SCIENCE, THEOLOGY, AND HUMAN VALUES

by Donald Szantho Harrington

Values are central to man's existence, happiness, and survival. They are the purveyors and guarantors of life's meaning. They assure men that life has meaning, define what that meaning is, and thus help men to make the choices which contribute to the increase of meaning in their own lives, the lives of their fellowmen, and the universe itself.

Grounds for Human Values

A crisis in values is the worst kind of crisis that can confront a man. It undermines his sense of the usefulness and meaning of life itself. Without the undergirding of a value system, man feels unrealized as a human being, unable to exercise intelligently his capacity for choice. He feels like a thing, an object pushed about by circumstance, without any possibility or basis for purposefulness or self-direction. He experiences anomie, paralysis of will, boredom, what Viktor Frankl has called "the existential vacuum."

Such a man tends to turn upon himself, upon his neighbors, and upon his society in a rage of random destructiveness. Only as a creative being, making choices which he believes to be significant, can self-conscious, rational man feel himself to be more than an object manipulated by forces beyond his control. When he cannot discover and develop a basis for such creativity, as Erich Fromm has pointed out, he will rise above the experience of being an object in the only other way he can, by destroying others or himself. Without solidly grounded, vividly experienced values, man finds it hard to resist the temptation to commit one or another kind of suicide, individual, social, or both. Much of what man is doing in this late twentieth-century world bears resemblance to an unconscious process of homicide and suicide—a massive testament to man's need to recover or redevelop a value system by which to live and make the important choices which crowd his days. He is like the Achilpa, whose value system's structure was described by Mircea Eliade:

Donald Szantho Harrington, minister of the Community Church, New York, presented this paper at the eighteenth summer conference of the Institute on Religion in an Age of Science, Star Island, New Hampshire, July 31-August 6, 1971.

Perhaps the closest parallel to the experience of feeling lost in an unknown, chaotic space is found among the Achilpa, one of the Australian Aranda tribes. According to their mythology, a divine being called Numbakula cosmicized their territory, created their ancestors, and founded their institutions. [Numbakula] fashioned a sacred pole out of the trunk of a gum tree, climbed up to the sky on it and disappeared. This pole represents the cosmic axis, for it is around it that the land becomes habitable and is transformed into a world.

For this reason the ritual role of the sacred pole is a considerable one; the Achilpa carry it with them in their wanderings and decide which direction to take according to the way it leans. This allows them, in spite of their continual moving about, always to find themselves in their world and at the same time to remain in communication with the heaven into which Numbakula has vanished. If the pole is broken, it is a catastrophe; in a way, it is the end of the world and a regression into chaos. The world, for the Achilpa, becomes their world only to the degree in which it reproduces the cosmos organized and sanctified by Numbakula. They cannot live without this vertical axis which assures an opening toward the transcendent and at the same time makes possible their orientation in space.

In other words, one cannot live in a chaos. Once this conduct with the transcendent is broken off and the system of orientation disrupted, existence in the world is no longer possible—and so the Achilpa let themselves die.[1]

Value systems, and the philosophical systems which support them, are not created out of thin air. In the lower animals they are automatically structured-in, genetically determined, evolution-derived behavioral instincts which are geared to species survival. There is no need, or power of choice. Instincts dictate choices. In man, values are socially and culturally derived through a heritage transmitted from one generation to another across the ages of man's history. In this sense, they are man-made and man-maintained, though they are derived from encounter with the physical, social, and cultural contexts within which men have lived, and from the nature of the web of life to which man belongs.

This is not to say that man does not carry genetically derived, instinct-like urges within himself like those of his animal ancestors. Konrad Lorenz and other biologists and anthropologists have pointed this out.

