

God and Morality

Robert B. Tapp

What's with God?

In the late 1960's, when I was analyzing a survey of 12,000 Unitarian Universalists, I addressed the faculty and students of a UU seminary with the title "What's with God?" The wordplay was not intended to connote any first-hand acquaintance with any deity and his/her current concerns but rather to analyze some of the correlations with god-beliefs and other beliefs among liberal religionists. On such social issues as abortion, sexual freedom, and peace, the more theistic UUs were also the more conservative UUs. This was partially due to the fact that theistic UUs tended to live in smaller towns in New England and be older. But even when those factors were controlled, the correlation between theism and conservatism held.

Social scientific surveys in the larger religious world typically discover this same correlation, although the absence of any large number of Humanists and agnostics makes the analysis proceed along the lines of a continuous "god-variable" where the conservatives are those absolutely certain of a personal god and those at the other end of the spectrum identify god as an impersonal force, less strongly affirmed. But the correlation of religious and social conservatism holds.¹

Some qualification is in order here. In the main, *pace* Durkheim, religions support their own societies, making their conservatism understandable. On occasion, however, there are sectarian emergences which challenge the status quo in the name of some revised or new ideological stance. Liberation theology among

third-world Roman Catholics, civil rights and anti-war movements, utopian communarians, militant fundamentalisms in modernizing societies.

From a global historical perspective, we would do well to remember the conclusion of that great Victorian historian Edward Westermarck: there is no behavior that has not somewhere at some time been recommended by some religion.

The point that must be made here is that religions, precisely because they are ideologies basically untouched by such mundane considerations as ethical consequences or rational proofs and consistencies, gravitate toward coercion to bolster their particular behavioral and ethical choices.

The novelist Tom Robbins put this well in a recent interview:
The ultimate end of any ideology is totalitarianism.
Today, the religious right and the academic left seem to be in some kind of competition to brutalize the gene pool. As agents of homogenization, both sides are committed to institutionalized mediocrity. They want to re-create the world in their image, and re-create society to fit the contours of their fears.²

Religious morality is good for the masses

This cynical argument is regularly advanced, and is often tagged Machiavellian or Napoleonic. In a more sophisticated way, it has been associated with Humean fideism. In its most cynical form it claims that "It's better to have a religion than to have nothing!" The problem with this is that it is very difficult to have "nothing" and the issue more typically comes down to a matter of **which** religion some **they** should be urged to adhere to, and whether those beliefs can persist when they discover that some we no longer share the belief.

In other words, there is a price being paid for this condescending double-belief system, and that price is the almost inevitable discovery on the part of the many that they "have been taken in." Consider the belief in Santa Claus so widely disseminated to children in our culture. Only the very young take this literally, and they move beyond it with their own age-cohort. If there is bitterness or a feeling of having been misled, it is short-lived because the underlying custom of gift-giving and receiving remains intact. In fact, the now-knowing child moves into a maturity which lets him/her fool other children and eventually become *magister ludi* in a home of one's own.

The difference with god-beliefs is that most cultures reinforce them, and they persist unquestioned. Doubt is further averted when theoreticians come up with the solution that they cannot be evaluated. Things are true because they are absurd! Or think of the medieval attempts to distinguish between the contra-rational and the supra-rational. When asked why he never spent time discussing the proofs for the existence of "god," Sidney Hook replied that he would consider such proofs along with proofs for the existence of leprechauns, fairies, ghosts, and goblins. In our culture, however, most people would miss the thrust of his thrust.

