

The Reality Principle in Religion

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

THE THEORY called Operational Theism sketched in preceding issues of this journal was summarized in these statements: (i). God is the religious name for the Directional Momentum immanent in the episodes which constitute man and that in which he lives, moves and has his being; (ii) as Directional Momentum, God is compresent with, operative and implicated in all that occurs directly in terms of quality and indirectly in terms of transeunce; and (iii) God operates in all episodes with directionality dominant over repetitiveness and randomness; (iv) in terms of value, the outcomes of God's activity consist in successions of culminations, i.e., satisfaction of conditions at all levels which are more or less temporary. The succession or such episodic values, though each one may be temporary, appears to be unending.

When we related this form of theism with such contemporary views as traditionalism, Christian Existentialism and Idealism, we noted that each presupposed some humanizing of nature. Religious values in these systems apparently presuppose such humanizing. The question posed at the close of the last paper was this: **Is religion possible and adequate if it is based upon "the reality principle" rather than the hedonism implied in the humanizing of nature?** Stated otherwise, granted that Operational Theism may be a fair statement of the knowledge available to us at present, does it provide a God who is "religiously available"? This is the issue considered here.

The Reality Principle.

Interest in "the reality principle" stems from its use in the writings of the late Sigmund Freud. His theory of man was Hedonistic and Voluntaristic.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT is Professor of Philosophy of Religion, The Iliff School of Theology.

The "pleasure principle" which governed his interpretation of man is, of course, hedonistic, the theory that human behavior is controlled by the enjoyment of pleasant feelings and the avoidance of painful ones. Freud added a Narcissistic element to this. Pleasure was primarily a matter of libido-narcissism. To make more specific what he meant, Freud distinguished libido from interest. The "investments of energy directed by the ego toward the objects of its sexual desires" constituted "libido"; investments of energy for the purpose of self-preservation were called "interest." Narcissism was the state in which the energy invested in various objects (in this case, subjects of affection) was withdrawn from them and invested in the self or ego. Freud concluded that narcissism was the "complement" of libido in that self-love was the source of greatest pleasure. Here the ego is withdrawn from the world without, which was the source of much of its pain.

This development of hedonism was supplemented by Schopenhauer's Voluntarism. Schopenhauer found reasons to believe that the basic fact about man and nature is "restless striving" or unconscious Will. The "energy" which Freud believed to be invested either in others or in self was "freely mobile, (which) can invest either object or ego, and can serve the purposes of the one as well as the other."¹

Given this hedonistic-voluntarism, what is meant by "the reality principle" in Freud's formulations? The answer is that the pleasure-pain principle (**Lust-Unlust**) did not work as expected. Infants may live in terms of this for a time, but gradually they become aware of conditions and situations

¹ Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. (Eng. trans. Joan Riviere.) Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1935, p. 363.

which interrupt its operation. Hallucinations and dreams are then resorted to in order to restore some semblance of the desired state. These too fail, and "a new principle of mental functioning was then introduced; what was conceived of was no longer that which was pleasant, but that which was real, even if it should be unpleasant."² But this does not constitute a denial of the pleasure principle. It was "only a safeguarding of" the pleasure principle.³ Realities were recognized, and attempts made to control them in order that the smooth operation of the pleasure-pain principle could be restored.

As I understand Freud's theory of man, it was and remains basically Hedonistic and Voluntaristic. Even scientists, whom he regarded very highly, were not exempt from this unconscious striving for the pleasurable even though they concerned themselves with the real. Religion comes into the picture in that it promises persons greater pleasures, those of Heaven, in exchange for sacrifices, including work, in the present. It is obvious that if this reading of man is correct, then the attempt to provide an Operational Theism based upon an analysis of what is "real" rather than pleasurable has little future.

But even this is not the whole story. In his *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930) Freud sketched in still more of his understanding of man. From his analytic studies he concluded that a basic hostility to culture characterized the mass of men. This hostility is the result or outgrowth of inhibitions imposed by culture upon man's "instinctual wishes." What are they? "Such instinctual wishes are those of incest,

of cannibalism, and of murder."⁴ Granted that they appear to be outmoded forms of human behavior, he stated that "there are innumerable people who would shrink from murder or incest, and who yet do not hesitate to gratify their avarice, their aggressiveness and their sexual lusts, and who have no compunction in hurting others by lying, fraud and calumny, so long as they go unpunished for it; and no doubt this has been so for many cultural epochs."⁵ To this sordid picture, he added that people are lazy, that they work only under the coercions of culture. The import of this is that there is a conflict between man's instinctual wishes and the demands of civilization. We shall consider this again when we discuss anxiety.

Man is not only at odds with his culture, he is also threatened and cramped by nature. The threatening factors include earthquakes, floods, starvation, disease and death. Society and culture are man's collective reaction to these forces. Individuals working alone could not long survive. Collectively, they find it possible to check the destructive factors and so extend life and decrease pains and discomforts.

But this comes at a price. It means restriction of sex satisfactions since unlicensed sex behavior tends to disrupt social existence. It means work, whether one likes it or not, since only by such work can society protect itself and its members from the threats to its existence. It means denial or repression of the "instinctual wishes" for incest, cannibalism and murder as well as their modern counterparts of avarice, aggressiveness, lust, lying, fraud, and calumny. Religion enters here in that its hopes, or as Freud would say, "its illusions" make it possible for men to accept the frustrations, to "increase their frustration tolerance" (Rosenzweig) and

² Sigmund Freud, "Formulations Regarding the Two Principles in Mental Functioning" (1911), in *A General Selection from the Works of Sigmund Freud* (ed. John Richman). Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1957, pp. 39 f.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴ Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*. (1927). Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., (Eng. trans. W. D. Robson-Scott), 1957, pp. 12 f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

accept the necessity for labor and other restrictions on striving for pleasures.

If, as Freud stated, human motivation is basically libidinal and narcissistic, and that both civilization and nature are so organized as to thwart their free expression, then his view that "man's seriously menaced self-esteem craves for consolation, life and the universe must be rid of their terrors, and incidentally man's curiosity, reinforced, it is true, by the strongest practical motives, demands an answer"⁶ becomes meaningful. Both the need for consolation and the answers to the riddles of existence are found in the "humanizing" of nature. Man is incapable, from Freud's point of view, of coming to terms with impersonal forces and fates since "they are eternally remote." When they are humanized, they become understandable and since they are moved by motives analogous to ours, somewhat meaningful and bearable. Man can feel "psychically free" in a humanized world whereas Freud believed this to be impossible for most persons in a non-humanized one.

