religions to the religions of civilization. This first great transition was much slower than the one of equal magnitude now occurring. Hence the development of a religion fit to sustain the life of civilization could come much more slowly than is now required to develop a religion fit to sustain the life of post-civilization. But, if we are to survive the great transition of our time and actualize the constructive potentialities of the new age, we must have a religion that differs from the religions of civilization as much as they differ from the tribal religions that ruled the life of man for thousands of years before civilization arose.

If Kenneth Boulding is correct, along with C. P. Snow, Carl Bridenbaugh the historian, Michael Harrington the sociologist, Arnold Toynbee, and others who agree on the radical nature of the present transition, then civilization, along with all its religions, is a brief, tumultuous, and precarious transition from tribal life with its religions to post-civilization with its religion. The transition called civilization is brief in the sense that six thousand years, more or less, is brief compared to the preceding more than million years of a human-like existence and the following possible million and more years of post-civilization. (No attempt at accuracy is made in citing these numbers of years. They are mentioned only to suggest relative periods of time.) Civilization as we know it, and the religions of civilization as we know them, are transitional from primitive tribal life with its religions and post-civilization with its religion.

All this is mentioned to indicate the significance of religious inquiry and the paramount importance of interpreting the problem of religious inquiry aright so that the answer may be found that will be one primary factor in determining whether or not we survive the great transition and what values human existence will have in the age of post-civilization.

A further presupposition must be mentioned. There is no possible way of dealing constructively with the religious problem until it is recognized that any understanding and evaluation of human existence ever to be discovered by human beings must be an understanding and evaluation within the human perspective. It is a contradiction in terms to claim that we ever discover any other perspective and any other way of understanding the nature and the value of human existence. Any claim to find a truth and a standard for evaluation that transcend the

ZYGMOND

human perspective is false on the face of it, because it is a claim that contradicts itself by reason that the claim is made by a human being.

Still another preliminary presupposition should be mentioned. We can say that post-civilization will still be a form of civilization, if we wish, provided that the continuity of the same word does not blind us to the radical nature of the change. Since religion tends to resist change by reason of the magnitude and intimacy of the values involved, we need some word to serve as a red light to keep the mind alert to the basic changes involved when we conduct religious inquiry. For that reason we shall take over from Kenneth Boulding the expression "post-civilization" to indicate the nature of the problem in one of its essential aspects.

In dealing with any problem, the crucially important step is to formulate correctly the question that inquiry should seek to answer. If one does not ask the right question, he will not get the right answer. In a time of basic change such as ours this question must be basic to human existence itself. The basic question in any inquiry is the one that must be rightly answered in order to make it possible to find the right answer to all the other questions involved in the problem. In the case of religion, this basic question is about the nature and value of human existence, how it can be saved from its self-destructive and degenerative propensities and transformed toward the greatest content of value that human existence can ever embody.

Yet it is at this crucial point of formulating the basic question that we find most confusion and disagreement in the field of religious thought. For example, many seem to think that the basic question for religious inquiry is about God. But God is one of the proposed answers to the basic question and not the question itself, unless, of course, the word "God" is defined as the best present answer to the basic question, regardless of any past meanings attached to this word. Furthermore, we cannot understand the meaning of any belief in God, or its adequacy as an answer to the basic question, until we understand this question itself and see it independent and prior to this proposed answer.

The same applies to the Christian message. Some are saying that we should cast off belief in God and put in its place the Christian gospel in its essential form, stripped of the myths with which the gospel was apprehended by minds in other ages and cultures because they obscure the message for minds shaped by our age and culture. But this perpetuates the same error we noted in the case of belief in God. The Christian message is one proposed answer to the basic question about human existence. It is not the question in itself. We must have this

question before us to judge the meaning and merit of the Christian gospel.

The Christian message has been given radically different interpretations throughout the ages of Christendom and among the many different sects and forms of Christianity. These interpretations have been, and are now, so different that one could never know from their content that they all were intended to be the same message. We cannot judge the rightness of any of these interpretations, or the adequacy of the Christian message itself, given any possible interpretation, until we have before us the basic question about human existence with which to judge the meaning and merit of the answer found in the gospel. Furthermore, we cannot derive the question from the gospel because that begs the question. We must know the question independent of the gospel in order to find what truth there is in the Christian message.

All the great religions represent answers to this question about the meaning of human existence. But our present purpose is not to survey these answers. We have mentioned a few of them for the purpose of making clear the difference between the answers and the question that is answered. When a form of religion is practiced for ages these two become merged and confused. The answers are accepted and practiced for so many generations that it is difficult for the mind to imagine the question as standing apart from the traditionally accepted answer. But this distinction between question and answer is imperative for those who engage in religious inquiry at this juncture in human history, when we must start anew with the ultimate question if we are to find an answer fit to meet the demands of post-civilization.

This distinction between question and answer was required when tribal religion was transformed into the religions of civilization. As long as the question about human existence was identified with the tribal religion, the religions of civilization could not arise. The same now holds true when the religions of civilization must give way to the religion of post-civilization. The question must be asked anew independently of the answers found in the religions of civilization.

Primitive tribal life, civilization, and post-civilization are three stages in the development of our humanity. Hence, somewhat like childhood, adolescence, and late maturity, they require different formulations of the answer to the question about the meaning of human existence. This does not mean that the reality sustaining human existence is different at these three stages. It does mean that our intellectual understanding of it, the way we symbolize it, and the practices of individual and social commitment must be different.

The reason we must have more precise intellectual understanding of

the reality to which we give the ruling commitment of our lives, as we pass through these three stages, should be clearly recognized. The reason is that man's power to change the conditions of human existence increases greatly as we pass from primitive tribal life to post-civilization. When man has little power, its misuse cannot do much harm. But when his power is enormously magnified, its misuse can do irreparable damage. For this reason our understanding of what creates and sustains human existence and transforms it toward greater content of value must be more precise. Otherwise, we shall exercise our magnified power in ways that impair or destroy the conditions that must be present for the conservation and increase of human good.