The double issue, "god" and linkage

In modern US culture, God and morality seem rhetorically linked. As the culture shifts toward the more conservative phase (of Arthur Schlesinger's sine-curve?), the rhetorical claims for this linkage increase. "Moral relativism" is increasingly decried, and Dostoevsky's dictum that "without God all things are possible" is increasingly invoked. Most Americans identify themselves as "Christian" (86%).³ Polls typically show that we regard ourselves as highly moral but view our neighbors as considerably less so. The common understanding ("conventional wisdom") is that our

theism and our morality go hand in hand. Conservative Christians argue that the enemy is something called "secular Humanism" and that this cancer is spreading, particularly in educational circles.⁴

In fact, the situation among America's intelligentsia is more complex. To be sure, philosophical positivism, with its insistence that moral statements were nonsensical assertions of personal preferences, has fallen out of favor. But, for all its shortcomings, positivism had to acquire an alternative moral earnestness in the face of European fascism. Current forms of intellectual nihilism thrive in alienation from a conservative political period and a consequent moral cynicism. Given the dire straits of universities, it seems doubtful that much can be expected from proclaimedly post-modern literary and philosophical circles.

In many parts of the world, however, the collapse of Marxism-Leninism has revealed a profound naivete regarding the strengths and weaknesses of human nature. The brief euphoria of liberation has been overtaken by the resurgence of repressed nationalistic and religious chauvinisms. Overt violence has replaced the society of oppression with yet another denial of human dignity.

The democratic societies that have survived the Cold War ("victors" seems a hollow and undeserved phrase) are finding it difficult to expunge the lying and cover-ups to recently-rationalized brutalities of their own governments and intelligence services. Having exposed local citizens to hidden radioactivity and neighbors to death squads and massacres exacts a moral price. Military dictatorships, overt and covert, thrive in this political vacuum. Local economic troubles may prevent the more democratic nations from the kind of moral housecleaning necessary to redeem the past and inhibit repetition. In particular, in the United States, it must become clearer whether the "national interest" is to be determined by the CIA or by the President and Congress.

The moral track record of the world's major religions leaves much to be desired. They participated too readily in the distortions of the Cold War. The price they are now paying is a resurgence of fundamentalisms, each in its own way proclaiming that modernity has failed and that we will only be saved by ideological regression.

Historical precedents within religions

We need not remain narrowly Western in thinking all of humanity's religions to be theistic or transcendental. Some of the pioneering comparative religionists of the last century applied crude evolutionary metaphors to their data which let them see their own cultural patterns as crowning achievements. Thus nonmetaphysical Theravadin Buddhism was interpreted to be a disguised form of theism.⁵ Chinese traditions were similarly squeezed into more familiar Western modes, making it hard to attend to the naturalistic elements in both Confucian and Taoist systems. India's Jaina tradition also had to be downplayed. And most important, in view of its numerical importance, the Vedantic versions of Hinduism had to be interpreted through Hegelian lenses.

The real problem, however, has been less whether some putative god exists but what he/ she/it does. Create? Sustain? Intervene? Consummate? If none of the above, we are left with a kind of Humean nongod. Gods without attributes may appeal to some mystics, but they cannot satisfy intellectual requirements of clarity and delineation. When we cannot specify functions for a nonnatural god, we are left with a naturalistic universe, a universe in which all events have potential interconnectedness.

This more balanced scrutiny of historic religious traditions sheds considerable light on the moral linkages as well. Morality is the way to the highest human experiences in much of Chinese and Indian thought. In India, to be sure, this moralizing was often

seen as only a preface to some kind of Inward Ho mysticism. But the main thing was the viewing of morality as instrumental. In the West, of course, this is the Aristotelian tradition. That tradition was able to infuse some sanity into Christian otherworldliness and, most recently, played a strong role in Dewey's pragmatic ethics.

The Enlightenment project

That eighteenth-century project to replace religion with reason, to enthrone democracy by dethroning monarchs and monarchical privilege, to link human happiness and morality, has failed, according to many contemporary voices. For theologians, it took sin too lightly; and for elites, it overestimated the virtues of the masses. For some philosophers and literary theorists, it was "too foundational."

John Stuart Mill wanted us never to forget Socrates. Those of us who would add to this the thinkers of Enlightenment need to insist on a proper historicism as against those utopian critics who think the world should have been/ could have been transformed overnight. There are no guarantees in our human history; no evidences of any transcendental hands (visible or invisible). Instead there are possibilities, brought into being by new ideas and human commitments to transformations.