This constitutes a substitution of psychology for cosmology, and provides a key to the understanding of what we have called "metatechnology" in much of the religion of the past. If the forces operative in nature are human-like, then they may be exorcised, appeased, bribed, all in the attempt to lead them to intervene helpfully in natural processes. The history of religion is filled with exemplifications of these and other attempts to introduce divine factors into natural processes. It also suggests the reasons for the use of the name "Father" for the divine. Once this conception has been achieved, then the function of God or gods becomes specific; "they must exorcise the terrors of nature, they must reconcile one to the cruelty of fate, particularly as shown in death, and they must make amends for the sufferings and privations that the communal life of culture has imposed on

man."⁷ But precisely these functions of divine beings prevents man from facing life realistically, from utilizing the reality principle in religion.

The "reality principle" as defined in this admittedly sketchy analysis of Freud's theories does not constitute a denial of his hedonistic and voluntaristic view of man. It is designed to protect man in his quest for satisfactions as he defines them. Support for this suggestion may be found in many places. A brief sketch of what Freud and Jung call the "phylogenetic prototype" may indicate the type of support we have in mind. C. G. Jung's recently translated work, *Answer to Job* (1954) contains a discussion of the "collective unconscious" which consists of all that men have experienced or endured from the emergence of the human. It is compounded not only of what primitives and savages underwent, but also of what each person undergoes in the processes of birth and growth. Divine beings are "facts" or "realities" of this collective unconscious, but not of the world as such. Divine beings are thus "phylogenetic prototypes" whose influence upon man are profound, and to some extent force him to recognize realities which thwart his hedonistic-voluntaristic impulses.

As used in this paper, "reality principle" means the adoption of an operational approach to the understanding of the Existential Medium, that in which we live, move and have our being. It represents a denial of the humanizing of nature, and the attempt to understand it as it is in so far as our knowledge and emotional maturity permit us to do so. The results of this approach were sketched in the preceding paper in this series, and summarized in the opening paragraph of this one.

Religious Values.

If religion is concerned primarily with the reorganization of life in the presence of unsatisfactory and inescapable conditions or situations, then re-

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 24 f.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

ligious values consist in more or less satisfactory culminations to these experiences. It should be noted that these culminations are "more or less satisfactory." There are some situations which cannot be met in ways which are satisfying to any great extent. The past war with its thirty million casualties may be viewed as a necessary episode in man's long struggle for some semblance of human freedom and dignity. Despite its necessity, it constitutes a dismal chapter in human history. Yet the millions who suffered did not do so wholly in vain. If they did nothing else, they purchased a bit more time in which to try to fashion a more rational and humane way of living. And they placed upon the rest of us the solemn obligation to take full advantage of the time at our disposal.

This presupposes that mankind is worth saving, a fundamental presupposition of every religion. For the Operational Theist, it also assumes that it may be possible to achieve an organization of society about a set of values in which human dignity and human freedom are central. This may have to be taken on trust for the moment. If the conception of God which emerges from an Operational Theism permits us to justify this hope honestly, it may provide some grounds for a positive reorganization of life in the more immediate areas where religion makes its primary contribution.

The more inclusive problem emerges from conditions which appear to be antithetical, where implications clash. Man is a form of directional momentum who will not be satisfied with minimal gains. He strives continuously for new and enlarging experiences and for new and greater possessions. This fact has led some students to see conflict as the basic factor in social existence and others to make power the organizing principle in human life. Karl Marx is a good example of the first, Bertrand Russell of the second. I suspect that Arthur Schopenhauer was closer to the truth when he said that will or restless

striving constitutes the center of personal existence. In more neutral language, such as we have adopted, it may be said that directional momentum or dynamic directionality constitutes the core of all that lives. Man is moving. In the medieval world, he spent his time and himself producing great cathedrals which consumed the available energy of artisans for hundreds of years. At other periods, exploration occupied the time and attention of the more vigorous. Commerce, industry, empire, scaling high peaks utilized available intelligence and energy at other times. Even missionary work may be viewed as the outreach of dynamic directionality of groups seeking to transform others into replicas of themselves. Directional Momentum is "protean", assuming many different shapes and forms.

During the twentieth century, it assumed one of its most devastating forms, that of attempting to reshape the world to conform to ideals or patterns adopted or invented by some virile peoples. With the coming of the Space Age, even geological limits appear to be confining. On a smaller scale, industries are striving for dominance in increasing our wants and then satisfying them. This is done by means of propaganda designed to delete the value from what we happen to own and thus enduce us to buy the new. Last year's automobile may have some value as a means of transportation, but none as a prestige object. It must be replaced. This expansive and to some extent destructive effect of dynamic directionality exhibits itself at other levels. The grass in my lawn has to wage continuous warfare with weeds of many kinds. These are but a few instances of an apparent lack of interest in minimal status and minimal gains at all levels of life.

But this is only part of the story. Research in recent years indicated the slow but steady development in the human. Semi-human creatures, the proconsuls, lived some twenty million years ago; clubs were used as weapons

two million years ago; man domesticated such animals as the dingoes 200,000 years ago, establishing what may have been the first true form of symbiosis in which men and animals played a role.⁸ Ages before this various human groupings were established, leading eventually to the great national groups with world order as a next step in the process. These are instances of the factor of directional momentum operative in what we think of as human welfare.

The effects of directional momentum at the galactic level may mean the birth and death of stars and suns. We normally accept these changes without evaluative judgment. It is the changes which effect us directly, whether they are attributed to the activities of power-dominated persons or to natural forces, which raise theological questions. How can a reality expressing itself in these confusing and apparently contradictory ways be called God? If God is the religious name for the dynamic directionality which expresses or exhibits itself in the formation and destruction of suns, in the formation and the destruction of societies, in the origin, development and growth of persons with all that attends these processes, then we may not call this "God" if by God we mean a being of absolute goodness.

