

Published 1988
Reprinted 1988, 1989

Carol MacCormack is a member of the Society of Friends and Quaker Universalist Group. She teaches anthropology in the University of London, and has undertaken research in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean and published widely in the subject.

The present pamphlet is an exploration into the concepts of God as supernatural spirit compared with some extreme materialistic scientific views. Carol MacCormack finds a reconciliation of these conflicting viewpoints in some fields of contemporary science. Her text, always easy to read, is lightened by some pertinent limericks.

CONTENTS

1	Watchmakers sacred and profane	
	Introduction	1
	The sacred watchmaker	3
	The profane watchmaker	5
2	The almighty metaphor	
	Fundamental definitions	8
	Metaphorical language	9
	Reconstructing what is deconstructed	10
3	The heart's greening	
	The fire warms, the sap rises	12
	Awareness	14
	Being whole	16
	References	20

THE WATCHMAKER RECONSIDERED

PART

WATCHMAKERS SACRED AND PROFANE

Introduction

It is autumn 1988, following a summer disturbed by the Greenhouse Effect. Is a nuclear winter coming? The world changed when we tasted the fruit of the tree of nuclear power; we know and all generations shall now know that we have the power to destroy the world. In these times, how are we to think of God? Will a provident supernatural figure look after us, or is he "beginning to resemble not a ruler but the last fading smile of a cosmic Cheshire Cat" as Julian Huxley irreverently suggested (1957:59).

When we speak of God we talk in riddles. Is God *deus ex machina* who resolves all life's difficulties? Is he *deus otiosus*, the redundant creator like the Greek sky-god Ouranos whose function became so general and so exalted that he disappeared, promoted to obscurity? Or is he *deus absconditus*, hidden in the depths of our hearts?

Don Cupitt makes a perceptive observation that most Europeans¹ no longer take seriously the religious teaching that God controls the course of events in the physical world. People cannot accept metaphysical aspects of Christianity that postulate supernatural beings, powers and events. Deist² ideas of God as the author of physical and natural laws of the universe have faded with the growth of scientific explanation. Cupitt describes faith in an objectified God who is external to the world, authoritatively placed over us, as a false religion "for it no longer saves" (1980:5). In the early 1960s John Robinson helped us realize that an objectified God 'out there' was a mythological expression of our culture at a particular time in history. To cling to an objectified deity now would be spiritually oppressive

and would block our attainment of greater self-consciousness (1963). If we hang on, feeling that we should believe even though such a deity is not an authentic living experience, then our religion is believed in the past tense. It can only be believed aesthetically in religious paintings, beautiful 17th century language and liturgical music but not in the ordinary experiences of each day of our lives (Cupitt 1980:12).

John Dourley, a Roman Catholic priest and Jungian analyst, has put the case more radically. Following Jung he suggests that our unconscious begets into consciousness many deities through historical time. An anthropologist would tend to say that concepts of deity arise from ecological conditions, economic and political structures, family organization and other adaptations. These are not conflicting, but complementary points of view since anthropologists recognize that all adaptations are internalized and nurture both conscious and unconscious images. Jungians and anthropologists, from their complementary perspectives, would argue that we should enquire into the adaptive and archetypal basis of current religious, economic, political and social beliefs, being aware of the nature of their power to elicit faithful commitments from us (Wallis 1988). This is much more healthy than just accepting objective theism, mechanistic scientism, capitalism, marxism or any other fixed set of values. Values must emerge from tradition, experience and reflection. As Quakers, who were nurtured in the seeker tradition, such reflection is, after all, second nature.

However definitions of deity are generated, Dourley suggests that the possibility of any Gods or Goddesses becoming the absolute and exhaustive expression of deity is rather slim (1984:9). To claim one absolute and exhaustive revelation which has somehow drained the unconscious of its ability to express its religious energies in future revelations would block rather than stimulate growth. Any further revelation which might transcend the limitations of currently competing revelations would block rather than stimulate growth. Any further revelation which might transcend the limitations

of currently competing revelations awaits further development of human awareness. Meanwhile, current Christian and non-Christian ideas of deity are not wrong. They will surely be significant but only partial contributors to a more inclusive knowledge of God. Our current task is to develop a more adequate religious consciousness for our age.