There is a second reason for asking and answering anew the basic question about human existence. Our knowledge today reaches much more deeply into the complexities of existence than it ever did before; also it extends farther through time and space. Perhaps most important of all, it is more precise. Consequently, the traditional answers must be corrected by the more extensive and precise knowledge with which we do our thinking and guide our action.

For these reasons, the range, precision, and power of our action and also the range, precision, and power of our thinking must be guided by a ruling commitment more accurately informed about what operates to conserve and increase the values of life in opposition to what does not.

Other features of the revolutionary transformation of human existence that is generating the problem for religious inquiry might be mentioned. One of these is the radically new kind of work that must engage the strivings of men when machines take over most of the work of producing and distributing economic goods and services. This new kind of work will be centered in developing the valuing consciousness of individuals in community with one another, if we survive the great transition from civilization to post-civilization. Also, developing and operating methods of negotiation and adjudication between conflicting interests in ways to exclude war and other forms of violence will require far more dedication and hard work than were ever required in other times. The work of institutional education will absorb far more of the energies of mankind. Art will need to assume a burden of responsibility for interpreting the values of individuals and peoples to one another, if the powers of post-civilization are to be used constructively rather than destructively. The art of government and politics will need to be developed and given a load of responsibility not previously required, together with a great increase in the number doing

this work. In short, as machines take over the work that men have done in the past, a new kind of work will be as demanding and imperative as work in the past has been. It will be the work of developing and conserving interpersonal and other social relations along with the integrity of the individual and of expanding his valuing consciousness in a community of mutual support with other individuals and peoples.

This exposes one of the prevalent errors about post-civilization. It is the error of thinking that there will be more leisure in the future than in the past. There will be more leisure when that means freedom from the kind of work engaging the energies of men in the past. But a different kind of work will be equally demanding. Yet it will be the kind of work more closely akin to the potential demands of our humanity and in that sense may be enjoyable, at least for those who have found the way to live in the new age and providing that we have the right kind of ruling commitment, called religion, fitted for this new age.

THE CENTRAL CONCEPTS FOR RELIGIOUS INQUIRY

After this examination of the revolutionary transformation of human existence that is generating the problem for religious inquiry in our time, we go on to the next step in the analysis of this problem. The next step is to distinguish and formulate as clearly as possible the central concepts necessary for adequate conduct of religious inquiry when we begin anew with the basic question about the essential structure and constructive potentialities of human existence.

There are four central concepts of this kind. They are: (1) the concept of human existence; (2) the concept of value distinguishing good and evil, right and wrong; (3) the concept of that kind of transformation human existence undergoes when the good of life is increased; (4) the concept of religion itself, about which there is great confusion in our time.

We begin with the question: What distinguishes human existence from every other kind of existence in respect to those matters that concern religious inquiry?

What distinguishes human existence from every other kind of existence is the valuing consciousness that is capable of indefinite expansion. This enables man to expand beyond any known limit the range of what he can know, can control, and can value. Knowledge and power of control are themselves values. Hence we can say that our essential humanity is the individual's valuing consciousness, which is capable of indefinite expansion in community with others.

"Community with others" must be added because it is impossible to

expand the valuing consciousness of the individual beyond the animal level unless he is in a community that embodies a culture, when "culture" means an extensive system of values accumulated through many generations and shared by many individuals.

Let us then characterize humanity as endowed with a biological organism capable of using symbols that carry meanings subject to indefinite development in range and complexity. This is the concept of human existence to be used in religious inquiry. Otherwise stated, it is a valuing consciousness capable of indefinite expansion by way of the historical development of a community of unique individuals in communication with one another, provided the individuals are activated by a ruling commitment that makes this possible and also provided that other required conditions are present. We must guard against the frequent error of assuming that this expansion of the valuing consciousness of the individual in community with others is inevitable or due to any law independent of those specific conditions that must be present for this expansion to occur.

This concept of human existence is not a form of optimism when optimism means that this expansion of the valuing consciousness will necessarily occur. We could define human existence in terms of its self-destructive and degenerative propensities. No other form of existence is so profoundly and powerfully addicted to self-destruction and perversion of the potentialities just described. This side of human existence is equally relevant to religious inquiry. Religious inquiry is concerned as much with the way of salvation as it is with the way of creative transformation.

Human existence is uniquely related to the universe. To see how intimately the universe is involved in human existence we should note what knowledge is and how it is attained. The infinite fulness of being is unknown and unknowable until selected parts of it are transformed by creative transaction with the inquiring mind. This creative interaction creates both the knowing mind on the one hand and the known world on the other. The unknown must be transformed by this creative interaction with the inquiring mind before it can be known. The transformation whereby knowledge is created occurs in the following manner:

1. Data are selected by the inquiring mind from out of the fulness of being which is the unknown and continues to be unknown except for these selected data. These are infinitesimal compared to the fulness of being from which they are selected.
2. The selections are made by the focus of attention, which in turn is shaped by the interests arising in the occasion.

3. These interests are themselves shaped and narrowed down by what the biological organism must have to survive.
4. The data selected and lifted out of the fulness of being are further determined by the categories with which the mind does its thinking, by the culture inherited from the past, by the language and the requirements of logic.
5. Theories constructed by the human imagination order the selected data to render them subject to prediction and logical inference. Selected data do not come first in time. Ruling interests and theories often come first to select the data from the fulness of existence.

To say that knowledge is thus created by theories that are constructs of the human imagination does not mean that the imagination is free to construct any theory it chooses and thereby gain knowledge. The theory must fit the data even as the data must fit the theory. Nevertheless, different theories can be used to select different data. Also, it is often the case that a number of different theories will all equally serve to give predictable and logical order to the selected data. In such a case that theory will be chosen which is most simple according to the principle of Occam's razor. Also, that theory will be chosen which has the widest range of coherence with other theories. Also, that theory will be chosen which is most fertile in the sense of opening the way for developing many other theories from it by logical deduction and by suggesting innovations.