This is the basic issue for religious values which must be met by an empirical or Operational Theism. It should be observed, however, that all other schools of Christian thought face the same issue. Neo-Kantians, Neo-Orthodox, Christian Existentialists and those who adopt Paul Tillich's ontological theology all live in the same world, subject to the same problems and conditions. Those who have adopted a non-empirical approach try to meet these difficulties by transforming the cosmos into some replica of man and society, something which Operational Theism cannot do if it is to be true to its fundamental

principles. As I have indicated elsewhere, most of the contemporary schools of theology are based upon non-verifiable and non-falsifiable realities. If one adopts the reality principle in religion, he is committed to the view that it is **better to live in terms of verified probabilities than of unverified certainties.** A theology based on this presupposition will have little room in it for the "humanizing of nature" so characteristic of other types. The evidence from all fields of knowledge does not indicate that the human venture is the center of cosmic existence. Perhaps, as Harlow Shapley suggests, we must learn the art of "being incidental." Religious values must be found in relation to God as operationally defined, with all that this implies.

"Where" is the Divine Experienced?

We stated that religion consists of individual and group activity designed to effect creative reorganization of persons in the presence of unsatisfactory and inescapable conditions. This is done by reinterpreting the values or value-systems of the person or persons concerned and the relevant context. The reinterpreted values and situational context are transformed into functional bases for living by means of overt or somatic activities which we call techniques. Conceptions of God emerge from and are modified by continuous reinterpretations of the situational context made necessary by changing conditions and the growth of knowledge. From an Operational point of view, God is ideally an experienceable reality. Actually, religious reorganization has occurred in relation to fictional or imaginary divine beings. Some anthropologists describe the spirit world of the savage as an "imaginary environment." Even a brief examination of some of the weird religious movements of today will indicate that some conceptions of God must be classified as part of an imaginary environment. If one adopts the reality principle in religion, such imaginary gods are not available. What, then, is?

⁸ Cf. Herbert Wendt, *In Search of Adam*. (Eng. trans. James Cleugh), Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1955.

This question may be reformulated as follows: Where do religious persons normally "experience" the divine? Observe that we ask "where" rather than "whom" or "what". This is done deliberately for reasons to be presented later. The literature of religion contains many answers to this question. We shall discuss four of them briefly. The first is that the divine is found in language. This is the significance of the distinction between sacred and secular writings. Two quotations will suggest the relevance of this view. The Augsburg Confession contains these sentences: "Also they teach that one holy Church is to continue forever. But the Church is the congregation of saints (the assembly of all believers), in which the Gospel is rightly taught (purely preached) and the Sacraments rightly administered (according to the Gospel)."⁹ The emphasis is placed upon the Gospel and the Sacraments. The latter, important though they may be, are "rightly administered" (governed or determined) by the Gospel. Lutheranism was a Church of the Word. If men were to become aware of God, they had to place themselves where the saints assembled to hear the Gospel expounded.

A contemporary states this even more explicitly. "Protestantism vigorously insists that the Bible is the authoritative basis for the knowledge of God who is revealed in Jesus Christ. It is the norm by which the Church must test its faithfulness to the mission it has to proclaim the gospel. **Read and interpreted within the church**, it is, so to speak, the **rendezvous which God has chosen for meeting and speaking with man**, the 'holy ground' on which God confronts man with his humbling and forgiving word."¹⁰ According to this, if one is to become aware of God, he must expose himself to the written Word, the Bible.

The second location of the divine is the group. This was suggested in both of the preceding quotations. In earlier centuries, Cyprian stated that "he cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother."¹¹ A leader in the movement for church unity, Cyprian believed that the undivided church was a divine society and that religion was impossible outside of its borders. More recently, Henry Nelson Wieman asserted that God may be found only in that form of interpersonal relations which he called "creative interchange."¹² Those who engage in creative interchange constitute a divine society wherein the divine may be experienced.

The third answer is found in "divine majesty." Kant stated that two things filled the heart with wonder, "the starry heavens above" and "the moral law within." Schleiermacher focused his attention upon the feeling of absolute dependence and that responsible for it. Tillich speaks of "ultimate concern" and of the "Unconditioned" as the locus of the divine. Einstein and other scientists were impressed by the magnitude, complexity and order of the nature of things, and in that contemplation became aware of the divine.

A fourth answer locates the divine in the realm of the "imperative." This will remind one of Emil Brunner, but it found clearer expression in the ancient Stoics and Spinoza. John Calvin may be added to the list of those who made this central. In a preceding paper we stated that the divine may be found in the moving, determining, controlling and directing activity in the world of our experience. The word "imperative" is not too happy a choice for this. We used it to indicate that "God as Directional Momentum" is an attempt to state in modern and more understand-

⁹ Pt. I, art. vii, in Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, III.

¹⁰ Bernard W. Anderson, art. "Bible" in *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958, p. 35 (Italics added).

¹¹ *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, 6. In *Documents of the Christian Church*. (Ed. H. Bettenson.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

¹² "Naturalism," in *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, pp. 243 f.

able language what was one of the traditional attempts to locate the divine.. We noted that "every identifiable phase of the existential medium appears to be directional and dynamic." If the concept God emerges in the reinterpretation of persons and their situational context, this directional dynamism is one fact which must be accepted. If change is a basic characteristic of persons, societies and their inclusive environment, this fact of directional dynamism becomes more important. If the word "God" is the religious name for that in oneself and the inclusive environment which makes creative reorganization of life in the presence of the unsatisfactory and inescapable facts of existence possible, then God as dynamic directionality interpreted religiously is a possible conception.

The divine so interpreted belongs within the dynamic or power category. The Middle Stoics in the ancient world defined God as a "craftsmanlike fire" engaged "methodically in the work of generation." Generation was purposive work under a guiding omniscience seeking to secure a world "structure best fitted for survival" which would be absolutely complete and endowed with "consummate beauty and embellishment of every kind."¹³ The Old Testament contains references to God Almighty and the New Testament is not without its own references to the "power of God." More recently, various philosophers have used other language to refer to the same factor. S. Alexander used the words "Nisus toward Deity" to designate the directional dynamism productive of the several levels of existence.. C. Lloyd Morgan wrote of "directive Activity within a scheme which aims at constructive consistence"; A. N. Whitehead thought of "Creative Advance into Novelty" as the ultimate metaphysical principle. It is true that Whitehead did not identify God with Creative Advance. He considered it beyond both God and the

world which were both in its "grip." It should be noted, however, that creative advance into novelty is possible interpretation of dynamic directionality observed at all levels. If it is defined as "beyond" both God and the world it is not operationally verifiable. In any case, the list of views just presented indicates the presence of what we have called "imperative" as loci of the divine.