John Wilkinson, in an article in the *Center Report* called attention to some of the problems which arise when these genetically determined urges come into conflict with the need for basic cultural change. He wrote:

. . . Eliade and Jung appear to agree, on balance, that the archetypes that constitute such a large part of our mental furniture are, at least to a great degree, genetically determined; and that the age-old selection pressures that caused them to evolve in *homo sapiens* represent behavioral systems of

enormous importance, that is, in the equilibration or disequilibration of the mechanisms that preserve "culture," while allowing it to adapt to changing circumstances. This sort of neo-Lamarckism, that fifty years ago would have evoked ridicule, has today become very much more plausible through the work of C. H. Waddington, Konrad Lorenz, and others who have succeeded in describing the inheritance of acquired characteristics in genetic and Darwinian terms. The great problem is: How far can we go, especially in a rapidly changing society, in neglecting pre-programmed, spatial and temporal, phylogenetic, structures, as they are found expressed in myth and cultus? . . . On the one hand, we must observe these archetypal structures religiously; but, on the other hand, they have been rendered obsolete; and, to a large degree, irrelevant, by science, . . . *If* it be true that modern man resolutely rejects the religious axis of his Being he may be in the condition of being unable to believe what he must believe.[2]

Nonetheless, man has considerable power to modify, sublimate, and redirect such urges into new patterns of behavior which he may find more valuable, more likely to assure his survival and that of his species. As instinct has faded, the cultural or newly learned value systems have become more and more important. Without a value system, man becomes confused and sick. Psychologically he falls apart. His society tends to disintegrate. He reverts to the lower animal level of life.

The value systems by which men have lived were handed down by religious tradition and based upon the authority of supposed divine revelation. In the West they were derived principally from the Bible, believed by the devout to be the very Word of God. In the East the sources were similar great traditions and scriptures, interpreted by religious authorities.

The modern age has witnessed the gradual dissolution of the authority upon which these value systems of East and West were based. Modern science has undermined the capacity of men to believe the myths upon which the value systems were founded—Moses receiving the tablets of the Law on Mount Sinai direct from the hand of God; Jesus, God incarnate, transmitting a new Covenant, summarized in the Sermon on the Mount, to replace the old one with Abraham.

With the basic authority of traditional values thus undermined, and with many new forces and circumstances pushing men in new directions, the old values have begun to crumble and are disintegrating today before our eyes. Unless *a new ground for human values* can be found, our traditional values seem likely to disappear, leaving us with nothing significant to take their place. Where are that new grounding and those new values to be found?

Before attacking this fundamental question, let me illustrate the problem by describing the present plight of the religious movement which has in our time most fully abandoned the authority of biblical revelation, substituting for it the free search for truth which is characteristic of the scientific approach. The Unitarian-Universalist movement in the United States today is a vivid illustration of what can happen when the mythological framework and undergirding of an existent system of values has eroded and been cast off.

Unitarians and Universalists began the process of self-liberation four hundred years ago in Europe by rejecting the hierarchical authority of the church and several of the most central Christian myths. For four hundred years this liberation process has continued. After rejecting hierarchical control, they rejected certain of the dogmas, such as those of the Trinity and of predestination, and then began to question the divine character of the biblical revelation itself. Steadily casting off traditional or mythological beliefs that could not be reconciled with reason and scientific knowledge, they ceased one hundred years ago even to require belief in God, and finally came to rest in a belief in *freedom*, in the completely free search for truth as the foundation for religious faith. This was in accord with scientific method and logically seemed quite adequate as a uniting principle for a religious movement.

It has not proved to be so. In the process of casting off the myths of the past, the Unitarians and Universalists found they had lost any basis for making value judgments, for distinguishing right from wrong, from reaching a community consensus. Freedom tended to become a substitute for values. Each individual was encouraged to exercise his freedom to believe whatever he felt compelled to believe. The movement tended to lose all sense of coherence and order. The Unitarians and Universalists discovered that with the dissolution of any clear context for values, the values themselves tended to dissolve and disappear. Freedom of opinion tends to become lethal because there is no common fundament, no commonly accepted context, and thus no objective testing ground to fall back upon. Martin Buber described this superbly:

> Freedom—I love its flashing face: it flashes forth from the darkness and dies away, but it has made the heart invulnerable. I am devoted to it, I am always ready to join in the fight for it, for the appearance of the flash, which lasts no longer than the eye is able to endure it, for the vibrating of the needle that was held down too long and was stiff. I give my left hand to the rebel and my right hand to the heretic: forward! But I do not trust them. They know how to die, but that is not enough. I love freedom, but I do not

believe in it. How could one believe in it after looking in its face? It is the flash of a significance comprising all meanings, of a possibility comprising all potentiality. For it we fight, again and again, from of old, victorious and in vain.