Thus we see that the universe does not exist apart from the inquiring mind. The unknown is not itself a universe waiting to be known. The universe as known to the human mind is not a part of a larger universe already knowable but unknown. If the inquiring minds of men continue to search with all the resources for inquiry that are increasingly available, the known universe will greatly expand beyond what it is now. It may also become far more full of aesthetic quality by the creations of art and by the expansion of the valuing consciousness. But this universe is not now waiting in being to be discovered. It must be created by the creativity operating in human existence. Until we understand this relation of human existence to the universe, we do not have that concept of human existence required for effective religious inquiry.

This shows the error of directing religious commitment to the universe. The universe as known to the human mind is itself created by the same creativity that progressively creates the knowing mind of the individual from infancy and has progressively created the knowing mind during the past million and more years. To commit ourselves to the universe as known at any one time is to obstruct the further creation by which the known universe is transformed. If men had com-

ZYGON

mitted themselves to the known universe when they thought this earth to be the center of all creation, we would still be holding that view, and the universe as now known would not be in existence. Indeed Copernicus and Galileo had to break through that very kind of religious commitment.

Not the universe but the creativity progressively expanding the universe and giving it a fuller content, at the same time creating the valuing consciousness of the knowing mind—this should command the ruling commitment of our lives.

After this consideration of the way human existence is related to the universe, we turn to examine the way human existence is related to history. "History," as the word is here used, refers to the accumulation and transformation of the symbolized meanings with which the human mind does its thinking, knowing, and valuing.

History in this sense is necessary to human existence because, without it, there could be no valuing consciousness capable of indefinite expansion with symbolized meanings. The newborn infant could not acquire a valuing consciousness that expands indefinitely to include wider ranges of knowledge, power, and value if there had not been accumulated through the long course of history an extensive system of symbolized meanings in the form of a language. If this language, the product of history, were not already present with all its meanings when the infant is born, he could not have the valuing consciousness capable of indefinite expansion that is our humanity.

Thus it is that history creates our humanity. Our humanity becomes more or less, rises or falls, becomes dominant over other forms of existence or sinks to a subordination under the domination of other forms, all depending on its heritage from history. If each generation adds a further expansion of symbolized meaning to what it has received from the past, our humanity is progressively created. If each generation transmits less to the next, our humanity begins to regress toward extinction. Thus man is the embodiment of history when "history" means what the past has accumulated and given to the present in the form of symbolized meanings that expand the valuing consciousness.

Human existence is the embodiment of the universe and of history; and this distinguishes human existence from every other kind of existence of which we have knowledge. Indeed these two embodiments come to the same thing. What we call the universe is what we are able to know with the symbolized meanings given to us by history.

Now, after this consideration of what we mean by human existence, which is the first of the four essential concepts required for religious

inquiry, we come to the second of the four, namely, the concept of value. Here again we have a storm center of confusion and controversy. Without trying to fight our way through all this diversity of view, let us simply state that concept of value here held to be most useful in the conduct of religious inquiry.

By the word "value" we shall mean any goal-seeking activity. The value is the activity combined with its goal. At the most elementary level, the value is positive if the goal is attained; it is negative if the goal is not attained. But goal-seeking activities are connected in all manner of different ways. They can support one another and frustrate one another. They can be locked together into a system of tight interdependence, or they can form systems that exclude one another, each operating independently. In still other cases they can be related as means to ends, one set being instrumental to the attainment of another set of goal-seeking activities. Some activities seem to be valued for their own sake, independently of others, although careful analysis will generally show that they are the momentary conscious manifestation of many other activities not recognized at the time.

We cannot enter into all the intricacies of the ways in which goal-seeking activities can be related to one another. The only point we want to make is that the good of life increases to the measure that activities support one another across the widest ranges of diversity to form an expanding system of mutually sustaining activities, provided that this expanding system can be symbolized for the individual so that he can be conscious of the expanding system. This is another way of speaking of the individual's valuing consciousness, which expands indefinitely in community with others.

Such a system provides for freedom to the measure that mutual support reaches across the widest ranges of diversity when such diversity is required to express and develop the uniqueness of each participant.

An expanding system of goal-seeking activities of this sort must be able to absorb conflicts so that the conflict modifies the opposing activities in a way to make them mutually sustaining even when they are engaged in the conflict. In some cases the conflict may modify the opponents to the point of reconciliation. In other cases the conflict may continue in the form of a dialectic that increases the value of the conflicting parties without reconciliation. Of course, not all conflicts can be absorbed in these ways. Many frustrate and defeat the value of the goal-seeking activities. Such conflicts must be excluded if value is to be conserved and increased.

It is not here suggested that perfection in this way of ordering goal-

ZYGON

seeking activities is ever attained. Life is never perfect. The only claim here made is that this way of organizing activities can be approximated to various degrees. Life becomes better to the degree that goal-seeking activities are organized in the way mentioned.

This gives us the standard that religious inquiry must have for judging human life in terms of better and worse. The standard proposed here can be summarized thus: Human existence is better to the measure that all goal-seeking activities are brought into relations of mutual support across the widest ranges of diversity to form an expanding system of activities when this system is symbolized so that the individual participant can be conscious of its value.

This gives us the third concept essential to the conduct of religious inquiry. It can be stated in the form of an answer to the following question: What transformation of human existence increases the good of life and saves human existence from its self-destructive and degenerative propensities?

Human existence is saved and transformed creatively to the measure that all goal-seeking activities across widest ranges of diversity are brought into relations of mutual support to form an expanding system of value symbolized so that participant individuals can be conscious of the system as a whole.

This transformation is called creative because it requires a continuous transformation of the total structure of human existence so that this structure can embody a greater content of value. By "total structure" we mean the structures found at the physical, chemical, biological, psychological, social, cultural, and historical levels of human existence. A second reason for calling this transformation creative is that it is caused by a kind of creativity later to be described.

This brings us to the fourth concept essential to religious inquiry. This is the concept of religion itself. The word "religion" is given many different meanings. We must decide definitely what we shall mean when we use the word. The meaning here suggested may be stated thus: Religion is the most comprehensive, over-all, ruling commitment accepted on the belief that this commitment will direct human striving in such a way that human existence will be saved from its self-destructive and degenerative propensities and transformed to contain the fullest content of value that human life can ever embody.