Nor must we neglect the fact that the original Enlightenment project was driven by a new focus on "nature" (including "human nature") and the expectation that science would at last lead us to universal truths, over and above those truth-claims of various religions and philosophies. We must keep the burden on those critics of the Enlightenment culture of science to come up with a better epistemology. In the US context, John Dewey's instrumentalism did provide an expansion of scientific modes of thought into ethical realms.

One of Dewey's many contributions that is germane to our purpose here was his consistent attack upon dualisms. In particular, he stressed the natural role of experience in 'expanding' the human world. While this flowed naturally from his interest in psychology, biology, and education, it did not resonate with the Continental interest in physics. One result of this was that when physicalism moved from the Continent to England (we could almost say that it was expelled by Hitler), the new fashion had little sympathy for Dewey's non-mathematical formulations (or for that matter his social and political agendas). As Dewey himself had once noted, in explaining the decline of interest in philosophical idealism, thought-systems are more often ignored than refuted. "We do not solve old questions: we get over them."⁶

Schweitzer's paradox

Albert Schweitzer is an interesting case-in-point since he embodied so many strands in liberal Christian thinking and idealistic philosophy. He moves from being a European Christian to becoming a guilty European (over the effects of colonialism) to declaring himself a 'Humanist' and dropping any pretense of remaining Christian. As he moves along this trajectory, he also abandons the search by idealistic philosophers for some kind of rational ethics. His famous 'reverence for life' is based on a Darwinian skepticism-I am life that wills to live in the midst of other life that wills to live. It was permissible to use antibiotics in the operating room but one should not step on an ant on a pathway (or kill a rat trapped in the kitchen). Or, as he said, One can either explain the world or choose to be ethical within it-but not both.

While this has some parallels to the existentialism that emerged in European thinking during World War II, its core is still a kind of ethical reflection and search for stable axioms.

The persistence of god-thoughts

Several recent studies remind us of the persistence of thoughts about supernatural entities. *One Nation Under God*⁷ reflects a telephone survey of 113,723 Americans in a carefully-drawn sample. Only 8.2 percent of the population regard themselves as religious "nones" (the percentage of self-designated "Humanists" within this group is statistically negligible, "agnostic" being a more preferable term). Even more controversial, and noteworthy from our perspective, is an analysis of recently-uncovered census data by two sociologists.⁸ Contrary to the conventional wisdom among church historians and the loud laments of televangelists, church-belonging is by no means on the decline. It has risen quite steadily.

The reason academic historians have failed to see this is that their kind of churchgoing is indeed in decline. Growth occurred in Baptists and Methodist circles-outside the "mainstream" groups whose ministries were university/seminary based and whose theologies strove for intellectual respectability. In more recent times, many Methodists have moved toward the religious center, gothic has replaced the architecture of the chapel, and "enthusiasm" has become declassé. Baptists, especially Southern Baptists, have remained truer to their enthusiastic origins and are continuing to grow. The same must be said of a number of newer Protestant pentecostal groups.

America, religiously, grows increasingly more hungry, and the hunger is for religiosities based on unusual experiences, not on carefully thought-through theologies and intellectual rapprochements with modern culture.

The current global situation: universal human rights vs. local cultures

The concept that humans have rights by virtue simply of being human probably can be traced back to the Stoics (in the West).

The religious components of Western civilization saw things quite differently. Jews distinguished themselves from 'the nations' and the Christian adaptation of this was to distance from the world of 'paganism.' By and large, encounters among Western religions deepened such chauvinisms. In the world-context of India, we should note the insistence on religious toleration inscribed on Asoka's pillars (3rd century BCE) and celebrated in Akbar's colloquia (16th century CE).