The central symbol of our Christian tradition is death and resurrection. Thus to some extent our religious tradition might affirm itself by transcending itself. We may come to welcome the death of some doctrinal tenets in order that religion might rise in some form of more inclusive awareness. This is the very process of indeterminacy and transformation that physicists posit for the universe.

The Sacred Watchmaker

Mechanical clocks with a source of energy such as a weight, a train of gears, and an escapement to allow the energy to 'escape' at a uniform rate became somewhat common in Europe at the end of the Middle Ages. Chaucer mentions them in England at the end of the 14th century. In the Middle Ages the cosmos was sacred, full of purposes, values, omens and forces. The cosmological order and the social order mirrored each other, and people sought harmony within both together. But a shift in European world view followed the work of Copernicus and Galileo. The world was no longer enchanted. Accurate measurement of time helped in formulating scientific definitions - or laws - of the world. The laws became morally and religiously neutral. Deist ideas of God as the author of physical laws of the universe became attenuated with the growth of scientific explanation. Some sense of law-directedness was the only connection between the cosmos and society.

In post-medieval times God was somehow the sacred watchmaker, but he became more and more remote, not just from scientists ('natural philosophers'), but from theologians as well. Religious thinkers began to turn away from cosmic, earthly and even cultural

concerns. They began to concentrate almost exclusively on the uniqueness of the Christian story. The theology of creation languished as religious enquiry concentrated on 1) the personality of Jesus, 2) the process of redemption and salvation, 3) the spiritual disciplines needed to guide a person's soul along the path of salvation, and 4) enforcement of judicial procedures to protect the path of salvation (McDonagh 1986:62).

Meanwhile, scientists became increasingly successful in manipulating a desacralized, objectified nature. But we are beginning to see how we have been impoverished by this dualistic split between nature on the one hand and God pushed to a hardly credible supernatural realm on the other. Our approach to the natural world has become increasingly mechanistic. Nature is no longer permeated with spiritual presence. The illusion has grown that the scientist is an objective observer, separate from the object of observation (MacCormack 1983). The natural world, reduced to an object, has been stripped of its inherent rights and dignity as a kindred being. We no longer think of all creation as our kin in the sense that the same vitality that animates it animates us. Healthy bodies are no longer a balance of humours; the balanced universe in microcosm.

In the 18th and 19th centuries Europeans developed an increasingly robust faith in the power of technology to transform the world (Hardy 1988:7). Science took on the saviour role as people drifted away from religion which was largely defined as obedience to the will of an external deity. This drift has been mirrored in social behaviour as ordinary people sought to evade the oppressive social hierarchy and working conditions of Victorian society. They anchored their lives in alternative beliefs, notably technological rationality. Increasingly we pattern our lives to machines, and God is *deus ex machina*, ex in the literal sense that he has come out of the machine, leaving a casing. This is an inadequate belief system for creating an habitable world for us to live in. Indeed, the destructiveness of such a belief system is becoming increasingly apparent (Cupitt 1980:2, McDonagh 1986).

The Profane Watchmaker

Richard Dawkins' first book, *The Selfish Gene* (1976) has sold about 200,000 copies and has been translated into eleven languages. His subsequent book *The Blind Watchmaker* (1986) is even more popular: the whole front window of Heffer's was given to it when the paperback appeared! But as you browse in such university bookshops you will also find stacks of books by Capra, Sheldrake and Bohm. Demand is so strong that staff do not bother to shelve new stock but leave the books piled on the floor. These equally credible scientists are helping us imagine an alternative world view. As the materialist paradigm swept away the God-centred world of the Middle Ages, so might we now be on the threshold of a new definition of 'reality'? Are we at the turning point?

The Blind Watchmaker is a refutation of the last glimmerings of the sort of deistic thinking that held sway within the scientific community before the advent of very materialistic evolutionary theory in the mid 19th century (MacCormack 1983). William Paley, writing in 1802, was awed by complexity in the created world. Just as a complex watch must have been designed by someone, so even more complex aspects of nature, such as the human eye, must have had an infinitely greater Creator. But Dawkins is careful to explain that natural selection for something as complex as an eye develops by a cumulative process of chance mutations. At each stage of the process the new type does not survive randomly, but individuals with the more adaptive type will reproduce themselves in greater numbers. Stage by stage cumulative selection proceeds toward greater and greater functional complexity. The 'machinery' of DNA and its expression in protein make cumulative selection possible. "To explain the origin of the DNA/protein machine by invoking a supernatural Designer is to explain precisely nothing, for it leaves unexplained the origin of the Designer. You have to say something like 'God was always there', and if you allow yourself that kind of lazy way out,

you might as well say 'DNA was always there' . . ." (1986:141). Dawkins described natural selection as a blind, unconscious automatic process which has no purpose in mind. "It has no mind and no mind's eye . . . If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker" (1986:5).