This definition of "religion" identifies it with belief because it is an obvious fact that religious commitment can be in error. The horrors and stupidities of religion throughout human history cannot be denied. Any definition of it that conceals these monstrous evils is deceptive

and should not be tolerated. This recognition of the evil and error of religious commitment exposes the problem of religious inquiry. The problem is to find the correct answer to the question: What is that over-all, ruling commitment which will in truth, and not merely in belief, direct all the strivings of human life in such a way that human existence can be transformed toward the greater good, provided that men live by the commitment?

A ruling commitment is one that gives to the individual and to the group a predisposition to choose, in every time of major decision, that alternative which, according to available evidence, best serves to provide conditions most favorable for the operation of that reality to which commitment has been made. This is true whether the ruling commitment has been made to my country right or wrong, or to what is believed to be the will of a supernatural and almighty God, or to a creativity operating in human existence to bring goal-seeking activities into relations of mutual support across the widest ranges of diversity with a consequent transformation of human existence giving it a greater content of value.

With this understanding of religion one may ask: What is the difference between morality and religion? This difference is of crucial importance and yet is often obscured or ignored completely. The substitution of morality for religion is the source of some of the greatest evils in human life. Morality is essential. Without it human existence is impossible. But, like all other good things, it can become a monstrous evil when practiced apart from those conditions that define its proper function.

Morality is to act in obedience to those ideals most inclusive of all values within reach of the individual's imagination. But beyond the reach of every individual's imagination are values included in the imaginations of other individuals or yet to be imagined. Every person, to the measure that he maintains his integrity as an individual, has an imagination that includes values unique to him except as he communicates them to others in a creative interchange that enables each participant to derive new values from the others and consequently to integrate their values into his own individuality. This applies not only to individuals; it applies to cultures and peoples, to families and groups of all sorts. These all have values that others do not and cannot imagine until each derives them from others. By this creative interchange the valuing consciousness of participants can expand indefinitely.

When morality is made supreme in disregard of this kind of religious

ZYGON

commitment, the participants try to impose their moral ideals on others. With utmost sincerity and devotion, each strives to correct the evil in others, this evil being the ideal of the other party held in opposition to the first party. When each tries to impose his ideals on the other, conflict, tyranny, and injustice ensue; and the more sincere and zealous is the morality in each, the worse the conflict can become.

The corrective of this is not mere tolerance, because tolerance of evil has very narrow limits. We cannot with moral integrity tolerate great evils without doing our utmost to correct them. Nor is love the corrective of this evil arising in morality, because the more we love another, the more we must try to save him from his evil ways.

Nothing here said is intended to deny the indispensable value of morality. Morality, to repeat, is one of the essentials without which human existence cannot continue. But morality has its proper place and when not kept to its proper place becomes an evil. What, then, is its proper place? The proper place of moral commitment is in subjection to a higher commitment, and this higher commitment is religious commitment.

Religious commitment of the kind here defended is commitment of the total self, including one's highest ideals, to a creativity operating in human life to expand the valuing consciousness of each person by creative interchange with others. By way of this creativity I come to include in myself values I previously could not imagine, and this inclusion creates a community of mutual support with persons and peoples previously in conflict.

We have now completed our survey and formulation of the four essential concepts required in the conduct of religious inquiry. These are, to repeat, the concept of human existence, the concept of value, the concept of that transformation of human existence which increases its value, and, finally, the concept of religion itself. We can now go on to the next step in our analysis of the problem of religious inquiry. This is to formulate the basic question that religious inquiry must seek to answer.

FORMULATING THE BASIC QUESTION

With the analysis thus far made we have the background and context in which to formulate the basic question for religious inquiry. It can, of course, be worded in many different ways, but the diverse use of words should all point to the same basic question if inquiry is not to be misled by seeking an answer to the wrong question.

The question can be worded thus: What operates in human exist-

ence to save man from his self-destructive and degenerative propensities and to transform human life toward the fullest content of value that human existence can ever embody?

Some may object to this way of putting the question because it speaks only of what operates in human existence. Why not ask about what operates in the total universe, or in the totality of all being, or in being itself? The previous analysis should make plain why we ask only about what operates in human existence and not primarily about the universe or the fulness of all being or about the power of being or about supernatural God or any other being.

What we call the total universe at any one time is what our valuing and cognitive consciousness can envision at that time. The universe as so conceived will be transcended and become obsolete when our valuing consciousness is expanded by the creativity operating in human existence to expand the valuing consciousness.

The same applies to the process of evolution. Nowhere except in human existence does evolution expand indefinitely the range of what can be known, controlled, and valued. Consequently, this creativity operating in human life is the only form of evolution to which we can be committed. It is impossible to commit ourselves to evolution in its prehuman form because we are human. For the same reason we cannot commit ourselves to any form of evolution that may develop beyond the human level. Evolution in no form except that of the creativity operating in human existence can command our ruling commitment. Only in this way can we know about evolution and correct and redirect it to bring forth a universe of conscious value rather than chemical and biological processes with the minimum range of conscious value, if any at all. Biochemical processes may have led to human existence, but with the development of symbolized meanings we have something radically and incomparably different. Only as biochemical processes are integrated into the creativity that expands the valuing consciousness, or can otherwise be made to serve this creativity, are they involved in our ruling commitment. The prevalent confusion of cosmic evolution with the creativity operating in human existence must be corrected if we are to conduct religious inquiry in a way that will find a ruling commitment fit to direct our use of modern scientific research and technology.

As said before, all this applies in like manner to the Christian message—or, as it is technically called, the *kerygma*, the gospel—and to the Bible generally. The Christian message can mean nothing to us except as we get that message by creative interchange with those who

live by it. Otherwise there would be no need of the church, no need of preaching, no need of scholars like Rudolf Bultmann and others devoting their lives to study of the gospel message in creative interchange with other scholars and thinkers, exposing new meanings which must in turn be criticized and developed by others.

