



UNITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION:
ALTERNATIVES TO DESPAIR AND DECONSTRUCTION

by

James Fleming
Science and Technology Studies
Colby College
Waterville, Maine USA

The Twentieth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Seoul, Korea August 21-26, 1995

© 1995, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

**Unity and Interdependence in Science and Religion:
Alternatives to Despair and Deconstruction**

James R. Fleming

In those days there was no king in Israel;
every man did what was right in his own eyes.

-- Judges 21:25

When the scientific nature of the world is observed, it
can be concluded that God, the Creator, is the very
origin of science.

-- Divine Principle, 14

Introduction

At the end of the 20th century there are two basic modes
of discourse concerning contemporary society. One, of post-
modern despair is encapsulated in the recent statement by
Mexican author and Nobel laureate Octavo Paz warning of the
"spiritual wilderness" facing the "survivors" of the Cold
War:

It is the end of all utopias... the end of the idea of
history as a phenomenon whose outcome can be known in
advance. For the first time in history, humanity lives
in a sort of spiritual wilderness, no longer in the
shadow of the religious and political systems that
consoled us even as they oppressed us. Ours is the
first age that is ready to live without a meta-
historical doctrine.¹

It is easy to respond that history has never been known "in advance" and that other -- perhaps most -- eras in human history have appeared to their inhabitants as spiritual wildernesses. However, Paz is certainly correct when he observes that meta-historical doctrines are not in vogue today. But is humanity "ready" to live without them? Have we no choice?

A second response to the condition of late or post-modernity involves the tearing down (like the Berlin Wall) or the dismantling (like the former Soviet Union) of previously rigid boundaries. This is also manifest in trenchant critiques of previously held conceptual certainties, as in religion and science.²

Although critiques of religion have been around for a long time, historians, philosophers, and sociologists of science, and, notably, a large number of practicing scientists, have recently come to realize, "that the moral, the political, and the scientific spheres are inextricably related and constantly interact."³ Indeed, the heady practice of de-mythologizing science by examining the social, cultural and psychic bases of scientific beliefs and practices constitutes a major portion of the combined efforts of the Science and Technology Studies (STS) community.⁴

While it is currently in vogue to point to the wilderness in despair (Paz) or to deconstruct either religion or the science, technology, and society relationship (via

STS), constructive or synthetic efforts are also needed. The collapse of the monolithic "science as objective truth" paradigm, while a significant scholarly accomplishment, is not in itself a positive accomplishment. What is needed to replace the rubble is a re-articulation of the relationship between science and belief. Likewise, the apocalyptic fears of a secularized and provincialized (but fully "info-tained") humanity confronting the "wilderness" at the end of the millennium represents an opportunity for visionaries to map out an alternative vision of the cultural frontier and the road just over the horizon.

This paper presents an exegesis of the Unificationist doctrine of Creation as one alternative to post-modernist despair or simple (but useful) deconstruction. In the family of models available for describing the relationships between religion and science, Unificationism is presented as an example of "unity and interdependence".⁵

The Modern and the Postmodern

To begin, consider several definitional statements regarding the modernity and post-modernity.⁶ Following Habermas, the term modern may be traced to the late fifth century Latin term modernus which was used to distinguish an officially Christian present from a Roman, pagan past. Thereafter the term is employed to situate the present in relation to the past of antiquity, appearing and reappearing

"exactly during those periods in Europe when the consciousness of a new epoch formed itself through a new relationship to the ancients."⁷

However, with the Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes and the emergence of the French Enlightenment a different conception developed, of modernity as a distinctive and superior period in the history of humanity.⁸ In relation to reason, religion, and aesthetic appreciation it was argued that the moderns were more advanced, more refined, and in possession of more profound truths than the ancients. The quarrel over the respective merits of old and new effectively ended the blind veneration of classical antiquity and prepared the way for the eighteenth century Enlightenment philosophical project of developing the spheres of science, morality, law, and art in accordance with their respective inner logics in order to achieve a "rational organization of everyday social life."⁹