Perhaps we should call attention to the fact that we have used the word "creative" with reference to religious reorganization but not with reference to God, even though we suggested Whitehead's use of "creative" Advance was one form of expression for Dynamic Directionality. The reason for this is that every form of creativity includes destruction or disintegration. The productive soil within which plants grow is in part a result of the decay and death of preceding forms of life. Even the present cosmos may be the result of the collapse and destruction of a preceding one. Some years ago a colleague and I were climbing a mountain near Denver. We paused to rest and to look at the vista before us. I became aware of the various stages in the trees all about us. There were small trees starting their journey, others well on the way, and still others filling their places against the sky. Others were in the reverse process. Some were beginning to decline, others lay along the ground, and beneath our feet were the results of the decaying process. Pondering this, I remarked that the end result of the tall trees about us was the stuff under our feet. To which my friend answered that "the end of what was beneath our feet would be tall, beautiful trees such as those about us." We were both right and wrong. We were "right" in that either of these "ends" could be accepted; and we were "wrong" in assuming that either was in fact an "end." No tree is an end in itself; it is a temporary culmination within an inclusive context comprising the life of this planet. In this continuous culminative process, each stage

¹³ Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II, 57, 58.

represents a value, a satisfaction of the conditions at that specific stage. This suggests that creativity is a limited concept, applicable to specific phases of Episodic Durationality, but hardly designative of God as the directionality involved in all.

Creative reorganization of life in the presence of the unsatisfactory and inescapable factors in existence is made possible, in part, by placing oneself in situations where God becomes operatively effective in the process. One does not escape from the non-manipulatives in life by withdrawal or denial. He may find within the situation the resources whereby some degree of creative reorganization becomes possible. It is a case of **salvation by participation** rather than by escape. We shall consider this more fully later. Here we need to note that participation in divine activities implies that one must place himself "where" this is possible. This point is supported by John Wilson in his *Language and Christian Belief* (1958). Using the field of aesthetics for analogical purposes, he notes that if one is to find value in classical music, he must place himself in certain situations and expose himself to the music itself. So also the religious person must learn "where" the divine become most real to him in his search for religious values.

The Reality Principle and Anxiety.

"Anxiety" and "stress" are important words in the vocabulary of contemporary theology. One writer defines anxiety broadly as "the experience of the threat of imminent non-being". This occurs when one is "confronted with the issue of fulfilling his potentialities." Failure to fulfill them, or at least to do what is possible toward this end, produces "guilt." These potentialities as sketched by Existentialist psychiatrists and psychologists are found in three areas or levels. The first is in relation to one's *Eigenwelt*, his private or self-world. The second is the level of one's *Mitwelt*, the world of one's fellowmen. The third is that of *Umwelt*, nature as a

whole.¹⁴ In the language we have used in this paper, anxiety and guilt are consequences of the denial or rejection of the reality principle. Man is a center of potentialities, a center of directional momentum. If he refuses to accept this fact, if he denies that he is a participant at these three levels, if he withdraws from one or more of them, tensions develop and anxiety or stress emerges.

From a religious rather than a psychiatric point of view, the types of anxiety and stress the minister and counsellor may be competent to treat are those which grow out of refusal to participate or engage oneself with these levels of existence, or the denial that they are relevant. Let us consider the conception of stress presented in a recent study. According to Camilla M. Anderson, a condition is "stressful" if there occurs some change from the customary or anticipated, and some threat to survival appears.¹⁵ In his later writings, Freud suggested that "the effect of anxiety developed whenever the influx of stimuli into the psychic apparatus was too great for the apparatus to cope with; whenever the psychic apparatus was flooded with stimuli or overwhelmed by them."¹⁶ In religious language, or at least that which some of us would consider such, stress and anxiety are psychological terms used to designate the response or reaction of persons to unsatisfactory and inescapable factors. Failure to achieve some creative or satisfactory reorientation of self in their presence may mean that stress or anxiety continues with harmful effects upon us.

From a physiological point of view, anxiety and stress are related to hypertension. Some tension is necessary if

¹⁴ *Existence: New Dimensions in Psychiatry and Psychology*, (ed. Rollo May and others). New York: Basic Books, Inc., pp. 61 ff.

¹⁵ Camilla M. Anderson, *Beyond Freud*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1957, pp. 117 ff.

¹⁶ Charles Brenner, "The Reformulation of the Theory of Anxiety," in *A General Selection from the Works of Sigmund Freud*, p. 241.

life is to continue. When bodily tensions are lowered to specific levels, sleep follows; reduced to another level, death ensues. Hypertension consists in some increase in heart action or some hardening of the arteries so that the pressures mount beyond the normal. So prevalent is this condition that "at least 40 per cent of adults are found to be actually or incipiently hypertensive."¹⁷ Anxiety and stress, as well as obesity, overactivity of some glands, excessive work or disfunctioning of the kidneys are considered responsible for hypertension. And, hypertension itself may give rise to the basic anxieties to which some of us are subject. The obvious conclusion here is that one way to treat anxieties and stresses is to see a good physician. There is little point in attributing anxieties based on hypertension to "ontological guilt" when the factor responsible is disfunctioning kidneys. The reality principle in religion presupposes intelligent treatment of ourselves as biological organisms. The difference between anxiety, stress and emotional stability may be largely a matter of intelligent living.

The second comment concerns the so-called *Umwelt*, or natural world. At the moment, the streets of Denver are littered with branches of some of the finest trees. A heavy snow late in September and early in October while the leaves were still on the trees was responsible. The fully-leaved trees caught and held the snow until the weight broke even very large branches. Here was a situation costly both financially and emotionally. To see trees you have planted and cared for destroyed by the elements is disheartening. Yet it was to be expected. The trees planted were native to the plains and the lowlands, areas where snow does not fall as early as it does in the mountains. The native trees, evergreens, suffered very little during the storm. The damage and distress

were a natural result of an unintelligent treatment of environment. Through the ages, nature has gradually produced trees suited to their several environments. A realistic approach to nature means understanding the conditions which obtain and adjusting oneself efficiently and creatively to them. Mountain trees and shrubs are as beautiful in this environment as are maple and others in the lower areas. The expenditure of money, energy and emotions in our present Denver disaster was the result of unintelligent planning, not of nature's evils.