Whatever truth there is in the Christian message, and in the Bible generally, can only be known by way of the creativity that expands the valuing consciousness. The case is better stated when we say that the value of the Christian message lies in what it can contribute to promoting creative interchange between parent and child, husband and wife, between human associates of all kinds, between cultures and peoples. When not applied to human living in this way the Christian message becomes a tyranny of dogma, a barrier to creative interchange, and a source of great evil, as history demonstrates.

Some point to the mystery of being as the primary concern of religious commitment. But whatever meaning we are able to derive from the mystery of being depends on the valuing consciousness we have, and this in turn depends on the creativity developing the mind from infancy.

The same applies to the meaning of history or to anything else that can be mentioned as the guide and goal of our ruling commitment. Always our understanding of such goals and the values we find in them are determined by the valuing consciousness we have at the time. Always there are other values, further understanding, and greater powers yet to be brought within reach of the valuing consciousness. Only the creativity here under consideration can bring forth these transformations of human existence.

The conclusion from all this seems to be obvious. The ruling commitment of our lives must be given to the creativity operating in human existence to expand indefinitely the valuing consciousness of the individual in community with others. This is the only way we can be saved from tyranny, saved from blindness to changing conditions requiring a change in the order of human life, saved from dogmatism, arrogance, narrow mindedness, and that disregard of the demands of individuality in others which is the source of so much evil.

We have asked the basic question that religious inquiry should seek to answer, the question underlying many answers that have been made to it. The question is: What calls for the ruling commitment of human existence? We have also suggested an answer to that question which we believe is better fitted to meet the demands of post-civilization than other answers fitted for other times. Our answer is the creativity op-

erating by way of creative interchange. But this suggested answer must be further examined.

THE FOURFOLD CREATIVITY

The answer here suggested to the basic question about human existence that religious inquiry seeks to answer is a creativity made up of four parts. It is a kind of communication or interchange between individuals and peoples. The first part of this interchange is that the individuals, groups, or peoples get from one another some understanding of the values each seeks, which are different for each party.

The second part of the interchange is that these goal-seeking activities, which each comes to understand as activating the other party, are modified and integrated into the system of activities that activates each participant engaged in this kind of interchange.

The third part of the interchange is that the valuing consciousness of each party is then expanded, because the system of activities for which he lives has come to include, in some modified form, some of the activities previously embodied only in the other party.

The fourth part of the interchange is that relations of mutual support and mutual understanding become more extensive between the parties concerned than would have been the case if this interchange had not occurred.

It is here claimed that this fourfold creativity creates the human mind progressively from infancy to the measure that required conditions are present for its effective operation. It does the same for the human race throughout the course of history, also to the measure that required conditions are present. Not only does it create the human mind, it creates all the values, all the knowledge, all the power of control that human beings can ever exercise. Basically it creates and magnifies our freedom and our capacity to love and be loved and prescribes that course of action called justice.

Furthermore, this fourfold creativity saves us from the self-destructive and degenerative propensities in human existence. The self-destructive propensities arise from irreconcilable conflicts both within the individual and between individuals and peoples. Irreconcilable conflicts within the individual arise from failure to integrate goal-seeking activities so that they can work together in the life of the individual instead of working at cross-purposes, either subconsciously or consciously or both. The same applies to conflicts between individuals, peoples, and organized groups. Conflicts are not in themselves evil. They become evil only when they fail to arouse that kind of inter-

ZYGON

change just described which expands the valuing consciousness of the participant parties while at the same time increasing the relations of mutual support and understanding between them.

Conflicts that bring on self-destruction and degeneration can be corrected and become ways of expanding the valuing consciousness and deepening the community only to the measure that two conditions are met. The first of these conditions is that the ruling commitment of human life be given to the fourfold creativity just described, so that, at every time of major decision, each individual, group, and organization will choose that alternative course of action which seems to provide conditions most favorable for the effective operation of the fourfold creativity, throughout the life of each individual and throughout society. This ruling commitment can be more or less effective and powerful, depending on how completely it dominates the life of the individual, group, or political body, so that other alternatives will not be chosen, no matter how alluring they may seem. This is the first condition that must be met if this fourfold creativity is to save human existence from its self-destructive and degenerative propensities and transform it toward the fullest content of value it can ever embody.

The second condition that must be met is that we get the required knowledge, not merely so that when we make our major decisions we shall have the intention to choose the course of action that provides conditions most favorable for the effective operation of the fourfold creativity, but so we shall be informed of what those conditions are so that our choice will be intelligent as well as having the right intention.

This brings us to a further point in our analysis of the problem of religious inquiry. It has to do with the relation of religious inquiry to scientific research and technology.

THE RELATION OF SCIENCE TO RELIGIOUS INQUIRY

In treating this subject we shall use the word "science" to include both scientific research and scientific technology. Using the word in this way, it can be said that henceforth science will be the supreme instrument of power to shape the course of human history and determine how each person will live his life. Depending on the way science is used, the life of an individual will be ordered so that he becomes either a helpless unit moulded and coerced by a gigantic technology reaching down into every impulse, or he will become increasingly a free and unique person with a valuing consciousness expanding indefinitely in community with others.

This being the case, religious commitment has a prime responsibility for the way scientific research is directed and the way scientific technology is constructed and used. Conflict between religious belief and scientific knowledge has no place in the modern world, and we can ignore it for present purposes. But there are two other ways of relating religious thought to science that are mistaken because they refuse to assume this responsibility for the conduct of science which must be assumed if science is not to dehumanize us.

The first of these two ways is the naïve and uncritical approach. When this is followed, religious thinking eagerly seeks to learn what all the specialized sciences have to teach as though this knowledge thus given helps to answer the basic question that religious inquiry seeks to answer. This approach to science makes religion nothing more than a way of popularizing the accumulation of scientific knowledge. It takes away from religion every distinctive function of its own. Religious inquiry must have a distinctive question of its own for which it seeks an answer by way of scientific knowledge.