A major element in Western Enlightenment thought was the idea of universal truths and rights. The English, American, and French revolutions of the eighteenth century began the process of political implementation, a process continuing and expanding into our own times. The 1948 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights is an important landmark. Another important landmark is Pope John XXIII's *Pacem in terris* (1963), setting the stage for Vatican II and the belated movement of this major Christian body toward modernity.⁹ What must not be overlooked is the long wait for religious bodies (and we must add, the United States Congress!) to make this move. The struggle to end oppression by religious and political bodies is an ongoing one, and each victory opens the way for a broadened vision of the human. Not unnoticed by nineteenth-century feminists was the fact that black men received rights still denied to women, black or white!

Critics of universal human rights today march to several different drummers. Chinese Marxists say "not yet" (i.e. not until the "revolution" is "completed"). In east Africa, female genital mutilation is defended as a local custom of initiation. Many developing societies have tried to curtail press freedom (the right to knowledge) as dangerous to a nascent state. Many third-world politicians see human rights as the occasion for the powerful nations to oppress the weaker and to weaken those local defenders of the weak. And, closer to home, postmodern philosophers attack universals as "foundational" and therefore untenable.¹⁰

Chastened pragmatism

The philosophical approach most closely connected with democratic Humanism is that variety of pragmatism associated with John Dewey. Unfortunately, many modern Humanists have bought into the disparagement of this tradition that some more recent intellectual fads have encouraged. We need to recapture the rightness of Dewey's stress upon the public school as the way that democracy assures its survival and spread-by developing habits of critical intelligence. We also need to recall his emphasis on the places of activity and the arts in learning, which for him and us was based on rejection of any mind/body dualism. We need to continue his focus on the centrality of sciencizing for epistemology. And we need to review his political stances which today appear far more prescient than those of his opponents and detractors. Dewey simply was 'right' about Marxism in its Leninist form, about the variety of fascisms, about the threats to democracy of supernaturalisms, and about the need for hard-headed rather than sentimental pluralism (now renaming itself multiculturalism). 11

Adopting our fore-mother/fathers

The biological fact is that none of us chose our parents, place or time of birth, social class, religion (the list could go on). But education can bring past, present, and future before our eyes. We can choose our associates, living and dead. In India, this would be called our "spiritual lineage." In picking a guru, we automatically make his lineage our own. Whether naturalistic Humanism should be viewed as a religion, philosophy, or ideology here makes little difference. We have the opportunity to build a metahistory,¹² a narrative that describes what we hold meaningful for ourselves and humanity. Or, we find a personal set of heroes, heroines, movements, ideologies to weave into our own lives.¹³

Most Humanists have spoken of Hebrew prophets, Stoics, Renaissance thinkers, Enlightenment philosophers, Jefferson, Paine, Emerson, Adler, Dewey. The list, of course, is too culture-bound and too male. But the seeds of a critique are self-contained, and many flowers now bloom.

Strategies for Humanists

. Join in post-confessional formulations

A continual temptation and risk for small groups is ideological perfectionism and purity. Even Humanists can fall prey. The human rights movement was mentioned above as a movement that many have recently joined. If Humanists can claim to be pioneers, they are certainly no longer majority stockholders. That this means compromise and accommodation simply indicates the price of democratic organization.

Equally resonant with Humanist values is the freeing of prisoners of conscience carried on by Amnesty International. Humanists need to learn more about various liberation movements, and work in ways to help Humanistic values remain central. Humanists also need to be engaged in a continuing effort to make economic systems become subservient to humans and not the other way around. This means, of course, that the self-destruction of state "socialism" in the USSR model does not mean either that capitalism is good or that it is the only show in town.

. Persist in showing the irrelevance of god-talk

Humanism is often faulted for its negativities, its persistent denials of the existences of gods and devils. I suggest that we recognize the necessity of such polemics in helping others work through the emptinesses and contradictions of god-talks, and also as thera-

peutic for recently-awakened Humanists who are still treating their own scars.¹⁴ Cautions arise within the psychic economy of individuals when the polemic stance becomes obsessive, preventing persons from taking up the many positive tasks and opportunities that a liberating Humanism affords. In other words, polemics has a place, but when it remains in center stage the movement becomes less attractive, even to many of us who have been around for longer.