According to Marshall Berman, modernity is generated by "great discoveries in the physical sciences, changing our images of the universe and our place in it; the industrialization of production, which transforms scientific knowledge into technology, creates new human environments, and destroys old ones, speeds up the whole tempo of life, generates new forms of corporate power and class struggle; ...systems of mass communication, dynamic in their development, enveloping and binding together the most diverse people and societies; increasingly powerful nation states,

bureaucratically structured and operated, constantly striving to expand their powers..."¹⁰

The term "modern" then, has come to mean the rationalization of the natural world and social life under the domination of the universalistic claims of instrumental rationality. We may also say that modernity (as a consequence of modernization) arose with the spread of western imperialism, the dominance of capitalism in northern Europe in the early seventeenth century, and the acceptance of the scientific procedures promulgated by (among others) Sirs Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton.¹¹

Undoubtedly science has transformed history, notably since the Enlightenment, but especially in the twentieth century. Science has given us ways of understanding, predicting, and controlling nature, sometimes, but certainly not always for the good of humanity. It has changed the ways we live, think, and act. It is changing our view of the possible, our aspirations, our dreams, and our fears. It is defining who we are, how we behave, and even what it means to be human. While some consider technological progress as inevitable and one of the driving forces behind history, others view the quest for control as the rape of nature in violent, intrusive and reductive acts of destruction. Increasingly coming under scrutiny are the relationships of science to its patrons, to the natural environment, and to systems of thought and belief. Science is not only in service to humanity (medicine, technology) but is also a

destroyer of humanity (weapons, pollution, etc.) This STS approach points to the limits of science, its historical contingency, and the inability to build ethical or moral systems on scientific beliefs and practices.

The term postmodern signifies to some a fundamental break with modernity. Perhaps, and this is more likely, the term is rather more ambiguous and is employed to situate the present in relation to the "modern" past. In this sense it is an expression of profound cultural anxiety. Perhaps it too will appear and reappear during those periods when the consciousness of a new epoch forms itself through a new relationship to modernity.

According to David Harvey, postmodernism is something akin to the deconstructionist "dissolution of all narratives and meta-theories into a diffuse universe of language games" thus "reducing knowledge and meaning to a rubble of signifiers."¹² According to Barry Smart, "postmodernism is rarely rigorously differentiated from modernism, indeed within both aesthetic and sociological discourse there has been a marked tendency to conceptualize postmodernism as a part of the modern."¹³ Much of the postmodern analysis comes from aesthetic, literary, and philosophical circles. I believe specific case studies are needed to unpack the real meaning of postmodernism. If we are constrained to generalities, I believe the confusion of the modern and postmodern may be inevitable.

Reference to a particular historical period as

"postmodern" first appeared, rather ironically, in Arnold Toynbee's macro-historical A Study of History (1934-1954). Toynbee contrasted the "modern" chapter of Western history, ca. 1492 to 1914, with a subsequent "post-modern age" that began with World War I -- "the first postmodern general war" and continued through World War II -- "its sequel." These two conflicts and a series of problems associated with the rapidity of technological change and the persistence of political and economic inequalities raised the specter of the mortality of Western civilization.¹⁴

Thus apprehension of a pending apocalypse is an important factor in the postmodern. How does the fin de millennium fit into all of this? A popular work by Hillel Schwartz argues that the end of the twentieth century represents a cultural "black hole" with an "event horizon" through which society must pass and be either crushed or transformed as the new era dawns.¹⁵ Like the medieval citizens of the year 995, we "postmoderns" are living in the "nervous nineties," looking over our shoulders for the expected apocalypse at millennium's end. Since the 1960s most people have dreaded the big one -- thermonuclear war -- but instead got the 1970s and '80s, the decades that (for many) weren't supposed to happen. And while we fear the apocalypse (perhaps some anticipate it as a sublime act of devastation), we cross, both individually and collectively, innumerable event horizons each year. Hiroshima, the Cuban missile crisis, Vietnam, Chernobyl, and the fall of Communism

are only the most recent in a long series. And now, according to environmental writers like Bill McKibben, we face the "end of nature" and global environmental collapse conveniently located at millennium's end.¹⁶