It is easy to understand that in a time when the deterioration of all traditional bonds has made their legitimacy questionable, the tendency to freedom is exalted, the springboard is treated as the goal and a functional good as substantial good. Moreover, it is idle sentimentality to lament at great length that freedom is made the subject of experiments. Perhaps it is fitting for this time which has no compass that people should throw out their lives like a plummet to discover our bearings and the course we should set. But truly *their* lives! Such an experiment, when it is carried out, is a neck-breaking venture which cannot be disputed. But when it is talked about and talked around, in intellectual discussions and confessions and in the mutual pros and cons of their life's "problems," it is an abomination of disintegration. Those who stake themselves, as individuals or as a community, may leap and crash out into the swaying void where senses and sense fail, or through it and beyond into some kind of existence. But they must not make freedom into a theorem or a programme. To become free of a bond is destiny; one carries that like a cross, not like a cockade. Let us realize the true meaning of being free of a bond: it means that a quite personal responsibility takes the place of one shared with many generations. Life lived in freedom is personal responsibility or it is a pathetic farce.[3]

When freedom becomes an end, rather than a means to an end, chaos is likely to result. Science did not make this mistake. It used its freedom to search for an ever more refined and developed consensus in the various fields of knowledge. But the Unitarians and Universalists have never quite dared to try to state a developing consensus in the various theological and moral categories—with the result that they often find themselves confused and bewildered, affirming contradictory values, their leaders paralyzed and unable to lead, their scholars unable to agree even upon what to study, their people confused and falling away.

This is of importance not only to Unitarians and Universalists but to all who are interested in organized religion because all of the religions of the world are today following the same path. Unless they do something different, they will ultimately find themselves in the same position and experience the same despair.

Nor is this despair felt in the field of religion alone. It is also experienced in liberal politics. Some of the most massive evil has been countenanced or condoned by so-called liberal politicians, who seem not to have been able to distinguish between right and wrong, just and unjust, when faced with the pragmatic choices of day-to-day politics.

As today, in the West, the entire Judeo-Christian movement en-

ters the ethos of the Enlightenment, looking primarily to reason as the ultimate authority, affirming the freedom to question all creeds and dogmas of the past, trying to build a faith anew on the authority of evidence, will it come at last to the same condition, a valueless confusion, a spiritual void? It could.

We are driven to the conclusion that there can be no possible consensus on human values, unless there is deemed to be a consistent, coherent context within which and from which those values can be derived. The search for such a context is the task of the scientist, the metaphysician, and the theologian.

Science has responsibility for investigating and describing the nature of the universe in all its manifold character. The composite summary of the various scientific disciplines should give man a steadily growing, increasingly accurate picture of "the nature of things," and thus a valid source for the derivation of values.

But we must not forget that both scientific method and the freedom which it requires are themselves based upon metaphysical assumptions which are rarely acknowledged. Science is founded upon the assumption that reality is in some measure apprehensible by man; that human consciousness is a handle upon reality, and not just a dream of illusion; and that universal reality, in which man is immersed and of which he is conscious, is coherent to the point that he can discern and state its laws and understand its nature, at least in some degree.

Freedom, similarly, is based upon the assumption that universal reality is consistent enough to make human choices meaningful, that there is and will be a consistency of response to human effort and activity, by which man may learn to distinguish the good from the evil, the right from the wrong, the constructive from the destructive. Both science and reason rest upon the faith that the universe is a consistent and coherent whole, whose nature man has some ability to understand and state, and to which he must relate, whose reality he cannot escape.