• **Continue to probe the alleged supernatural/magic borderline**

"Magic" is one of those chimerical human labels, usually attached to the other person's religions. Is it OK for Minnesota farmers to offer Christian prayers for rain, but superstitious for Hopi to dance for the same boon? A recent television show examined the "near-death experiences" of women in childbirth. If the earlier claims for such experiences is taken seriously-that one glimpses the "other side" while standing at the threshold, that one sees other souls, etc. -the idea that such experiences appear in non-near death situations points to a much more naturalistic explanation of a neurochemical kind.

This point in my paper becomes the place to tout what will be the most important and shocking book for some years to come: *The Five Gospels*.¹⁵ This is the report of the "Jesus Seminar," a group of over 200 leading New Testament scholars who have been meeting annually and addressing a variety of questions about Jesus. They set forth the historical rules they have used, and apologize for letting televangelists and other fundamentalists hold the field. They conclude that only 20 percent of the words attributed to Jesus can be affirmed as his, the rest resulting from the imagination and need of early Christian communities. He did not, they have voted (anonymously but overwhelmingly) make any Messianic claims, or contend that the world was about to end. Needless to say, birth stories and resurrection stories become just that,

...~ ~

not history. I am tempted to paraphrase my earlier allusion to Santa Claus: No Easter Bunny; in fact, no Easter!

The volume bears a fascinating triple dedication: to Galileo (for removing Heaven), to Jefferson (for taking scissors to the varied passages of the New Testament), and to D. F. Strauss, for pioneering the historical study of the gospels. One hopes for many reprintings of this valuable tool, which represents a fresh translation of the canonical gospels plus the gospel of Thomas, larded with fascinating historical-critical notes delightfully free of scholarly jargon. And one hopes for long careers and tenures for the brave scholars (including Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and no doubt others) who have labored so long.

Humanists need to explore some of the fringes of magical thinking in regard to health matters (smoking won't hurt me), buying lottery tickets, seeking evidences for personal immortality, dreaming of free lunches (economically), praying before football games, praying for military victories (or, for that matter, counting on military persons to succeed in nonmilitary projects).

The importance of this issue is highlighted by the success of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of the Claims of the Paranormal (CISCOP) in reaching persons outside the usual small Humanist circles. A sizable population welcomes demystification (*Skeptical Inquirer* has many more subscribers than *Free Inquiry*).

Exploring these boundaries between wish and knowledge, faith and reality, may be the most direct route for most people to a naturalistic and Humanistic way of life. A recent controversy in *Nature*, revolves around a physicist's proposal to weigh the human soul, suggesting that the human body at death would recoil, measurably, when an entity (possessing direction, velocity, and quantum spin) departed. Daedalus (the pen name of David E. H. Jones) further noted that "traditional theology is silent on the sub-

ject of spin, though it may predict that the soul of a sinner would depart downward and might weigh less than that of a righteous believer." One of the most interesting responses was that of Hermann Bondi. Noting that religions often contradict each other, he observed that "The variety of religions is a calamitously divisive force in human affairs. The less this factor is brought in, the better for all. This is especially incumbent on those working in a universal and global enterprise as science is."¹⁶

Sidney Hook perhaps said all this best when he defined human maturity as the art of reasonable expectations.

. Support oppressed groups

While many persons today define differences in power as prima facie evidence of oppression, Humanists need a less-sweeping definition. Perhaps it might point to those differential situations that inhibit the full humanization of both parties. In any event, the point of human rights is not that they represent some fixed and maximal sets of claims upon particular societies but that they represent an expanding spiral of sensitivities reflective of an evolving human selfing.¹⁷

The nineteenth century in the West is instructive here. As the slavery issue came to a climax, the women's movement pressed parallel claims, and not far behind were assertions of worker's and children's rights. In our time rights are pressed by sexual and ability minorities. Humanists have been involved in most of these struggles, and have helped societies hear the voices of the oppressed. 'Empower' is the right verb here, since history shows little evidence that dominating groups share their power and privilege willingly.