The major concerns of the history of science and technology: great discoveries in the sciences, the industrialization of production, and increasingly powerful nation states, imply that to a large extent, the history of science has been a modernist project, with scientists and inventors relating heroic triumphs of the mind and spirit and historians providing the narrative, often the grand narrative, in support of the cutting (if not cruel) "edge of objectivity."¹⁷ According to Jean-François Lyotard, "The state spends large amounts of money to enable science to pass itself off as an epic: the State's own credibility is based on that epic, which it uses to obtain the public consent its decision makers need."¹⁸

Although the heroic motif is still overwhelmingly dominant in science writing -- if you doubt this take a look at any issue of Scientific American, Omni, Discover or the Tuesday New York Times -- in the contemporary STS movement, rhetorical boundaries are being obliterated between the moral and the physical domains. There are, however, two dominant modes of doing science studies. One might be called the apologetic mode of court historians writing biographies of their enlightened scientific heroes and praising the dominant culture from a position firmly within it. They serve to

nuance, but mainly embellish and embroider the epic grand narrative of scientific progress and the universalistic claims of instrumental rationality. On the other hand much of the best recent work in the history of science and STS embraces skeptical, or anti-foundationalist modes of thinking which might be termed "postmodern" or "deconstructionist."

Quoting Leo Marx:

Terms such as "nature," "technology," "science," and "environment," -- which might be thought to represent constituent properties of an independently existing reality -- are seen from a post-modernist perspective as contingent products of historical processes. Like all our words and concepts, they are taken to be "socially constructed." So, far from having a univocal meaning, the import of each term is thought to vary according to historical, social, and cultural circumstances and, more particularly, according to the speaker's assumptions about race, ethnicity, gender, and class.¹⁹

These new "deconstructionist" studies examine the social and cultural context of scientific discovery and attempt to reveal the contingent nature of knowledge and its hidden connections to power and patronage.

**The Interaction of Science and Religion:
Images and a Brief Critique**

While focussing on the contemporary postmodern fray, it is important to remember that mainstream scholars of religion and science, of whom there are many at this meeting, are familiar with the structural relationships which have been defined historically between the two. Books by David Lindberg, Ronald Numbers, Ian Barbour, and John Hedley Brooke are on everyone's shelf.²⁰ In other words, there is no need to belabor a taxonomy of possible positions. I simply refer you to Table 1 (below)

Table 1: Models of the Interaction of Science and Religion

I. Conflict (or Warfare)

Faith and facts are in heated battle

Religion is in retreat before scientific theories

Advocates: J.W. Draper, A.D. White, also widespread popular position.

Examples: Galileo and the Church, Franklin and the lightning rod, Darwinism and Creationism

II. Separation

Science and religion are incommensurable

They speak to different human needs and aspirations

Advocates: K. Barth, R. Bultmann, most practicing scientists unless they consider religion to be **irrelevant**

Examples: Positivism, Neo-Orthodoxy

III. Relevance and Interaction

Science and religion are aspects of larger social and cultural practices

Interaction between them is real and may be advantageous, especially to religion

Advocates: R.K. Merton, most practicing scientists before Darwin, and some members of the current STS community

Examples: Jesuit scientific pursuits, Protestants and the scientific revolution, dedication to vocation as faith

IV. Unity and Interdependence Model

Reality is one

Revelation and reason should be complementary

Advocates: A.N. Whitehead, process theology, some Patristic Fathers, most world religions (e.g Taoism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism), and Unificationism.