As Clyde Kluckhohn has put it, "All discourse proceeds from premises and . . . its validity is limited by those premises. This is equally true of physical and biological science. The important thing in all cases is that the independent critic should be able to scrutinize the premises as well as the data."[4] Science and the metaphysical assumptions on which it is based thus have an essential role to play in replacing arbitrary revelation and authority as a source of human values. But science so far has not been able to translate its knowledge into value systems which can command the heart of man. Nor has

science tried systematically to translate its tentative conclusions and growing consensus into theological systems and value structures capable of commanding the loyalty of mankind. Only a few outstanding and somewhat unusual scientists have asked what values may be drawn from the scientific knowledge they have wrested from nature. Even fewer have compared these values with the values derived from their religious past to see whether they in any way coincide with or reinforce each other. Few scientists are even aware that they have an ontological problem.

John Dewey wrote many years ago, foreseeing the present crisis: "A culture which permits science to destroy traditional values but which distrusts its power to create new ones is destroying itself";[5] and Kluckhohn has written: "It is an induction from the evidence at the disposal of the anthropologist that religion in the broad sense is essential to the health and survival of any society."[6] The important task of developing scientific knowledge as a source of values remains the persistent and increasingly urgent challenge of our times.

Whitehead, Wieman, Teilhard, and Adler

The effort to create a theological structure based not upon revelation but upon reason and empirical knowledge is not new. Alfred North Whitehead, mathematician turned philosopher, laid the philosophical foundations for it in the 1920s in his process philosophy: "Religion is the vision of something which stands beyond, behind, and within, the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, something which is a remote possibility, and yet the greatest of present facts; something that gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good, and yet is beyond all reach; something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest."[7] About the same time, three other thinkers were wrestling with the same problem. In Vienna Alfred Adler was discovering and stating the need for a philosophical foundation for a therapy of social feeling as the basis for the achievement of psychological health. Quite independently, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was developing his ideas of the evolutionary essence of existence, approaching the problem from the scientific and theological directions simultaneously, and evolving a single, unified hypothesis to attempt to explain both the facts and the meaning of life.

Of all the process theologians, Henry Nelson Wieman was outstanding in devising a theological structure adequate to contain a scientific world view. Wieman makes clear his belief that "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."[8] He accomplishes this by stating the Supreme Value (God) as a reality of structure in the universe—structure within which man can discover an ever-changing, progressively evolving content. In his *Intellectual Foundation of Faith* he describes the supreme good as that which always eludes man's definition and thus stands in judgment upon his thoughts and works, but which man must, through reason, intuition, tradition, and scientific search, constantly be seeking and clarifying. "Man is so endowed that he can never satisfy the essential human demands in any final state, not in Atman nor in Nirvana nor in Paradise nor in the Infinite Power of being nor beyond history in any sense, nor in the so-called awe and wonder and mystery of the cosmos. But he *can* find it in a continuous creativity which . . . is a 'beyond,' to be sure, but it is not beyond space and time nor beyond society and history."[9] Wieman says:

> What is supremely important is not any belief. What is supremely important is the actuality which the belief seeks to apprehend. No belief ever apprehends any actuality completely and perfectly, least of all the actuality of what is sought by faith. Therefore the commitment of liberal religion is not to a belief but to the actuality which a belief seeks to apprehend; not to a problem solved but to a problem in process of being solved; not to an answer given but to a question asked and an answer found more or less adequate to the question.
>
> Thus the faith of liberal religion reaches beyond all available answers to the actuality operating in human life about which we need to know more than is now known. Such a faith is in a sense an absolute faith because it does not depend upon all fallible belief or answer . . . but on a question of such sort that when any answer is found inadequate, another and better answer is sought. In this way it can never be disillusioned, can never fail; it can always spring anew from every defeat.[10]

Values, in Wieman's thought, are discovered by man in every relationship of life, and consist of that quality of relationship in which the activities of living beings mutually sustain, enhance, and create each other, on continually evolving higher levels of life. This is how Wieman puts it:

> Value is that connection between enjoyable activities by which they support one another, enhance one another, and, at a higher level, mean one another. At this higher level meaning may transform suffering and other forms of evil into experiences of great value.
>
> . . . value [is] that connection between activities which makes them enjoyable by reason of their mutual support, mutual enhancement and mutual meaning. . . .
>
> . . . the value does not lie in the enjoyment. . . The value is the connection. . . .