This has implications for earthquakes, storms and many other of the factors which led some thinkers to call nature evil, to deny the presence of God in and through it, and to reject an operational approach to religion. And the same judgment applies to our social relations. We make rules which are only imperfectly fitted for interpersonal relations at many levels, and then we cry "evil" when some malfunctioning occurs. The "demonic" supposedly responsible for our wars and intense competition in other areas are due, in part, to the attitudes we take toward ourselves and others. The British failed to understand the colonists and what the latter considered to be their rights, and the revolutionary war occurred. Hitler had inflated ideas of the Germanic people and their "place in the sun" and we suffered the second World War. Unless a more intelligent approach is adopted by the great powers, and there is some evidence that we are moving toward it, we may have to suffer further. And this can be applied to our economic and social relations also. Nature can be exceedingly cruel if we do not understand its conditions and use them wisely. Men can be the same if they do not heed Boethius. He made a comment, speaking through the figure Philosophy, that man's troubles are the "penalty of mistaken expectations." He has not learned to curb his expectations, to respect the conditions under which he lives. He plants Chinese elms in the

¹⁷ William D. Zoethout, *Introduction to Human Physiology*. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Co., 1948, p. 166.

mountains, and then complains because the snow and ice destroys them. Anxieties and stresses, when not due to physiological or psychotic factors, may be due to the failure or unwillingness of persons to understand themselves, their fellows and their environment.

This misunderstanding, or willful failure to accept the facts which one understands concerning these several levels, may be given any number of theological interpretations. We may say that nature is unfriendly because Adam and Eve sinned in some Garden of Eden; we may say that the demonic is present when finite man seeks to become infinite: we may say that the DesCartian dichotomy of subject-object is to blame, and the list could be extended. The fact would seem to be that man must learn to curb his imagination, to recognize it as a useful tool but a dreadful tyrant. We tend to believe that whatever we can imagine must be possible. One can imagine the highly tinted trees of a Missouri countryside planted in the high country of Colorado, and try to actualize the imagined scene. One glance at our front lawn littered with severed branches and at the mutilated trees would seem to indicate some kind of moral at this point. It is not a punishing God, a malevolent Demon, nor an evil nature which is responsible. It is man's failure to consider facts and to use them intelligently. The reality principle in religion means intelligent facing of facts and the willingness to use them as fruitfully and creatively as possible. Until he does so, he will be subject to anxieties and stresses at the several levels indicated above.

Salvation by Participation.

Following the suggestion, made by many, that man's problems center in himself, society and nature, we now suggest that these problems cannot be met by denial, avoidance or transference to some transhistorical realm. They have to be met where they appear and in relation to the realities involved. What are some of these matters?

Man has always been a problem to himself. As perhaps the most highly complex form of existence, he is a center of restless striving, directional momentum, even of conflicting interests. The ancient Greeks were concerned with this, and the temple at Delphi had inscribed upon it the command "Know Thyself." Yet this is difficult if attention is confined to the self. What man is becomes evident as he relates himself to others and environmental factors. One may spend his time filling his mind, strengthening his body, and disciplining his emotions. But this becomes meaningful to him as he uses his intelligence, his skills and disciplined emotions in social interaction, in participation in community activities, and in production of goods, goodness or beauty. What one can do, I do not say "what one is", is determined as he participates in the life and activities of his day and place.

The need for participation is important as one seeks to check his actual and imagined interests. Granted that we are not satisfied with minimal goals, we discover what possibilities may be open to us when we observe what has been and is being done. We cannot know what constitutes minimal or maximal goals except as we observe what others have done and are doing. All this becomes meaningful if we remember, with Boethius, that many of our personal difficulties grow out of our "mistaken expectations." We discover what is mistaken by observation and experimentation, but "observation" and "experimentation" are what we mean by participation, by giving oneself to the situations he faces and the conditions he meets. Once man discovers that he, like all others, is mortal, death becomes a natural event and not punishment either for his or Adam's sins. He may hasten its coming, or retard its advance, but if he has observed with any care, he will recognize and accept the fact that it is inescapable.

Or take the case of the "imminent threat of non-being" so widely discussed

these days. What can this mean? If I should use this language at all, it would mean that we face the loss of significance. No young mother actively nurturing her growing children and providing a home for her husband and family would think of "the threat of non-being." She is finding herself and her significance as she participates actively in the situation which is hers. The "threat of non-being" might emerge if she lost her family, and was thereby deprived of the possibility of creative action in a significant context. "Being" in this context means **being involved**, active, participating. "Non-being" means disengagement, passivity, non-participation. These operational meanings are relevant, they may be examined, and better still, something may be done about them.

Anxieties, in part at least, grow out of checks upon our participation in significant events, or with significant people. For that matter, all people are significant if they form links in some human chain, have a place in some context of affection, or stand in places of need. Here again, the danger of dropping contexts emerges. Interest in people cannot be divorced from interest in nature. Percy Bysshe Shelley wrote an impassioned elegy upon the death of John Keats. In it he mourns the fact he can no longer enjoy the friendship and companionship of the latter. Keats, in Shelley's thought, had become eternal whereas he, Shelley was "chained to time, and cannot thence depart. We are chained to time, and for that matter, to place. We are of the stuff of which nature is, and both time and place are factors in our existence. Failure to recognize this, and to take full advantage of it may well be a cause of anxieties. If time and place are denied, in thought if not in practice, then we are denying what is essential to any fulfillment which may be ours.

Less abstractly, man is human and lives in a human context. Yet he is also more than human, he is part of the very earth upon which he stands, the air he

breathes, the food he eats and the water he drinks. He finds much of his enjoyment in these more elemental matters, and his denial of their value and withdrawal so far as possible from their enjoyment increases the possibilities of stress, tension and anxiety. Nature is more than mere chemistry, physics and astronomy. It is often the companion of the lonely spirit, the source of profound esthetic experience, and the source of spiritual renewal. Great spirits such as Jesus found strength as they spent time alone in places apart.

Salvation is not something conferred upon one while he remains passive. It occurs when he accepts himself for what he is with all of his limitations and resources; when he takes his place in the life of his times, and when he opens himself to the healing which flows from a "companionable" interest in the place where he is, be it city, sea or mountain. In terms of Operational Theism, God is operationally present in all phases of existence, including all that is. Perhaps this is one of the reasons for the fact that gatherings of various kinds, such as churches in Christianity, are found in all religions. One becomes part of and a participant in activities, intellectual, ritualistic, esthetic and social. For many people all of the time, and for most people some of the time, the divine becomes a factor in human experience only in some group situation. Even those who realize the divine most fully in nature mysticism may find this heightened in some group experience. In either case, there is active participation, some trusting of himself to situations, some sharing of what he has found with other seekers.