Dawkins describes our end in natural selection as being ever more complicated machines; "each one of us is a machine, like an airliner, only much more complicated" (1986:3). This reiterates the argument of his earlier book "that we, and all other animals are machines created by our genes" (1976:2). He likens our genes to successful Chicago gangsters, surviving in a competitive world. "I shall argue that a predominant quality to be expected in a successful gene is ruthless selfishness" (1976:2). Dawkins goes on to explain that if we long for a peaceful society in which individuals cooperate generously toward a common good we can expect little help from biological nature, for "we are born selfish" (1976:3).

What do the hundreds of thousands of people think as they read these books? Can they see the mistakes in scientific method? For example, Dawkins supposes genes to be ruggedly individual rather than closely interworking components within a whole. Genes are then personified and described in emotive terms as being in competition. Then, with deft sleight of hand the 'selfishness' is transferred from genes to organisms: "we are born selfish". Finally, a social moral is given with 'scientific' certainty that human nature is iniquitous and any salvation for it must come from an outside source. But since in this secular style of discourse no outside deity is imaginable, we must fatalistically accept iniquity as inevitable (Midgley 1985:123, 36, 64).

The philosopher Mary Midgley has taken note of sentences such as "genes exert ultimate power over behaviour . . . Genes are the primary policy makers; brains are the executives", and concludes that the deity being worshipped by all scientists of this mechanistic persuasion is power. Their enquiries start with the false premise that only one kind of energizing force,

egoistic self interest, is possible. Then they try to prove that it is so. In addition to being tautologous, they are narrowly reductionistic, ruling out all other approaches as not really scientific. Like the reductionistic approach in other disciplines, this kind of biology is "engaged in its own monstrous enterprise of illicit inflation". It offers us an exciting mystique of egoistic power (Midgley 1985:131).

These proponents of objective knowledge have made a bid to replace religion, not only as a source of knowledge of the external world, but also as a source of knowledge of our whole being, including our aspirations and spiritual feelings. The unrealistic individualism thus engendered is damaging the physical life of the planet and the personal fulfilment of people upon it (Hardy 1988; Midgley 1985:86, 145; McDonagh 1986).

PART 2

THE ALMIGHTY METAPHOR

Fundamental definitions

Faith in the omnipotence of mechanistic science is crumbling. Many people realize that some of the dreams scientists promised have turned into nightmares. Even those who refuse to think about environmental degradation or the mathematical probability of a nuclear accident are reaching a dead end in seeking happiness through material acquisition. The happiness advertisers promise eludes them and they feel their lives are spoilt.

Some of this surely accounts for a swing back to religious fundamentalism based on a definition of God as the one supreme holy father who created the universe, rules over it, and will bring it to its fulfilment, to 'save' it. Some of the most common adjectives describing God are almighty, absolute, and transcendent. Whether the almighty is seen as providential or dominating, the power is all his; it is not shared. He is 1) the father who will not let his children suffer; 2) the king who will not let enemies overcome his chosen people. The first way of thinking encourages passive escapism; the second supports militarism. We read of those who accept the possibility of a nuclear holocaust as God's will, an Armageddon. We also read of militant fundamentalists who enthusiastically support wars against Godless communists.

These views of God the almighty that lull us into passivity or stimulate us to war and destructiveness keep us from realizing the nature of our own power. At this moment in history we are co-creators of the world in the sense that we have the power to let life continue. As a matter of great urgency we must stop thinking of God as externally and hierarchically related to the world. God must be profoundly in-dwelling in the world and in us, the web of loving interdependence that unites

all (McFague 1987:17).

Metaphorical Language

Sallie McFague, a theologian teaching in a university in the American Bible Belt, helps us understand that the triumphalist, imperialist, patriarchal definition of God is a cultural construct - a set of metaphors. James Hemming reminds us that there was no sex in the first two billion years of life on earth. To give God a sex is therefore a human projection, and he asks if that is not also true of all 'traditional' attributes of God (1987:37).