I would like to make three additional points. First, the warfare thesis of John William Draper (1875) and Andrew Dickson White (1896) has largely been put to rest by subsequent scholarship.²¹ Second, the hope that science might invigorate and inform religious belief (Model III in Table 1), as expressed by Pope John Paul II in a letter to the director of the Vatican Observatory, seems rather tenuous. Quoting Pope John Paul:

The matter is urgent. Contemporary developments in science challenge theology far more deeply than did the introduction of Aristotle in the thirteenth century. Yet these developments also offer to theology a potentially important resource. Just as Aristotelian philosophy through the ministry of great scholars such as St. Thomas Aquinas, ultimately came to shape some of the most profound expressions of theological doctrine, so can we not hope that the science of today, along with all forms of human knowing, may invigorate and inform those parts of the theological enterprise that enter into the relation of nature, humanity and God?²²

Finally, a study of the historical interaction of religion and science provides a broader view of the possibilities for faith and reason. The following brief presentation of the Unification Principle of Creation (as an example of Model IV in Table 1) is meant to stimulate a gentle, constructive, and Irenic (rather than ironic) dialogue about the alternatives to post-modern nihilism.

The Unificationist Position

What remains after the rubble of discarded signifiers is cleared? Who has a positive alternative? Writing in the Dictionary of the History of Ideas, theologian Langdon Gilkey concluded, "...the idea of God has...[since 1800] not only been radically refashioned, but has also tended to dissolve into emptiness."²³ Earlier debates focused on how we are to speak of God: through revelation, faith, science, or philosophy. Since about 1960, however, the question has become for theologians and for others, whether or not we can say anything meaningful about God. Rarely in the theology we read today is there discussion of the grounds either for our faith in God or for any knowledge of God based on our ordinary human experiences. If theology cannot specify what sorts of meanings its language has in relation to ordinary experience -- how, in other words the divine dimension fits into our common apprehensions of existence -- then theological language, however eloquent, and whether "Biblical" or otherwise, will remain empty and devoid of meaning.

In presenting the Unification Principle of Creation I hope to suggest a meaningful alternative to post-modern despair in general and to Gilkey's pessimism about religion in particular. Also, while I applaud the deflation of some of the heroic claims about science, especially when they come disguised as absolute truth or inevitable progress, I firmly

believe that the (in large part) admirable modes of criticism advanced by STS do not go far enough, but simply point to dimly viewed moral (dare I say spiritual?) relationships of science.

In 1981 Professor Richard L. Rubenstein observed that Reverend Moon's Unification Church showed promise as an "effective agent of spiritual renewal" and offered a way out of Max Weber's "iron cage" of radical secularization. Such a statement should not be taken lightly, especially from a distinguished scholar whose career path has encompassed traditional Judaism, the "death of god" movement, the secular study of religion, and, most recently, prominent leadership within the Unification Movement. Reverend Moon is a man who is not trapped in the cage of modern (or post-modern) Western secularism. In Unification Theology God does not dissolve into emptiness; meaningful and inspiring things can be said of God, often in the language of everyday experience.

According to Professor Eileen Barker, "Unification cosmology explicitly claims to rest on a scientific world-view."²⁴ Certainly, the unification of the sciences has been one of its goals. But beyond this, it espouses version of the scientific method in reaching religious conclusions. According to Sang Hun Lee, founder of the Unification Thought Institute:

The starting point of Unification Thought is God, and its logical development is deductive; as for those who are not accustomed to the deductive way of thinking, we

ask them to take the teachings about the essence and attributes of God as a hypothesis and to approve that hypothesis as a correct theory only when all of the natural and social phenomena are found to fall in line with the conclusions derived from that hypothesis. This hypothetical method has actually been very fruitful in the development of science, even until today.²⁵

As a new revelation, the Divine Principle seeks to harmonize science (which it calls "external" truth) with religion (which it calls "internal truth"), so that "mutual understanding will occur between the two.":

External ignorance is ignorance of physical reality; that is, ignorance concerning the natural world, which includes the human body; also, ignorance of such questions as: What is the basis of the material world? According to which natural laws do all physical phenomena occur?....