The significance of the question "Where do men find the divine?" becomes evident here. Men find the divine in sacred literatures, in language, but they do so only as they meet with others—so Luther—to hear the Word expounded, or as they read it participating intellectually and emotionally with the writers in the experiences they record. A bible on the table, revered as

it may be, becomes a place for a "rendezvous" with God only as it is entered into as fully and deeply as possible. By "entering into as fully and deeply as possible" we do not mean merely trying to understand what a given writer is saying, although that is included. It means that the passages read have become meaningful because through them we have found help in meeting some difficulty. They have become participants in an actual, meaningful situation, and from this derive their value.

Dorothy Lee stresses this point in her paper on "Symbolization and Value". Symbols, as she views them, "are a part of the process whereby the experienced world, the world of perception and concept, is created out of the world of physical reality, the so-called given, the undifferentiated mass, or energy or set of relations." Furthermore, language symbols are part of a creative process in "which an individual has an agentive function," that is, serves as a participant. Words have meanings, not because some one arbitrarily defined them, "but because each contains the meaning of the concrete situations in which it participates, and has participated, and which it helped to create. With participation in situations the meaning of the symbol increases; and when the situation contains value, the symbol itself contains and conveys value."¹⁸ Accordingly, "the symbol thus gets its meaning through participation in the concrete situations; and it grows in meaning, and even changes in meaning, with each participation."¹⁹

Add the term "religious" to her term value, and her statements indicate what we mean by salvation by participation. Sacred literatures find their meaning when they are taken into situations which are at once serious and impor-

tant. To the extent that they help persons to find religious values, they become meaningful. In so far as the situation provides some insight into a creative reorganization of life, then the sacred scriptures become techniques for the realization of religious values. This is true also of participation in group interaction, in the experience of the majestic as well as those of the Imperative, the Directional Momentum which serves as a symbol for the divine.

Acceptance and Forgiveness.

An operational theism must come to terms with matters such as "guilt," "rejection", and "estrangement." The meanings of these several terms are primarily psychological and ontological, especially for Existentialists. There are more checkable operational meanings available, meanings which provide more adequate treatment for these conditions.

It may be noted that these three words are in fact but three names for the same problem. Guilt is an ethical term indicating recognition of failure to maintain certain levels in our human relationships. It may be true that we sometimes consider ourselves "sinners in the sight of God." But this does not preclude the social dimension. God is defined in terms of some association of people, some religious body or some church. Sin is defined by some group whose rejection of the sinner and condemnation provides part, at least, of the foundations of guilt feelings. And in Christianity, at least, the removal of the guilt feelings is associated with changes in the attitude or attitudes of some groups.

Rejection means reduction of the level of participation in some areas of experience. It may occur within the family where some member is cut off from participation; it may occur in wider groups such as the religious institutions in the community; or it may occur in that the individual feels himself rejected because of his failure to live up to the standards determined by significant persons or groups. In any case, it

¹⁸ Dorothy Lee, "Symbolization and Value" in *Symbols and Value: An Initial Study*. (Ed. by Lyman Bryson and others.) New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., 1954, p. 74.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

means reduction in one's freedom to participate. "Estrangement" means that one has become a stranger where once he was a friend. He no longer has the possibility of free participation in situations or events which have become meaningful to him. And this leads to the condition designated as loneliness. Here the word itself suggests its relations to what we have thus far emphasized, namely, participation. He who is actively engaged with others, accepted by them, participating with them in their several activities, is not lonely, whereas he who finds his approach to others blocked, by rejection or neglect, and does not have the freedom to participate in significant activities with them finds himself lonely.

In theologies influenced by depth psychologies, guilt, rejection and estrangement with the resultant loneliness are believed to be removed, or at least compensated for, by relationships with God as Father, or with some "humanized" phase of the Existential Medium. What can a theology based upon the reality principle offer its adherents which will serve the same or alternative religious values? The answer to this question is not simple. Yet it is possible to sketch in broad outlines the directions in which answers may lie.

In the first place, it is necessary to undo, in so far as it is possible the conditions which produced guilt, rejection, estrangement and loneliness. In many instances, the fault "is not in our stars, but in ourselves." We engage in activities which by their very nature lead to the "evils we deplore." If we have these feelings, and suffer because of them, perhaps an honest examination of our motives, activities and interests is indicated. If by my actions, I deprive myself of acceptance, it is obvious where the revisions must occur.

Again, we may have accepted impossible standards for ourselves and others. If we wish to maintain absolute standards in human affairs, we face serious problems. If we are to believe that only theists are acceptable citizens,

and find a large segment of the world dominated by so-called atheistic rulers, we may be instrumental in plunging the world into chaos. Politics, as has often been said, "is the art of the possible." Yet if we are to believe Aristotle, politics and ethics are two ends of the matter of human conduct. If we accept politics as the art of the possible, then ethics also must be considered an art of the possible. Yet absolute standards are maintained in the ethical realm whereas a more reasonable approach obtains in politics. Man is exploring in both fields. His conclusions are and of necessity must be tentative. Yet fixity of moral standards is still praised and inculcated, with harmful effects upon the more sensitive souls. A static ethic in a dynamic world provides a fruitful source of guilt feelings, rejection, estrangement, and often loneliness. Witness the situation of Jehovah's witnesses in our own culture as an example of this condition.

But there is more to be said. There are capacities in God operationally defined for esthetic and mystic experiences. We tend to think of Dynamic Directionality as confined to the "pushing and pulling" aspect of our environment. Immanuel Kant had something else in mind when he said that the starry heavens above and the moral law within "filled the heart with wonder." This "filling the heart with wonder" is as moving an experience as any "pushing and pulling" can evoke. There is a mathematical precision in the operations of many phases of existence, something which led Sir James Jeans to name God the "Pure Mathematician." From this to the beauty found under the microscope or through the telescope, as well as in the excitement occasioned by autumn colors on a mountain side, or the tiny flower next to a rock high on some peak, there are moving factors in all levels of our world.