The second way that religious thought in our time approaches science is equally mistaken, although it is highly sophisticated. This form of religious thought segregates religious inquiry from scientific inquiry quite completely. These sophisticated thinkers accept without question everything science has to teach, but, they insist, it has nothing to do with religious inquiry. Religious inquiry seeks answers to questions that scientific research cannot answer. Therefore scientific research should go its way and religious inquiry go its way, without interference or connection or co-operation of any kind between the two.

These two ways of viewing the relation between science and religious inquiry open the way to disaster because they assume no responsibility for the supreme instrument of power shaping the course of human life, for the individual, for society, and for history. The whole meaning and purpose of religious commitment is to give direction, meaning, and form to human existence, and when it fails to use the only instrument capable of doing this, religious commitment becomes a practice in futility.

Science seeks knowledge for its own sake. It does not seek knowledge to answer any particular kind of question unless it is asked to seek that kind of knowledge. Increasingly the major institutions of our society come to science with questions that must be answered for them to do their proper work in the world. This is true of the military and other agencies of government; it is true of industrial and other economic interests; it is true of educational, medical, advertising, and most of

ZYGON

the other ruling interests of modern life. They come to science for the knowledge and the technology needed to fulfil their proper functions.

These interests do not come to science merely to learn what science has to tell about the universe. Rather they put questions to science, asking that these questions be answered so that they can operate more effectively in shaping human existence in accordance with the interests they represent. But the uncritical religious mind often comes to science to get a cosmic vision for contemplation and not to get the power to bring human existence more completely under the control of a ruling commitment to the creativity progressively expanding the valuing consciousness. A cosmic vision is a transitory thing. It is what the valuing consciousness at the present stage of its creation is able to value. It is not the creativity that expands the valuing consciousness in wider community and to a more comprehensive vision by interchange between individuals and peoples. The responsibility of religion is not to the universe; it is to the creative potentialities of human existence.

Unlike other forms of religion, commitment to creativity seeks cooperation with the sciences to shape physical and chemical conditions of human life, the biological and psychological conditions, the social, cultural, and historical, all to the end that these conditions can be made most favorable for the effective operation of this creativity throughout the whole of human existence.

Also, the ruling commitment given to this creativity must seek that form of scientific technology which can implement the use of this knowledge it gets from science to shape conditions in the way mentioned.

We have noted three mistaken ways in which religion and science have been related to one another. One is the relation of conflict, the second is the relation of naïve acceptance, and the third is that of segregation. To the measure that any or all of these ways come to dominate our lives, irreparable evils will result because human life must have a ruling commitment to give it the form and direction needed for survival and for maximum increase of positive value. We cannot have such a ruling commitment in our time if it is not informed by scientific knowledge and implemented by scientific technology designed to serve this purpose.

When scientific knowledge is sought to answer other questions and not the religious question, the knowledge it provides will not answer the religious question. Also, scientific technology designed for other purposes will not necessarily serve this religious purpose. Consequent-

ly, religious inquiry and scientific inquiry cannot unite unless they work on the same problem. When religious inquiry does not seek the conditions most favorable for the effective operation of the creativity mentioned, then religious inquiry cannot unite with the scientific in a way to be effective in doing its proper work. On the other hand, if scientific inquiry does not seek the required conditions for the effective operation of this creativity at all levels of human existence, then scientific inquiry cannot unite with religious inquiry. In the age of science the ruling commitment of religion and the knowledge and power of science must work together if human life is to continue.

The central problem of religious inquiry is to find out how to bring the whole of human life most completely under the control of that creativity which carries all the constructive potentialities of positive value residing in human existence. The practice of worship, both public and private, is the practice of religious commitment by which the individual and the group seek to bring their total selves into the service of what is worshipped so that, as said before, in every time of major decision that alternative will be chosen which best serves to meet the demands of what is worshipped. But to choose that alternative we must have the knowledge that science can provide, together with the ruling commitment that only religion can provide.

IS THIS HUMANISM OR THEISM?

One further question remains that should be considered because of the controversies prevalent in religious thought. Is the kind of religion here set forth a form of humanism or a form of theism?

To get the point of this question it should be understood that we are using the word "humanism" to refer to the belief that all salvation from the great evils and all transformation toward the greater good is done by human power, whereas theism claims that it is done by divine power.

This question, setting humanism against theism as the only alternatives, does not apply to the thought as here developed. To ask such a question is to be like a man who lived in the age when man power and horse power were the only two kinds of power that made things go. Such a man sees an automobile for the first time and asks the driver, Do you make this machine go by pushing it or is there some kind of hidden horse power that pulls it? The driver answers, Neither man power nor horse power does the work. Exploding gasoline makes it go. I open the throttle, steer at the wheel, and control the brakes, but I do not make it go.

ZYGON

But the old man is not satisfied. He goes back to his folks where no one knows of any other power except man power and horse power. There they argue for a period of fifty years over whether it is man power or horse power that makes the auto move.

This corresponds to the argument over humanism and theism when applied to creativity. Many insist that the creativity here under consideration operates by man power. Others insist that it can only operate by God power with the traditional idea of God. They cannot see any other alternative. But these are not the only alternatives. Human thinking need not stop with this argument, any more than it had to stop with the argument over whether the earth is flat or a sphere. We now know that it is neither. It is pear-shaped.

As human thinking develops through the ages, new models (or concepts) arise, enabling the human mind to distinguish forms of reality previously unknowable. For a time there is always a strong propensity to interpret these new models as though they were identical with the old. In religion this propensity is most powerful and difficult to overcome because of the magnitude of value involved. But in time, with persistent effort, the new model becomes accepted. One of the best examples of this lag in accepting a new model in religion is the case of the religions of the Roman Empire persecuting Christianity as a form of atheism.