Religion and science have been the methods of searching for the two aspects of truth, in order to overcome the two aspects of ignorance and restore the two aspects of knowledge. The day must come when religion and science advance in one united way, so that man may enjoy eternal happiness, completely liberated from ignorance and directed toward goodness, which is what the original mind desires. Then, mutual understanding will occur between the two aspects of truth, the internal and the external.²⁶

Unificationism harmonizes transcendence and immanence in a cosmological model of a Unified Person (God), who creates without being transformed, who maintains unity and continuity

through creation, and experiences the consequences, both good and bad, of the creation. God purposes a cosmic community of mutually responsible co-creators as goal of all creative activity -- past, present, and future. This view underlies the ethics and social philosophy of communitarian personalism. Unification anthropology puts humanity back at the center of the cosmos as its ultimate ruler and supports the vision of a just, prosperous, and peaceful society modeled after a perfected individual and family.²⁷

The interrelatedness of Unificationism is reminiscent of Hartshorne's process theology or Hutchingson's "systems theology."²⁸ Indeed there is much in common with process thinkers such as Whitehead and Bergson. Both process thought and Unificationism espouse dipolar theism; both reject the exclusively masculine identity of God; both emphasize divine sensitivity; both teach the importance of free will and the need for human cooperation if God's ultimate purpose is to be realized; both raise questions about God's omnipotence, given the free will of humanity and the indeterminacy of nature. Thus, both process thought and Unificationism deny that God predetermined everything before creation (e.g. the Fall or the Crucifixion), or that God knows the outcome of every human decision or every natural occurrence.

Consider also how Unificationism appears as a type of "systems theology." The Biblically-based (but not exclusively so) worldview of Unificationism is a grand scheme consisting of Creation (thesis), Fall (antithesis), and

Restoration (synthesis). These three aspects are echoed in the Unification view of history as consisting of the "history of sin, history of re-creation, and history of restoration."²⁹ The Divine Principle organizes the Biblical stories of the families of Adam, Noah, and Abraham, and the lives of Moses, John the Baptist, and Jesus into a consistent and recurring pattern based on the a meta-principle called "restoration through indemnity."³⁰ Rather than simply good moral stories, the Divine Principle, provides a conceptual framework in which leading figures in the Bible can be meaningfully compared. This provides a comprehensive and systematic view of scripture.

As a systems document, the Divine Principle traces Jesus' impact on individuals, society, the nation of Israel, the Roman Empire, and the entire world-system. Unificationism teaches that Jesus came to establish a new world order, the "Kingdom of Heaven on earth."³¹ In systems language, Jesus' messianic mission was primarily as the "change agent" to effect a cosmic transition from the fallen world system to the heavenly world system. The lack of this transition indicates that he was only partly successful, due to systematic failures by his disciples and others. He is, however, credited with bringing "spiritual salvation" to believers and keeping hope alive for a second advent.

On the institutional level, the International Cultural Foundation and all its projects (including ICUS) represents a serious commitment to interdisciplinary and ecumenical

dialogue in the world community of scholars. Theologians Harvey Cox and Lonnie Kliever see Unificationism as part of the "coming metainstitution." Cox writes:

New institutions are [required] to take the place of the old... in which the lives of the prophets and saints are commemorated, the hope for the New Humanity celebrated, and "new truths" are ever breaking forth from God's hold word.³²

Kliever amplifies:

There are structures and ministries of the Unification Church that have a metainstitutional character -- the International Cultural Foundation [and] the International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences... What if these are not mere organizational fronts? What if these are the Unification Church, not serving or supporting its own institutional and doctrinal interests, but providing a structure and symbolic context within which diverse individuals and groups, institutions and traditions can freely explore that "infinite possibility thing" which is modern religion and life.³³