We must not give greater weight of 'truth' to a metaphorical association such as 'God the father almighty' than the concept of metaphor will bear. Metaphors ascribe a name to an object to which it is not literally applicable. Metaphors seem 'true' because some connotations of the name match some attributes of the object. Words such as 'father almighty' have many meanings and many emotional overtones, including an overbearing and even brutal father. Since metaphor is based on a correspondence between only some implicit meanings, it can never speak an ultimate truth (MacCormack 1980:9ff, Ricoeur 1978:168ff.). Because metaphor is based on multiple shades of meaning - the open nature of words - metaphor has a great potential for extending meaning in new ways. It also has a great potential for contradiction. God is the loving genitor *and* the domineering judge who kills the spirit. Bertrand Russell rejected the later meaning with humour, helping to clear the air so that we might re-describe the reality of God:

There was a young girl of Shanghai,
Who was so exceedingly shy,
That she undressed every night
Without any light
Because of the All-Seeing Eye.

Religious metaphors arise and disappear in a culture for very complex reasons. But new metaphors

arise in Western culture and McFague encourages us, for example, to envisage the earth as the body of God, reading our concern for our own bodies into all creation. She also guides us in visioning God as mother, lover and friend (1987:20ff.). When we do, triumphalist images of the power of God give way to reflections on our experiences of the integrative power of love.

Metaphors which are inappropriate for our times may fade as our awareness of the interdependence of all levels of life grows. Our spiritual life is enriched by insights from other religions, including those that were once called 'primitive'. We read history and know the meaning of justice and compassion, and therefore know the crime of even metaphorically dispossessing one gender or other group. Also, many people now understand the role of language in constructing our understanding of existence:

Said Wittgenstein: 'Don't be misled!
What can be shown, cannot be said.'
He aimed to be sensible
Not incomprehensible,
But wrote the *Tractatus* instead.

Reconstructing what we have deconstructed

If our religious awareness is grounded in concepts and images appropriate to our times we must first deconstruct the monarchical, triumphalist images of past centuries, then reconstruct concepts, metaphors, and images that will focus our imaginative and creative energy. We might seek redemption through remythologizing the relationship between ourselves, the world and the godliness that connects us (Marsden 1988). An image of the world as God's body rather than an image of the world as the king's realm, or even the watchmaker's instrument, is provisional. We should not ask which image is true or false, but which gives the better picture of spiritual experience for our age.

As Quakers we are accustomed to testing religious experience, habitually seeking to explore beyond mere

linguistic constructions. We use our direct experience to assess traditional Christian teaching of a remote supernatural deity. We can walk cheerfully, testing provisional meanings of God in interactions with others, and in the gathered meeting. We can reflect on the meaning of peak experiences when we know ourselves to be harmoniously integrated in a web of people and activity. We may know God in ways unmediated by language, as in mystical consciousness of unity with all being (Hetherington 1975). We are blessedly free from dogma which might hold back our growing perceptions. Therefore, we might reassure ourselves that we are more than that large cat in Kew:

There was a kind curate in Kew
Who kept a large cat in a pew:
There he taught it each week
A new letter of Greek -
But it never got further than mu.

PART 3

THE HEART'S GREENING

The fire warms, the sap rises

Wholeness, holiness and humour often dance together in John Hemming's poems, and frank laughter is a feature in many mystical experiences. The scientist, Peter Russell, author of *The Awakening Earth*, wrote of a mystical experience involving a joke. Another wrote: ". . . I felt ridiculously happy, so much so that my inner smiles broke out into spontaneous laughter" (Coxhead 1985:71). Another described unity consciousness suffused with peace and joy. He thought of describing the experience to someone, 'stepping it down' into language, and the very thought caused laughter to overtake him.

Being fully aware of the limitations in 'stepping down' experience of God into language, let us look to the Bible for clues to the nature of God. John (1:1,14) wrote:

In the beginning was the word.
The word was with God
and the word was God.
And the word became flesh
and dwelt among us.