Creativity is not God in the traditional meaning of that word. But neither does it operate under the control of human purpose. To be sure, it could not operate in the way it does in human existence without human existence. Then, one asks, does not human existence come first before this kind of creativity can operate? No. We must go back into that remote past when an animal began to use symbols with the first beginning of the kind of meaning capable of indefinite expansion. Gradually those organisms with less ability to use symbols with extensive range of meaning were unable to survive and those who had more of this ability did survive. This development of animals fit to survive by reason of ability to use symbols with wider ranges of meaning was not the work of human plan and purpose.

So also the valuing consciousness of the unique individual cannot be foreseen, planned, or prescribed by any human mind, not even by that of the individual in the earlier stages of his own development. What values he will have in the full-blown uniqueness of his individuality no one can predetermine, not even himself. When any agency, or when even he himself, shapes his development so that his valuing consciousness in maturity includes nothing beyond what was foreseen

in the beginning, he becomes a puppet and not an authentic individual person.

The word "creativity" in one of its meanings refers to the creativity of the human mind. But we are using the word to refer to what creates the human mind. These are two very different kinds of creativity and they should not be confused. Innovating ideas that the individual contributes to the prevailing culture are produced by him. But he must first have that uniquely developed valuing consciousness which is himself; and this is not produced by himself or by anything other than the creative interchange which is here called creativity.

As man's power to shape the course of events reaches gigantic proportions, it becomes increasingly imperative that he recognize the disastrous consequences that ensue when human purpose is not held subject to creative transformation by interchange between those who exercise the power and they who are subject to it, whether this relation is between the government and those governed, or between parent and child, or between the United States and countries that have less power.

In this sense, it can be said that human purposes become self-destructive when not held subject to the divine corrective, when divine corrective means that creative transformation of purposes whereby wider ranges of diversity are brought into relations of mutual support by creative interchange between the participants. Furthermore, this self-destructiveness becomes increasingly disastrous as human purpose is equipped with increasing power to resist and ignore everything save its predetermined goal. A present-day example of this fateful development is the way the United States is using its power to shape the rest of the world in accord with its own image in disregard of the values of other peoples, especially those that profess the ideology of communism.

Here we see the danger and the evil of that kind of humanism which insists that human purposes and ideals must control the further development of human existence rather than submitting these purposes and ideals to creative transformation by constantly protecting and improving the conditions under which creative interchange can operate between diverse purposes and ideals to expand their comprehension of value and to bring them into the relations of mutual support across wider ranges of diversity. We must have ideals and purposes and we must increase our power, provided that above all else we are committed to that creativity which expands the valuing consciousness of the individual in community with others, holding all else subject to this in the sense that, in every time of major decision, we choose the

ZYGON

alternative best fitted to promote the transforming power of creative interchange.

One last feature involved in the problem of religious inquiry should now be noted. It is the need to have two kinds of religious language.

TWO KINDS OF RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE

If religious inquiry is to be effective, it cannot use the language of worship. Therefore we must have two kinds of religious language, one seeking utmost precision by way of abstractions, the other referring to that concrete fulness of being where alone can be found the fulness of the values for which we live. Intellectual inquiry must seek precision by way of abstractions; worship must seek fulness of content in what is worshipped. For this reason we cannot use the language of worship when conducting intellectual inquiry if we are to avoid confusion and be effective in seeking statements that can be reliably confirmed by evidence.

To show that the language of love, loyalty, devotion, and worship cannot be used in the conduct of intellectual inquiry if the latter is to be effective, let us take an example outside the field of religion because it is more simple and obvious than an example from the complexities of religious living.

Some wives on occasion address their husbands with terms like "honey." She says: "Honey, shut the door." Now there is no confusion whatsoever in this case. Everyone knows precisely whom she is addressing and what she means when she says, "Honey, shut the door." This is the language of love and devotion, of loyalty and worship. This is not mere emotivism, nor is it sloppy thinking. The wife is referring to the concrete total being of her husband; and this concrete total being of her husband cannot be identified with the physical components of his being, or the chemical components, or the biological, or the psychological, or the social, or the cultural, or the historical. If any of these abstractions, taken from the several sciences, were applied to her husband, it would falsify and confuse her meaning because she is referring to the total individual and not to any of these components of his total being.

Now all this applies to worship. In worship we are committing our total selves to the total being of what we worship. If this commitment is given to the creativity here under consideration, we will recognize that this creativity operates throughout the whole of human existence, at the physical and chemical levels, at the biological and psychological, and also at the cultural and historical. The several sciences may seek

to find out how this creativity operates at all these levels and the conditions for its most effective operation at these several levels. So also the several sciences can be applied to the husband, physics by seeking his weight and other physical components, chemistry by seeking his chemical composition, and so through all the sciences. This is valuable information, and if the wife is to help keep him at his best in health, vitality, psychological organization, cultural equipment, and historical orientation, all this knowledge may be helpful to her. But she will falsify what she really intends to say if she addresses him in terms of what these sciences may discover about him, because she is addressing the total individual who is infinitely more than all these scientific descriptions.

Let us return now to the two languages religion must have if religious inquiry is to be effective in attaining what intellectual inquiry must seek. Intellectual inquiry must operate with the abstractions of precision used in the several sciences and in philosophy. But worship must use language that does not refer to these abstract characteristics, correct as these may be in designating some component of what is worshipped, because what we commit ourselves to in the practice of worship is not any of these components. What we commit ourselves to is the total being of what is worshipped, and this can never be identified with these abstractions.

For this reason the language of the ruling commitment in religion must be different from the language of intellectual inquiry in religion. The word "God" might be used in worship just as the word "honey" might be used by the wife. I am not insisting that the word "God" must be used, any more than I am insisting that the wife use the word "honey." The associations and conventions of husband and wife might render the word "honey" entirely unfitting and confusing. But, whatever language the wife uses, it will not be the language of scientific description. It might simply be the word "John," as in religious commitment it might simply be the word —; I leave this space blank.

I do not think the word "creativity" should be used in worship because it has been invented for purposes of intellectual inquiry. There is another reason for not using the word "creativity" in worship. The most common meaning attached to this word refers to the creative power of the human mind, whereas the meaning here given to it refers to what creates the human mind. This makes the word confusing when this special meaning is not carefully explained.