Where the evolutionary presuppositions of Humanists can come into play is in moving from various 'nows' into 'tomorrows' where

reallocations of power are necessary and are at the same time resisted. Modern evolutionary theory leaves no pleasant exits for groups that cannot adapt to new situations, and affords no guaranteed blueprints for new situations. What the theory does insist is that humans are now responsible for the future since they have discovered its mechanisms, a point made forcefully by Julian Huxley in his various Humanist writings.

- **Understand goddess-movements**

Toni Morrison reminded a startled audience, as she accepted her Nobel prize, that theistic language is inherently oppressive. It is no surprise that many feminists have proposed "returning" to some form of goddess faith and worship. In most cases this is "inventing" rather than returning, since patriarchal theisms were so assiduous in stamping out traces of that which they had displaced.

Humanists might be tempted to argue that goddesses are no more plausible than gods, but this would be to miss the point of the dissatisfactions that move persons away from their ancestral faiths into untried directions. To the extent that the new worship promotes non-violence and ecological sensitivity, it represents a major step in the direction of more Humanistic conceptions of life.

- **Befriend the pagans and New Age questers**

Similarly Humanists should appreciate the hungers that drives those who move toward new religious conceptions. Openness is another major step on the road to human maturity, and one can assume that such fads as channeling and crystal-contemplation will prove less than satisfying, even as they lead their practitioners to critique the quasi-theological nature of their new discourses.

. Welcome environmental concerns

Environmental concerns, even when enveloped with Gaia-talk, remind us that there is only a single nature which surrounds and courses through us. They also reflect an evolutionary responsibility which no longer relies on the hope or expectation of super-human interventions. In addition, ecologisms promote respect for the cognitive sides of science since they depend upon extrapolations from our present situation. A more serious risk is the development of unhistorical romanticisms that earlier generations were any more sensitive to environmental degradations than we are in the time of modern science. But the cure for bad history remains better history.

. Resist anti-intellectualisms

A serious risk of the present, even in some academic circles, is a distrust in intellect. This surfaces in 'mad scientist' fears. Recent revelations of hidden experimentations with radiation underscore the dangers here. The cure, however, is a scientific openness where the collusion of governments and eager scientific amoralists can be exposed. In some fields of the humanities the potential of intellect is also being rejected. The cure, here too, is inquiry, exposure, and debate.

. Distrust ideologies and bureaucracies

For many years the world was divided among democratic socialist, state socialist, and capitalist ideologies. State socialism has all-but-lost its standing, and the U.S. 'free market' ideology has a commanding lead. But the old problems remain: how balance freedom and equality; liberty and justice. Developing societies are caught up in this belated version of the cold war.

The hard fact remains that no economic ideology presently accounts for the vicissitudes of human wants and productivities. Humanists need to remind themselves and their audiences of this dismal truth. At the same time, bureaucracies develop vested interests in their particular ideological versions and must be scrutinized for papering-over their failures. The most recent U.S. example is the Savings and Loan steal, which dwarfs previous chicaneries and is sufficiently pervasive of the political structure to prevent either real analysis or correction.

- **Embrace post-traditional body-emphases**

Many circles today (theologians, feminists, literary critics, art historians) are rediscovering 'the body.' Humanists should applaud this development since it helps avoid stultifying mind/body dualisms and relocate the centers of pleasure within a whole human person. In addition, body-philosophy sets the stage for a healthier appreciation of our human sexuality. This in turn should improve our general approach to the education of younger persons.

- **Showcase science**

At a time when science is being attacked from both the right and some of the academic left, Humanists must step up their insistence that the sciences represent our best ways of knowing and that the tradition of rationality fostered in the Enlightenment is alive and well. John Dewey's insistence that warranted assertabilities were the steps of human advancement needs to be reiterated to a generation that has grown up thinking pragmatism was a dirty word used only in cynical realpolitik.