Words in our industrial age are objects on paper, produced by a 'word processor' in such quantity they sometimes constitute a clutter. Most are cheap and common. Surely the writer of the gospel intended to convey connotations of wisdom which is alive and creative, not just words. Matthew Fox suggests that we have been translating the Hebrew term *dabhar* as 'word' when in fact its true meaning is closer to the phrase 'the creative energy of God' (1983:37). Creativity is playfulness. We see imaginative playfulness among animals, especially among primates, ourselves included. The Old Testament gives hints that we are playful co-creators of the universe

with God (Proverbs 8:22,23,30,31; Fox 1983:37):

Yahweh created me when his purpose first unfolded,
before the oldest of his works.
From ever-lasting I was firmly set,
from the beginning, before earth came
into being . . .

I was by his side, as a master craftsman,
delighting him day after day,
ever at play in his presence,
at play everywhere in his world,
delighting to be with the sons of men.

These are ancient images of the eternal now, the time concept of mystics and cosmologists, not the linear time concept of mechanistic science³. Or, in a contemporary poetic idiom, John Hemming reminds us:

No man can go back to Nature,
For Nature he already is;
He can only re-enter his primeval Centre
To re-find it's always been his.

In the Middle Ages, before the Christian *deus ex machina* had come of age, Hildegard of Bingen (1098-1178) knew the greening of the earth to be one with knowledge of God. One of her mandala 'illuminations' pictures a child standing on the earth, holding a kite string, the kite in the sky. The kite string unites within one cosmology the sky and earth, bringing down the fire that possesses the heart of the child, its soul burning with the fire of deep understanding. "It pours itself through all the limbs of the person and gives the greenness of the heart and veins and all the organs - to the entire body as a tree gives sap and greenness to all the branches from its root" (Hildegard 1985:55). Another of her illuminations pictures the universe as an egg, a single cell full of generative energy. In explaining this illumination she wrote ". . . we are co-creators with God in everything we do . . . God gave to humankind the talent to create all the world." The energy of creation is "God burning everywhere" (p.36-37). Saintly

people, Hildegard explained, are " . . . the happy ones, who moved God in their time on earth and stirred God with sincere striving for just works" (p.17). Ultimately, love is the source of creation. With love, all creation is endowed with value (p.15,52). Hildegard is vivid in explaining that the love of God is the same love which binds men and women together so that they might be creatively fruitful (Hildegard 1985:15, 52; McDonagh 1986:134).

Nearly a millenium later, James Hemming, 'updating God' in *The Guardian*, wrote that although traditional sources of love have been ascribed to God, if by love we mean profound caring for one another, for life, and for the world, then we do not have to look beyond the life process itself to account for the presence of love (1988:32).

In explaining her illumination of the egg of the universe, Hildegard wrote "O Holy Spirit, you are the mighty way in which every thing that is in the heavens, on the earth, and under the earth is penetrated with connectedness, penetrated with relatedness" (p.36). Janet Scott, in a Swarthmore Lecture, struggling to find words to describe God, concluded that our Quaker experience leads us to think of God in verbs of action, as a dynamic spirit (1980:81). For Quaker Universalists who are seeking awareness that grows beyond the limitations of traditional language describing God, and who are keenly aware of the light that comes from religious experience in non-Christian cultures, the Holy Spirit may be the aspect of the trinity that is most real. The Holy Spirit is an aspect of our awareness that helps us adjust to situations. It is the silent communication we know in meeting for worship. It is the compassionate creative energy that pervades all. It binds together the dualisms of body and spirit, us and the natural world, since it is profoundly in-dwelling. It is not 'out there' in a supernatural realm.

Awareness

On a warm summer's day, when even a city

seems to take on a drowsy hush, I took outdoors the plant that lives on the wardrobe, so it might 'enjoy' the extra light. Now it has gone brown at the tips and I promise never to do it again. The plant and I, with the sun and the rain that fills pipes for Thames Water, are all together in a feedback relationship: providing, sending messages to each other, and if we care, learning to do it better. Our little 'system' transcends the boundaries of organic and inorganic; the boundaries of animal, vegetable and mineral. It may successfully reconcile the opposites of light and dark, wet and dry, and manifest a creative harmony.

On another hot day Nicolas Humphrey was up a slope of the Virunga volcanoes in Rwanda measuring the skulls of gorillas. Relative to body size, gorillas have larger brains than any other species except chimpanzees and humans. But why do they have such large brains when life seems so simple for them? Food is abundant, easy to gather, and they had no predators until we humans started shooting them recently.