This, too, is a form of participation. The satisfaction found in some blending of colors in a garden accompanied by the fragrance of the many blos-

soms, these are not the product of man's activities alone. It is a living flower which pours out its fragrance; the light streaming from the sun and the moving air which makes this experience possible. Man is a recipient as well as a giver in these stirring experiences. If freedom of participation at the human level means acceptance, what shall we call the same thing at other than human levels? The mystics found complete acceptance, enduring satisfaction in it. Why cannot the operational theist do the same? There is no "guilt," nor "rejection," "estrangement" or "loneliness" in man's relations with God at this level, and there is opportunity to explore new levels of experience. There may be no thunder from Mount Sinai here, but there is the still, small voice, and note the word "still," in such situations. Too long have we been cowed by the demands of an ancient past, too confined by traditional modes of interpreting forgiveness and acceptance. The doors are open to new plateaus in experience, and we will be the poorer if we do not enter. This, then, is another answer, and we believe a more adequate one, to some of man's deeper religious quests.

God and Evil

God as dynamic directionality is implicated in all values experiences. Culminative activity is directional, and since we define value in terms of culminative experiences, God is implicated. But this is by no means the whole story. The directionality at work in the suns may in due course of time make the human venture here precarious, if not impossible. The snowflakes whose beauty entralls us may also destroy the crops and cattle upon which we depend, and even us. Human groups are not all engaged in creative interpersonal relations, or if they are, they may limit their creativity to too small a fraction of humanity. The result may be greed, sensuality, cruelty and warfare destructive of human values.

Traditionally, men divided the pow-

ers which surrounded them into "good" which they identified either with the divine or with divine activity, and the evil which they attributed to Satan, the Devil or the demonic. Freud believed that this humanizing of the powers of nature served a good purpose in that an evil "will" is bearable because understandable. He believed there was enough evil in every person for him to understand and perhaps to sympathize with an evil Will.

An operational theism find it difficult if not impossible to continue the humanization of that "in which we live and move and have our being." We have argued this before, and need not repeat that discussion. Religion operationally defined requires us to accept the reality principle, and learn to live with realities whether we like it or not. This may mean that more people are becoming "tough-minded" in William James' terms. It may mean that a new mentality is emerging, one geared to precise thinking and verification and/or falsification. Developments in recent years indicate that this is the case. Scientific thinking has increased greatly since the development of nuclear fission in 1942. It received added stimulus when the first Sputnik was lofted into the skies. The recent successes in hitting the moon and the rocket which circled it will also have their impact. Equally important is the development of a new system of education under the auspices of industries. Recent studies show that more students are enrolled in educational systems within industry than in all of the colleges and universities in America. Of course these students will study the humanities, but their programs are geared to the highly technical activities of the industries which support them. Men accustomed to think in mathematical terms will find it difficult either to comprehend or find significance in the ontologism dominant in Protestant theology. They are concerned with the checkable consequences of theories, and there are very few checkable con-

sequences to be drawn from some "Ground of Being."

It is probably true that the "humanizing of nature" finds most of its support in the ancient scriptures. These scriptures, Jewish, Christian and others, were written in an age when men lived close to nature, fought the elements, and relied upon myth rather than upon verification and/or falsification. The pastoral psychology of that time has been replaced, in large measure, by a mentality geared to operationalism. The recent revival of interest in the Bible may become a disturbing factor, productive of strained relationships between a clergy geared to the pastoral mind and a laity geared to the new mentality. Even more important is the fact that these strains will develop within the minds of both clergy and laymen. Neither is isolated from the massive impact of modern methods. The Roman Catholic clergymen may continue to bless automobiles, but the Protestant clergy are more concerned with safety measures and driver education.

This suggests an approach to the use of the Bible in our day. It may be suggested that ancient scriptures have served their day and new ones should be developed. A more sober appraisal would indicate the need for finding wisdom wherever it may be found. And wisdom is confined to no one generation or one people. We need whatever wisdom our scriptures may contain which bears upon the problems of our day. This wisdom will be subjected to the test of operational efficiency. What are the checkable consequences of the words of an Isaiah for our day? What does the book of Jonah or the Gospel of John mean to those of us who face the gigantic realities of the twentieth century? The Bible may again become a living book if it is viewed as a potential source of wisdom from which living men may draw inspiration and guidance. But the attempt to reconstitute the modern world in ancient terms does not appear to be a realistic appraisal

either of the past or the present. Another approach is needed.

We have said, repeatedly, that withdrawal, rejection and denial produce anxieties, fears, tensions, and other evils; that involvement, engagement, acceptance and participation lead to the good. What is significant in our scriptures will be found as they help men to face contemporary issues. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is the test to be applied to sacred scriptures as well as to human conduct. "By their fruits" is another way of saying that hypotheses are tested by their checkable consequences.

Turning now to the specific aspects of the matter before us, that of the contributions an Operational Theism may make to the evils we confront, the following tentative suggestions may be made. The first has to do with the meaning or meanings of the word "evil." From an Hedonistic point of view, whatever produces pain is evil. But this definition cannot be maintained as stated. As Freud indicated, one must choose between suffering "natural evils," i.e., the forces of the natural world which threaten what we value, and the sacrifices required by society to protect us against them. It will not do to say that pleasure is the good and pain the evil if good as defined threatens the human venture, and if some pains are necessary in the interests of survival. Neither pleasure nor pain have any relevance if life fails to survive.

But survival in itself cannot be adopted as the total meaning of the good. There are conditions under which survival, in specific instances, becomes unbearable. Death may be a relief, and a welcome one, for specific people. As Epictetus once remarked, if the room becomes too filled with smoke, there is always the "open door." And greater figures than he have accepted martyrdom rather than submit to conditions which violated their basic commitments. Who would say that the unwillingness of Socrates to drink the

hemlock would have been more valuable than his refusal to deny what he had always taught? Or that the death of Jesus, in order to maintain inviolate the gospel he had proclaimed, was a more perfect culmination of his career than would have been a withdrawal from the situation in order to avoid pain or death?

This suggests another meaning for "evil." **Evil constitutes whatever is suffered unnecessarily.** The morning paper reports that the driver of a stolen car drove into a group of children waiting for a school bus and killed three of them. Even if death is a necessary end to a given human life, this type of early and violent death is wholly unnecessary. It is not necessary for men to steal cars and to drive them recklessly. When they do so, they may cause unnecessary suffering, and this is evil. A recent earthquake in Montana presumably resulted in the death of a number of people. Is this evil? Earthquakes are necessary consequences of the way in which planets are formed. They are as natural as breathing on the part of living beings. If we place ourselves where earthquakes can cause us suffering or lead to death, there is a serious question as to where the blame lies. Operationally, I suggest that man must learn to live within the conditions set for him, after he had done all he can to transform them in terms of his available knowledge and skills. If he refuses to recognize the facts of existence, he may have to suffer the consequences.