> The greatest conceivable value would be the organization of this cosmos into that sort of a system where every activity in it would be sustained by every other, and each activity would have all the meaning, hence all the value, all the glory of the total system. . . .
>
> . . . Supreme Value is the greatest actual and possible connection between activities which makes them mutually sustaining, mutually enhancing and mutually meaningful. . . .
>
> [Supreme value] is growth of meaning in the world. . . .
>
> This growth of meaning and value in the world is God.[11]

Wieman goes on to explain that this growth of meaning commands our supreme devotion and our highest loyalty because it creates and sustains human personality and carries human personality to the highest fulfillments which are progressively possible for it. It has more wealth than any single personality, or all human personalities; therefore human personality finds its highest destiny in giving itself to this growth of goodness and meaning in the universe, to be mastered, used, and transformed by it into the fabric of emerging values, reaching toward the Supreme Value. The greatest values can be poured into human life only as human beings learn to yield themselves to the control of this growth. When they try to dominate and use it, they lose these values. Thus, says Wieman, the growth of meaning in the world and universe is superhuman, though not necessarily supernatural. It is superhuman because it operates in ways over and above the plans and purposes of men, bringing forth values men may not be able to foresee, and developing conditions of mutual support and meaning in spite of or even contrary to the efforts of men. "The chief thing man can do for this sort of growth which is superhuman is to be intelligently and devotedly religious. That means . . . to recognize the fact that this creative interaction is going on . . . [and that] in all the relationships of life . . . men must clear the way for this growth."[12]

What Wieman thus has done is to create a theological framework for the development of evolving values drawn from man's ever-increasing knowledge of this universe of which he is a part. In that framework, the Supreme Value is always beyond his grasp, and therefore always standing in judgment upon any immediate attainment of truth. Yet this structure does not inhibit man's making the fullest use of scientific knowledge for the attainment of values for living. Each particular consensus is a stopping place upon a long road marked by the increasing harmony of life forms and the development of meaning, purpose, beauty, and creativity in life as a whole. Its object, he says, is to "provide men with an object of loyalty which is vastly higher and richer than any specific objective."[13] "Reli-

gion," says Wieman, "must grow until it frees itself from an outworn theology and develops a new theology and philosophy which incorporates the perspectives, insights, and viewpoints of the modern world. From sociology, psychotherapy, educational philosophy, and the many other available sources it must gather needed light for interpretations accessible to modern persons. This light will increase understanding when it is employed to guide and direct practical experience in struggling with the needs of actual persons and of present society. The new interpretations of religion must be, for the most part, in terms of the conduct of life, individual and group."[14]

Wieman's great contribution, thus, is his presentation of human life as part of a total system, a process, characterized by the unending growth of meaning. Meaning is mutual enhancement, support, encouragement, correction, among all the parts of the process. In man this development of meaning becomes conscious and deliberate. All of the sciences can assist him in this, and the Supreme Value, remaining forever beyond any specific statement of it, continues to stand in judgment upon all man's lesser attainments of it. What Wieman has given us is a way of understanding the natural process of the universe as God, working around us and through us, using us, for the ever-increasing harmony and meaningfulness of the total universal life. This is a God that modern man can believe in, work with, pray to, and strive to be at one with.

Wieman writes:

> Today the entire planet is becoming one community, not in love, not in mutual understanding, and cooperation, but in interdependence. The superhuman power of God is shown shaping the lives of men into oneness that they never intended. . . . It is God at work in the economic process weaving a web of unity that can grow into brotherhood if men will do their part. . . .
>
> . . . Political problems will henceforth demand far more time, energy and thought from great numbers of people if democracy is to survive in any form at all. The economic process is providing the leisure and the opportunity for this redirection of attention. The Church, along with all educational agencies, must do the redirecting of human energies.[15]

Teilhard de Chardin[16] points out the same thing:

> Every new war, embarked upon by the nations for the purpose of detaching themselves from one another, merely results in their being bound and mingled together in a more inextricable knot. The more we seek to thrust each other away, the more do we interpenetrate. [P. 127]
>
> Although our individualistic instincts may rebel against this drive. . . , they do so in vain and wrongly. In vain, because no power in the world can enable us to escape from what is in itself the power of the world. And wrongly, because the real nature of this impulse ["the planetisation of

mankind"] that is sweeping us towards a state of super-organisation is such as to make us more completely personalised and human.