As the scientist measured and observed, his own mind was full of thoughts of his failed marriage, current relationships, and other problems revolving around people. Then, in one of those flashes of insight which is what good science is really about, he realized the gorillas knew each other in intimate detail, 'reading' many kinds of information from each other. They knew who grooms whom, who had first access to the best sleeping sites and why. They also agreed upon when a young male should be turned out of the family, or whether a strange female should be allowed to join them. Humphrey suddenly realized that for gorillas and humans alike, the intelligence to survive socially (rather than instinctively) is of quite a different order from the intelligence needed to cope with the material world. As for us human beings, the purpose of our large brains is not primarily to be better watchmakers, but to be 'natural psychologists'. Our minds - senses, memory, and abstract intellectual skills - are most fully employed when we are handling relationships with one another (Humphrey 1986:32-39).

Back in London, this scientist looked out of the window of his house in Chalcot Square, into the houses facing. Although he had never been inside most, he could 'read' what happens in those houses from his experience of his own house. When he saw someone through a downstairs window, then an upstairs one, it made sense in terms of his experience of mounting his own stairs (Humphrey 1986:71-72). Adept 'natural psychologists' use the self-consciousness we have built up since earliest childhood to know as much as possible about our own thoughts and emotions, then we 'read' that experience into empathic relationships with others, and with all creation. Humphrey, a careful and much respected scientist, concluded that a child who thinks two magnets *like* each other, or a gardener who thinks plants *want* water looks on the meaning of existence in a way that is not to be disparaged. The same can be said of my thinking my plant *wanted* light, or a person thinking of the earth as the body of God and *feeling* the wound of strip mining. Humphrey concluded that "indeed, a conscious model of the universe, based on our own reading of ourselves, may be the most powerful general theory there is" (Humphrey 1986:87).

As Nicolas Humphrey has become more and more active in the peace movement he has come to realize that the greatest danger of our time is a mechanical way of thinking that depersonalizes other people ('enemy', 'gooks', 'dinks', 'gays', etc.), and nature. That is the path toward destructiveness and death for all.

Being whole

We are that child holding the kite string, knowing the burning oneness binding everything. The sun's energy is part of our external environment, part of the energy nurturing seeds of love deep within us. The seeds sprout, filling us with joy, sending out roots and fragrance to connect us with others. The energy stimulates our empathic imagination, reaching tenderly to others, knowing their condition as our own. It is imagination searching for adequate metaphors to express the

creative energy binding everything. Physicists and cosmologists are saying the same thing with their metaphors and analogies. David Bohm writes of that vast sea of energy, the plenum, with implicate order that may become explicate in a reign of peace or in a better watch. Einstein helped us understand that mass does not change into energy or vice versa, but energy is mass; they are the burning oneness binding everything. Dualistic thinking has been transcended and the Holy Spirit is magnet, plant and earth as well.

To think in a different way of the whole, of everything-that-is, let your mind play on a nest of boxes, or Russian dolls, each containing a smaller one. But the dolls are not just empty wooden containers; they are dynamic self-organizing systems. A molecule is a system, responding to changes in its external environment and changes it generates inside itself. In a larger 'doll', molecules organize themselves into organisms (an amoeba or an elephant). They similarly live in dynamic interaction with their changing environment and their changing internal states. A personality is a dynamic ever-changing system, as is a gathered meeting. All exist within nested 'dolls' of social systems and eco-systems. The earth and its atmosphere, our Gaia, is their enfolding system, -and the entire cosmos is the plenum that enfolds all. The stability and duration - the health - of these interconnected systems is based on their restless adjustment to external and internal stimuli, achieving ever-changing homeostasis through feedback and adjustment (Jantsch 1980). External and internal stimuli include both selfishness and loving kindness, our positive personality and its shadow, good and evil. At every level the systems are self-organizing. A quality we might call awareness (mind, imagination, consciousness) is an aspect of all self-organizing systems. It is Einstein's matter-energy. It is the creative energy of God, pervading the universe, participating in its dynamic systems at all levels.