The possibilities are there, in Kliever's words, for Unificationism to "pioneer the way toward distinctively modern forms of religious organization"³⁴ and in so doing make a substantial contribution to the systematic articulation of the relationship of religion and science in which the individual and the whole, the personal and the universal, and nature and God are in harmony. Returning to

Divine Principle's call for an active fusion of science and religion:

What is the destiny of science? Until now, scientific research has not embraced the internal world of cause, but only the external world of result; not the world of essence, but only the world of phenomena. Today science is entering a higher dimension; it is no longer concerned exclusively with the external world of result and phenomena, but has begun to examine the internal world of cause and essence as well. Those who have taken the path of science are concluding that, without the truth that relates to the spiritual world of cause; that is, the internal truth, man cannot attain the ultimate purpose of science; that is, the discovery of the external truth, which pertains to the external world of result.³⁵

Conclusion

This paper began with an exposition of postmodern despair and the deconstructive practices in modern scholarship, especially in science studies. The situation of the post-modern, post-industrial, post-Cold War, post-just-about-everything world has brought us to a crisis point in the demythologization of both religion and science. It is accompanied by vague cultural anxieties about the "spiritual wasteland" at millennium's end, and very specific social fears about ethnic hatreds, the decay of the social fabric, and loss of hope for the future.

The world is full of despair; perhaps it always has been. Compounding the problem it is also increasingly populated with skeptical, or anti-foundationalist modes of thinking. Although there is much to admire in the attempts by rhetoricians, historians and others to break the hermeneutic circle, reveal the idols of the scientific tribe, and punctuate their overinflated narratives, it only takes a pin prick to deflate a balloon. Still, some limited good can come from the practice of deconstruction, for as Stephen Toulmin, has pointed out, (citing Frederick Ferré's discussion of postmodern science): "The point from which any "post-modern" science must start is the need to reinsert humanity into nature."³⁶

Of much greater importance (and infinitely greater difficulty) is the advancement of a constructive vision. In a rather abrupt rhetorical turn, and in full recognition of the need to build something rather than to tear down, I presented Unificationism as one of many "Unity and Interdependence" models of reality. These models -- in which both theory and practice, reason and revelation are complements, and which actively promote the unity of science and religion -- include most world religions (e.g Taoism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism), process thought, and some of the Patristic Fathers. Any one of them could have been presented to make the point.³⁷

NOTES

¹ Octavio Paz, quoted in the Boston Globe Magazine, Jan. 22, 1995, p. 24.

² Well-established models of the relationship of religion and science include conflict (or warfare), separation, relevance and interaction, and unity and interdependence. There is no room for a full discussion of these, but the basic characteristics are listed in Table 1 on page 11. Only the Unificationist model of unity and interdependence will be discussed at any length, although others certainly could serve a similar purpose.

³ Historian of science S.S. Schweber, quoted in Science 261 (1993): 1461-62.

⁴ E.g. Bruno Latour, We Have Never Been Modern (Harvard?, 1993) and Sheila Jasanoff, et. al., eds., Handbook of Science and Technology Studies (Sage, 1995).

⁵ See Table 1.

⁶ This section follows Barry Smart, "Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Present," pp. 14-30 in Bryan S. Turner (ed.), Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity (London: Sage, 1990), p. 17.

⁷ Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity versus Postmodernity," New German Critique 22 (1981): 3-14.

⁸ See Hubert Gillot, La querelle des anciens & des modernes en France: de la defense et illustration de la langue francaise aux paralleles des anciens et des modernes. (Paris, 1914).

⁹ Habermas, "Modernity versus Postmodernity," 9.

¹⁰ Marshall Berman, All that is Solid Melts into Air (London: Verso, 1983), 16; quoted in Roy Boyne and Ali Rattansi, "The Theory and Politics of Postmodernism: By Way of an Introduction," in Boyne and Rattansi, eds., Postmodernism and Society (Hampshire: Macmillan, 1990), 2-3.