ZYGON

CONCLUSION

This completes analysis of the problem of religious inquiry. If it be true that human existence is undergoing the most revolutionary transformation that has yet occurred, there must be more intensive religious inquiry in our time than has yet occurred, because ways of life fitted for past ages will not be fitted for the age now beginning. Our hope is to find a ruling commitment giving that order and direction to human striving which will enable us not only to pass through the great transition but also to pick up the potentialities of value brought forth by the great revolution and carry them to highest fulfilment. To this end nothing is so basically essential as the right kind of religion when religion means a ruling commitment that orders and directs the strivings of human existence. If we fail in finding such a commitment, all else will fail. If we succeed, all else will succeed within the limits of existing conditions.

We ought to be able to find a better answer to this basic question about human existence than the past was able to produce, not because we are wiser than the men of the past, but because we can learn from their striving. Endowed with this gift from the past we should, with labor and search equal to theirs, find an answer more fit to meet human need.

Civilization of the past five thousand years has been a brief transition from the million and more years of tribal life to the million and more years of post-civilization, if we can make the transition. Civilization was a time of diverse seeking and experiment, of great suffering and destruction, with conflicting religions offering different answers to the basic question: How use the power and wealth of civilization to bring the valuing consciousness of human existence to its fullest flowering? What conditions must be present for it to expand indefinitely and in a widening community?

No adequate answer to this question was found during civilization, but much was learned. Now the answer must be found. If we do not find it, this marvel of a valuing consciousness embodied in human existence will disappear; and no other kind of existence on this planet or in the solar system has such a consciousness endowing the universe with qualities of beauty and meaning.

To find the needed answer to this question is the responsibility of religious inquiry. There is need to have some institutional centers, free of obligation to serve the established church, where philosophers, theologians, scientists, and other competent and interested persons might discuss intensively the problem of religious commitment. Such a center

could not only bring individuals together in person but also circulate essays and other writings among them for critical interchange by correspondence.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCENDENT BEING

Some insist that the creativity here described is the manifestation in human existence of a transcendent being. This transcendence may be represented as infinite beyond all characterization (Tillich), or as a comic mind (Hartshorne), or as a combination of consequent and primordial orders beyond existence (Whitehead), or as one of four modes of being (Paul Weiss), or as a supernatural person (traditional theology), or portrayed in some of the many other ways in which the human mind tries to understand what transcends it.

It is not here denied that the creativity we have been describing *may* be the manifestation in human existence of transcendent being, although we cannot know what that being is precisely because it does transcend human existence and therefore is beyond the reach of our cognitive powers. But there are several objections to directing our ruling commitment to what transcends the creativity here described. Some of these will be listed as follows:

1. Our first responsibility is to make the best possible out of human existence, and this we can do only by total commitment to what operates in human existence, even if we do it in service of what transcends human existence.
2. If this creativity is the manifestation in human existence of transcendent being, then our commitment to this creativity is also commitment to this transcendent being and nothing more is required.
3. When we give priority to what transcends this creativity, we divert and confuse our commitment to what alone can save and transform human existence toward the best it can ever become.
4. What transcends human existence, if known in any form, can only be known with the categories of the human mind. But what is known under the categories of the human mind is not transcendent. Therefore either transcendent being must be falsified by imposing on it the categories of the human mind or we must reject all attempts to find any guidance or meaning in it since all such attempts are inevitably falsifications. To call these falsifications "religious symbols" or "myths" in no way corrects them.
5. When we commit ourselves to what transcends this creativity we become vague and indefinite (or else misled by falsifications), thereby incapacitated to make definite decisions and unable to focus our powers on the kind of action required to save human existence from the dangers that threaten.
6. More serious than any of the above is the last objection to directing commitment to what transcends creativity. When commitment is directed to what transcends the creativity that is open to scientific inquiry, religious inquiry cannot join with the sciences because transcendent being is beyond the reach of scientific research. Consequently other agencies, not concerned with the salvation and creative transformation of human existence, will take over this supreme instrument of power and shape human life to serve their chosen ends. This use of supreme power, in disregard of the demands of creativity, will bring human life to an end after a period of fear, hate, torture, and tyranny. This will be our fate because the

ZYGMOND

power of science has become so great that, if it is not used to serve the creativity that saves, it will obstruct this creativity so that it cannot save.

For these reasons our ruling commitment must be given to this creativity, even though we admit that this creativity may be the manifestation in human existence of transcendent being.

APPENDIX B

CREATIVITY AND THE IDEA OF GOD

MEANINGS THAT "CREATIVITY" AND "GOD" HAVE IN COMMON

1. Creativity creates the humanity of the individual, when "humanity" means a valuing consciousness capable of indefinite expansion.
2. Creativity creates our humanity throughout the course of history.
3. Creativity saves our humanity from its destructive and degenerative propensities, when required conditions are met, doing this both for the individual in his own life and for the human race throughout the course of history.
4. Creativity creates community of mutual support and mutual understanding across the widest ranges of diversity that can be reconciled.
5. Creativity creates the freedom of the individual to develop his own unique individuality, when required conditions are present.
6. Creativity creates the universe as known to the human mind.
7. Creativity creates human history so far as history carries the potentialities of increasing value.
8. Creativity transforms human existence toward the greatest content of value that human existence can embody, when required conditions are met.
9. Creativity should be served above all else by all men throughout human history to the end of their salvation and creative transformation.

MEANINGS OF "GOD" NOT SHARED BY "CREATIVITY"

1. A supernatural person or Person of any kind.
2. Creator of the universe prior to, and independent of, the human mind.
3. Operates beyond the kinds of existence that live by symbolized meaning capable of indefinite expansion.
4. A cosmic mind.
5. The pantheistic totality of all existence.
6. Eternal and infinite being transcending all forms of existence.
7. The mystery of being beyond the reach of human knowledge.
8. Ideals most inclusive of all values. Some identify God with this.
9. Human striving after highest ideals. Dewey identifies God with this.

NOTE

1. *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century: The Great Transition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).