The very fact of becoming aware of this profound ordering of things will enable human collectivisation to pass beyond the *enforced* phase, where it is now, into the *free* phase. [Pp. 124–25]

Alfred Adler, the famous Viennese psychotherapist and early associate of Freud, was coming to this same point of view in the 1920s when he wrote *Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind.*[17] This is how he put it:

The development of living things from a diminutive living unity could only take place with the sanction of the cosmic influence. . . . The universal fact of the creative evolution of all living things can teach us that a goal is appointed for the line of development in every species—the goal of perfection, of active adaptation to the cosmic demands.

. . . We have to realize that we are dealing here with something primordial, with something that has clung to primeval life. It is always a question of overcoming, of the stability of the individual and the human race; it is always a question of promoting a favourable relation between the individual and the external world. This compulsion to carry out a better adaption can never come to an end. [Pp. 270–71]

The best conception hitherto gained for the elevation of humanity is the idea of God. There can be no question that the idea of God really includes within it as a goal the movement towards perfection, and that, as a concrete goal, it best corresponds to the obscure yearning of human beings to reach perfection. . . . [P. 273]

Social feeling means above all a struggle for a communal form that must be thought of as eternally applicable, such as, say, could be thought of when humanity has attained its goal of perfection. It is not a question of any present-day community or society, or of political or religious forms. On the contrary, the goal that is best suited for perfection must be a goal that stands for an ideal society amongst all mankind, the ultimate fulfillment of evolution. It will, of course, be asked: How do I know that? Certainly not from my immediate experience, and I must admit that those who find an element of metaphysics in Individual Psychology are quite right. To some this is a matter for praise, others condemn it. Unfortunately there are many people who have a wrong idea of metaphysics; they wish to exclude from human life all that they cannot grasp directly. By doing this we would limit the potential development of every new idea. Immediate experiences never result in anything new; that is given only with the comprehensive idea that connects these facts. This new idea may be called speculative or transcendental, but there is no science that does not end in metaphysics. I see no reason to be afraid of metaphysics; it has had a great influence on human life and development. We are not blessed with the possession of absolute truth; on that account we are compelled to form theories for ourselves about our future, about the results of our actions, etc. Our idea of social feeling as the final form of humanity—of an imagined state in which all the problems of life are solved and all our relations to the external world rightly adjusted—is a regulative ideal, a goal that gives us our direction. This goal of

perfection must bear within it the goal of an ideal community, because all that we value in life, all that endures and continues to endure, is eternally the product of this social feeling. [Pp. 275-76]

Adler then goes on to point out that all of the problems of life demand the capacity and preparation for cooperation, the visible signs of social feeling. These are the conditions of health and character; they are the values which men evolve through their increasing understanding of themselves, of society, and of the universe in which they are set. This is the context from which values, through scientific inquiry, can be professedly defined in specific, everyday terms. This theological structure is not at war with the great traditions of the past. God, the Supreme Value, continues to be the context within whose life the search for values goes on. God, the Supreme Value, continues to stand in judgment upon all of our human attainments.

About the same time Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was developing his monumental hypothesis of the unity of all existence and its essentially creative, evolutionary character. Teilhard sees evolution as the expression of the divine in history, culminating in man at its growing edge. It is a process of continuing divine incarnation through evolution, in which man emerges as an integral and responsible part of the God that is Being-Becoming, a part that must work within the confines of the character of the process itself.

As Teilhard de Chardin put it in *The Phenomenon of Man*:

With the discovery of genes it appears that we shall soon be able to control the mechanism of organic heredity. And with the synthesis of albuminoids imminent, we may well one day be capable of producing what the earth, left to itself, seems no longer able to produce: a new wave of organisms, an artificially provoked neo-life. Immense and prolonged as the universal groping has been since the beginning, many possible combinations have been able to slip through the fingers of chance and have had to await man's calculated measures in order to appear. Thought artificially perfects the thinking instrument itself; life rebounds forward under the collective effect of its reflection. The dream which human research obscurely fosters is fundamentally that of mastering . . . the ultimate energy of which all other energies are merely servants; and thus, by grasping the very mainspring of evolution, seizing the tiller of the world.