Kenneth Boulding, who counts among his many books *The World as a Total System*, solved the riddle of the watchmaker in his *Nayler Sonnets*, written when

he was a young man:

Can I, imprisoned, body-bound, touch
The starry robe of God, and from my soul
My tiny Part, reach forth to his great Whole,
And spread my Little to the infinite Much,
When Truth forever slips from out my clutch
And what I take indeed, I do but dole
In cupfuls from a rimless ocean-bowl
That holds a million million million such?
And yet some Thing that moves among the
stars,
And holds the cosmos in a web of law,
Moves too in me: a hunger, a quick thaw
Of soul that liquifies the ancient bars,
As I, a member of creation, sing
The burning oneness binding everything.

Notes

1. European designates people whose world view is primarily conditioned by European culture, wherever they may live in the world.
2. Deism is belief in the existence of God without accepting revelation, connoting natural religion. Theism is belief in a God who is supernaturally revealed and who sustains a personal relation to his creatures.
3. See Hawking (1988) on the no boundary concept in which the multidimensional universe, though infinite, is curved around on itself. Having no boundary or edge, it would have neither beginning or end: it would simply be. Wilber (1981), a psychologist familiar with cosmological theory and Buddhist thought, has explored the no boundary concept of time in terms of psychodynamics.

REFERENCES

- Bohm, David
1980 **Wholeness And The Implicate Order.** London: Ark.
- Boulding, Kenneth
1945 **There is a Spirit: The Nayler Sonnets.** Nyack, N.Y.: Fellowship Press.
- Boulding, Kenneth
1985 **The World as a Total System.** Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Coxhead, Nona
1985 **The Relevance of Bliss: A Contemporary Exploration of Mystic Experience.** London: Wildwood House.
- Cupitt, Don
1980 **Taking Leave Of God.** London: SCM Press.
- Dawkins, Richard
1976 **The Selfish Gene.** London: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard
1986 **The Blind Watchmaker.** London: Penguin.
- Dourley, John
1984 **The Illness That We Are: A Jungian Critique Of Christianity.** Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Fox, Matthew
1983 **Original Blessing: A Primer In Creation Spirituality.** Santa Fe, N.M.: Bear & Co.
- Hardy Jean
1988 **There is Another World But It Is This One.** QUG Pamphlet No. 12.
- Hawking, Stephen
1988 **A Brief History Of Time.** London: Bantam
- Hetherington, Ralph
1975 **The Sense of Glory.** Swarthmore Lecture. London: QHS.
- Hemming, James
1988 'The New Human Perspective' in **Updating God**, ed. by Walter Schwarz, pp.27-38. Basingstoke: Marshall Pickering.
- Hemming, John
1987 **Ways To The Centre.** Falmouth: Hemming.
- Hildegard of Bingen
1985 **Illuminations of Hildegard of Bingen**, ed. by Matthew Fox. Santa Fe, N.M.: Bear & Co.
- Humphrey, Nicolas
1986 **The Inner Eye.** London: Faber and Faber.
- Huxley, Julian
1957 **Religion Without Revelation.** New York: Mentor.
- Jantsch, Eric
1980 **The Self-Organizing Universe.** Oxford: Pergamon.
- MacCormack, Carol
1980 'Nature, Culture and Gender: a Critique' in **Nature, Culture And Gender**, ed. by C. MacCormack and M. Strathern, pp.1-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCormack, Carol
1983 'Darwinian Theory: Some Contemporary Philosophical Issues', **Faith And Freedom** 36:130-140.

THE QUAKER UNIVERSALIST GROUP

The Quaker Universalist Group believes that spiritual awareness is accessible to men and women of any religion or none, and that no one Faith can claim to be a final revelation or to have a monopoly of truth. The group is open to both Quakers and non-Quakers.

- Marsden, Lorna
1988 *Redemption*. Manuscript. Open Letter Movement.
- McDonagh, Sean
1986 *To Care For The Earth: A Call To A New Theology*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- McFague, Sallie
1987 *Models Of God: Theology For An Ecological And Nuclear Age*. London: SCM Press.
- Midgley, Mary
1985 *Evolution As Religion*. London: Methuen.
- Ricoeur, Paul
1978 *The Rule Of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies Of The Creation Of Meaning In Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Robinson, John
1963 *Honest To God*. London: SCM Press.
- Scott, Janet
1980 *What Canst Thou Say? Swarthmore Lecture*. London: QHS.
- Wallis, Jack
1988 *Jung And The Quaker Way*. London: QHS.
- Wilber, Ken
1981 *No Boundary*. Boston: New Science Library.