These considerations suggest that any operational approach to evil must begin with the acceptance of the conditions under which we live as "fact." One may imagine another type of world, perhaps a much more desirable one. But imagination may become a dreadful tyrant rather than what it is, namely, a useful instrument. If one replaces the world-as-fact with the world-as-imagined, he has opened the door to tragic consequences. If he does this in terms of some "humanizing" of

nature, he is certain to encounter frustrations. Yet there are no solid grounds for condemning God as directional momentum if this immature behavior results in unnecessary suffering. In some of these cases, the evil is the result of refusal to accept realities for what they are.

Does this mean that God is "beyond good and evil"? We have reserved the terms "good" and "evil" to the sentient level in an earlier paper in this series. As indicated earlier in this paper, the decay of a pine tree is natural. It has its limited span of existence, and lives within a context with other interests, such as the means whereby it receives the moisture required for existence. If this falls as snow, and comes at times or under conditions which thwart the normal thrust of pine-tree activities, this other natural factor must also be accepted. We may lament the destruction of one natural factor by another, but it can hardly be called evil in ordinary terms. This is the way directional momentum operates at this level. If we attribute human characteristics to God at this level, then we will say the Divine is either beyond Good and Evil, or that he suffers under a limiting factor such as Brightman's "Given." God is, and there are no rational grounds for applying moral attributes, on human terms, to the divine. "Evil" and "good" are terms we apply to human ways of relating persons to one another and not to the more inclusive reality within which the divine operates. Any extension of these judgmental concepts beyond the human leads to confusion and frustration.

If this appears cold or even un-Christian to some reader, let me refer him to Matt. 5:45. This passage from the Sermon on the Mount has to do with the inculcation of perfection. Jesus was exhorting his followers to rise above the ordinary moral judgments of their day. In the midst of it, he said that God "makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust."

This is an exhortation to disinterestedness. "Disinterestedness" is not too happy a word here. The proposal made is that there is non-neutrality, involvement and engagement of the divine in all of existence. At the same time, this non-neutrality is not particularized or individualized as we have assumed in the past. An earthquake does not select those whom we call "evil" for destruction and save those whom we call "good." Nor is rain generally selective. That men depend upon it for moisture for their crops may be true, but rain does not fall for that particular purpose. We have learned how to use it for that purpose, and with moderate success. Jesus indicated that sunshine and rain were "divine" matters, and not controlled by human judgments. This is what we mean when we assert that the extension of moral judgments beyond the human leads to confusion and frustration.

It is this impartiality of God which provides a solid background for human living. It is a case of "the soul that sinneth shall die." It matters not **who** the sinner may be, it is the fact that he has violated the conditions under which he must live that counts. There is a thread of teaching in both the Old and New Testaments in which the conception of the Disinterestedness of God is implied. In recent language, we may say that the course of events in religion as in other matters is not completely random. There are random factors, considered in an earlier paper in this series (*Iliff Review*, Winter 1959, p. 28 f). It was noted that randomness belongs within the Context of Determinateness. We agreed with Aristotle that the chance of luck factor appeared to be found within what he called causality and we spoke of as Limitation and Determinateness.

If emergence, the appearance of the new or novel, is characteristic of what is real, then it is possible that some emergents will have detrimental effects upon existing structures. The emergence of man with higher intel-

lectual potentials meant the destruction of many animals and the domestication of others. To the extent that there emerge among men those with little moral perceptivity or who find it difficult to curb passions or what Freud called "instinctual wishes," moral evils find their way into human behavior. These appear to be facts for which there are no facile explanations. They become tragic only if man insists that he and his values are central to the cosmos, and that all must be subordinated to him. It is possible, as Harlow Shapley suggests, that higher forms of life are now present in other parts of the universe. We need not adopt this speculation, but we must accept the possibility that we are more or less "incidental" to the scheme of things. Accepting this possibility, and the presence of potentially destructive factors in ourselves and our environment, we become active participants with others in the attempt to remould conditions to remove as many of the detrimental factors as possible. And in the process, the human may become more humane. This, I suggest, adds a dimension of meaning to human existence which is good but which may have painful or tragic consequences. As God "sends his sun to shine upon the evil and the good," so also must "rain fall" upon both. Sunshine and rain are essential for certain purposes. Perhaps the "evils" also belong within the nature of things..

The necessity to distinguish the harmful from the beneficial was one of the factors responsible for the growth of human intelligence. The presence of that which disturbed him made a man conscious and even self-conscious, and the disturbing factors in our world probably served to make man respect and cooperate with his fellows, leading to society. A humanity portrayed as innocent in the Garden of Eden is not the humanity we value highly. Human dignity—and the word is derived from the Latin for "make worthy"—does not apply to those

without responsibility, who suffer no pain and face no necessity to struggle against the evil and for the good. It is the kind of world in which we live that made possible the evolution of man from lower forms of life, his slow growth in knowledge and self-consciousness and the achievement of some sense of human dignity. It also made possible love and sympathy.

It will not do to say that "God planned it so." We do not know that God has "plans." This belongs to the language of myth and has little operational significance or support. We do know something about the ways in which God as Dynamic Directionality works within us and our more inclusive environment. And this "working" may well be described in terms of Disinterestedness. We may be certain we shall suffer if we do not learn how this disinterestedness functions in nature and human affairs. We may be certain also that values may be realized if we have the intelligence and the courage to participate properly with it.

Despite the fact that we are not pampered, and that we have to use our intelligence, initiative and courage if we are to live in this world, a satis-

factory human existence is still possible. Pleasure and pain are incidental factors even though at times they loom large. We become pessimistic and lose faith in God if we engage in intensive preoccupation with the pain-producing and destructive factors; we become optimists if we neglect them. For most of us, neither view is correct. We recognize the fact that responsibility is ours to further the good and to combat the evil. And in this responsibility, I suggest we are aligning ourselves most fully with God as Dynamic Directionality.

What is required in the face of these facts is a religion which stresses human dignity, provides a basis for patient courage and the willingness to do what must be done in order to protect humanity from threats to its existence. This may mean some serious reorganization in our theologies and philosophies of religion. If so, it will not be the first time in Christian history that this has been necessary. To this end it may be necessary that we take a long look at the possibility of using the reality principle in the religion we transmit to our children and grandchildren.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.