At the same time, Humanists must themselves move beyond an attachment to positivistic philosophies of science that take as their

model the physical sciences. Human wisdom is also embodied in the biology stemming from Darwin, and the human future depends on the development and dissemination of evolution as the alternative to both fundamentalisms and anti-foundationalisms.

. Keep ethical inquiry at the center of discussions

We must take seriously the success of *All I Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten*.¹⁸ The title may have 'said it all' to many people. We would also do well to go back to a 1951 publication by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*. This powerful volume listed 10 values at the heart of democratic society that were 'independent' of theologies.

On a more philosophical note, we should remember Paul Kurtz' recital of "common moral decencies that are the collective heritage of civilization .individuals have responsibilities to themselves and to others in society, that we need to develop character, internalize compassion and empathy in our children, and to bring forth their capacity for ethical cognition."¹⁹ In addition to Dewey, Humanists need to attend to some of the serious moral philosophers working within naturalistic frameworks: Sidney Hook, Julian Huxley, C. H. Waddington, Paul Kurtz, Howard Radest, Antony Flew, Kai Nielsen.

On the Humanist banner?

To sum it all up (or boil it down), I would have us inscribe: Only one world, only one life, only our bodyselves.

- ¹A classic study using this form of god-question is Charles Glock and Rodney Stark's *Religion and Society in Tension*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- ²New York Times 12/30/94, p. B4.f
- ³Barry A Kosmin & Seymour P.Lachman., *One Nation Under God*. New York: Harmony, 1993.
- ⁴Tim Lahaye, *The Battle for the Mind*. Old Town, NJ: Revell, 1980.
- ⁵Cf. J. G. Jennings, *The Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, or the writings of C.AP. Rhys Davids.
- 61909lecture included in *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays in Contemporary Thought*. New York; 1910.
- ⁷Barry A Kosmin & Seymour P.Lachman. *Gp. cit.*
- ⁸Roger Finke & Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America 1976-1990: Winners and Losers in our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992.
- ⁹David Tracy's article "Religion and Human Rights in the Public Realm," *Daedalus* (1983) 237-54 is an interesting recognition of this Roman Catholic shift.
- ¹⁰Two volumes of Amnesty International Lectures are now in print: Barbara Johnson, ed., *Freedom and Interpretation*. New York: Basic Books, 1993 and Stephen Shute & Susan Hurley, eds. *On Human Rights*: New York: Basic Books; 1993. Some of these essays dramatize how difficult it is for some postmodernists to operate in a political arena.
- ¹¹As an antidote to much of the stridency surrounding this issue, we commend Robert Hughes, *The Culture of Complaint: The Fraying of America* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993 as a book in the Deweyan tradition of cultural analysis.
- ¹²Recent use of this phrase is Hayden White's. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1973. White introduces the verb "emplot" to describe the various tropes by which stories are retold.
- ¹³Early Christians would have called this "the goodly company of saints and martyrs." To their credit, they unknowingly included Buddha in this group for many centuries (Cf. the story of Barlaam and Josaphat).

¹⁴Some recent books can introduce readers to current philosophical argument and the steady shifting of the burden of proof, in what Antony Flew calls 'the presumption of atheism' See his *God: A Critical Enquiry*. 2nd ed., New York: Open Court, 1984. See also Michael Masters, *Atheism: A Philosophical Justification*., Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press; Paul Kurtz, *The Transcendental Temptation: A Critique of Religion and the Paranormal*. Buffalo: Prometheus, 1986.

¹⁵Robert W. Funk, et al. New York: Macmillan, 1993.

¹⁶Malcolm W. Brown, *New York Times*, 1/1/94.

¹⁷d. a recent incorporation of evolutionary theory into social psychology, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, *Evolving Self: A Psychology for the 3rd Millennium*. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.

¹⁸New York: Villard, 1990. Robert Fulghum, by the way, is a Unitarian Universalist minister.

¹⁹*Forbidden Fruit: The Ethics of Humanism*. Buffalo: Prometheus Press, 1988. Pp. 252f.