I salute those who have the courage to admit that their hopes extend that far; they are at the pinnacle of mankind; and I would say to them that . . . there is one point that I would like them to note, one that will lead us gradually to a more complete form of conquest and adoration. However far knowledge pushes its discovery of the "essential fire" and however capable it becomes some day of remodeling and perfecting the human element, it will always find itself in the end facing the same problem—how to give to each

and every element its final value by grouping them in the unity of an organised whole.[18]

Here we find that constant in the context of life, the great pattern which sets the bounds to our freedom. Man grasps the tiller of the world and becomes the master of evolution, yes, but always under a command. He is under the command of that power which from the beginning has been pushing life toward greater and greater harmony, toward more and more complex, more and more highly integrated organisms within a single, organized, interdependent, evolving whole—a whole which seeks to recognize and incorporate the value inherent in each constituent part.

This command to wholeness and individuation simultaneously is the source of man's values, and he will ignore it at his peril. Here is a concept of God that affirms both man's freedom and his responsibility, is not at war with sense, and is not really very different from the God of our religious past. From this structure of understanding there can be derived all that we need in the way of moral values for the future. Each decision, every choice we make, will have to be tested by how it contributes to the well-being of all men and to the interconnected processes of life itself. This will require vast changes in the outlook, attitude, and very consciousness of the generations that are to come. Fortunately, the beginnings of such a new consciousness are already apparent in the younger generation, and from this we may draw new hope in the days ahead.

As William Irwin Thompson, professor of humanities at York University, Toronto, and author of *At the Edge of History*, put it recently in the *New York Times*, "I would guess that the new planetary consciousness means that we are building up a larger model of reality in which religious myth and scientific fact are both simultaneously true. Clearly, this will amount to a scientific revolution as large as that of the sixteenth century."[19] Whether we know it or not, this is the scientific revolution, and rebirth of religion, which the Institute on Religion in an Age of Science and others are tentatively, gropingly helping to formulate and structure. All religious institutions, I believe, will ultimately be judged and tested by their openness to it and their ability to adapt so as to embody it.

NOTES

1. Mircea Eliade, "Space—Sacred and Profane," *Center Magazine* (January-February 1971), p. 53.

2. John Wilkinson, introduction to Mircea Eliade's "A Cosmic Territorial Imperative?" *Center Report* (April 1971), p. 22. Also Hudson Hoagland at the 1965 summer conference of the Institute on Religion in an Age of Science: "It may be that our cerebral cortex will turn out to have been a phylogenetic tumor capable of inventing incredibly powerful weapons of destruction but unable to control the primitive aggressions and drives of our ancient limbic brain."

3. Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man* (1947; reprint ed., New York: Macmillan Co., 1965), pp. 91-92.

4. Clyde Kluckhohn, "The Scientific Study of Values and Contemporary Civilization," *Zygon* 1 (1966): 236-37.

5. As quoted in ibid., p. 233.

6. Ibid., p. 232.

7. Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1925), pp. 267-68.

8. Henry Nelson Wieman, "The Problem of Religious Inquiry," *Zygon* 1 (1966): 393.

9. Henry Nelson Wieman, *Intellectual Foundation of Faith* (New York: Philospohical Library, 1961), pp. 6-7.

10. Ibid., p. 2.

11. Henry Nelson Wieman and Regina Wescott Wieman, *Normative Psychology of Religion* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1935), pp. 48-51.

12. Ibid., p. 60.

13. Ibid., p. 525.

14. Ibid., pp. 430-31.

15. Ibid., pp. 532-33, 536.

16. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, trans. Norman Denny (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

17. Alfred Adler, *Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind*, trans. John Linton and Richard Vaughn (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939).

18. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), pp. 249-50.

19. William Irwin Thompson, "Beyond Contemporary Consciousness," *New York Times*, May 11, 1971, p. 39.