¹¹ This is from Bryan S. Turner, "Periodization and

Politics in the Postmodern," pp. 1-13 in Bryan S. Turner (ed.), Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity (London: Sage, 1990), p. 6.

¹² Harvey, David, The condition of postmodernity (B. Blackwell, 1989).

¹³ Barry Smart, "Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Present," pp. 14-30 in Bryan S. Turner, ed., Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity (London: Sage, 1990), quote from p. 20.

¹⁴ Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History, 12 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1934-1954), 12: 422, 467.

¹⁵ Hillel Schwartz, Century's End: A Cultural History of the Fin de Siècle from the 1890s through the 1990s (New York, 1990).

¹⁶ Bill McKibben, The End of Nature (New York, 1989).

¹⁷ Charles C. Gillispie, The Edge of Objectivity (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960).

¹⁸ Jean François Leotard, The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, transl. G. Bennington and B. Massumi (Minneapolis, 1984), 27-28.

¹⁹ Leo Marx, "Postmodernism and the Environmental Crisis," Report from the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy 10, no. 3/4 (Summer/Fall 1990): 13-15; quote from pp. 13-14.

²⁰ See for example, John Hedley Brooke, Science and Religion (1991); and David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (eds.), God and Nature (1985).

²¹ John William Draper, History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1875); and Andrew Dickson White, A History of the warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom (New York : Appleton, 1896).

²² Quoted in Jean-Pierre Lonchamp, Science and Belief, transl. M. Groves (Middlegreen, U.K.: St. Pauls, 1993).

²³ Langdon Gilkey, "God, Idea of, Since 1800," in Philip

P. Weiner, ed., Dictionary of the History of Ideas, vol. 2 (New York, 1973), p. 366.

²⁴ Eileen Barker, "Science as Theology -- The Theological Functioning of Western Science," in A.R. Peacocke, ed., The Sciences and Theology in the Twentieth Century (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981), 271.

²⁵ Sang Hun Lee, "Today's World Problems and Unification Thought," ICUS XVIII presentation, available on the World Wide Web at the following URL -- http://www.cais.com:80/unification/misc/lee_ut1.txt.

²⁶ Divine Principle (Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 4. The basic texts of Unificationism available in English are Divine Principle; Outline of the Principle, Level 4 (New York, 1980); and the speeches of Rev. Moon, many of which were given at previous ICUS meetings, notably Science and Absolute Values (New York, 1982). For basic theological and philosophical statements by elder members of the movement see Young Oon Kim, Unification Theology (New York, 1980); [S.H. Lee], Unification Thought (New York, 1973); and [Lee], Explaining Unification Thought (New York, 1981). There is also a "Unification Home Page" on the World Wide Web at the following address -- <http://www.cais.com:80/unification/>

²⁷ Divine Principle, pp. 58-60, and 44.

²⁸ Charles Hartshorne, The Divine Reality (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948); James E. Hutchingson, "The World as God's Body: A Systems View," Journal of the American Academy of Religion xlvi (1980): 335-44.

²⁹ Sang Hyun Lee, Explaining Unification Thought (New York: Unification Thought Institute, 1981), 293.

³⁰ Divine Principle, 222-30.

³¹ Matthew 4:17; Divine Principle, 140-41.

³² Harvey Cox, The Feast of Fools (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 113-15.

³³ Lonnie D. Kliever, "The Unification Church as

Metainstitution," in Herbert Richardson, ed., Ten Theologians Respond to the Unification Church (New York: Rose of Sharon Press, 1981), 73.

34 Ibid.

35 Divine Principle, 5.

36 Stephen Toulmin, The Return to Cosmology: Postmodern Science and the Theology of Nature (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1982), 210.

37 A starting point for this larger project is World Scripture: A Comparative Anthology of Sacred Texts, edited by Andrew Wilson (New York: Paragon House, 1991). The electronic text archive is now available on the World Wide Web at the following URL -- <http://rain.org/~origin/ws/wstp>.