

Evolution And The Inward Light

Where Science And Religion Meet

Howard H. Brinton



PENDLE HILL PUBLICATIONS
WALLINGFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

ABOUT THE AUTHOR When Howard and Anna Brinton first came to Pendle Hill in 1936 they had to face the contingencies of a pioneer school-community. This meant that all sorts of odd jobs, which in years to come would be handled by a maintenance crew, fell to the lot of the Director of Studies in person. As a consequence Howard Brinton would be seen traipsing across campus, with appropriate tool in hand, on his way to negotiate the latest crisis. Frequently on these treks he was pursued by a faithful rabbit, Tibbar, which, in its turn, was followed by Nuto, the Brinton dog. This Peaceable Kingdom on the march was viewed with delight by Gerald Heard, then a member of the Pendle Hill staff, who saw in it a practical illustration of his own philosophy of survival by reconciliation.

Howard Brinton, now Director Emeritus of Pendle Hill, finds a place for this gospel, and much that is relevant to it, in *Evolution and the Inward Light*, which summarizes the thought and purpose of a lifetime.

Introduction

The following essay is a supplement to my former statement on the cosmological significance of George Fox's philosophy, *The Religion of George Fox* (Pendle Hill pamphlet 161). That philosophy is derived directly from the New Testament. It was in fact the philosophy of early Christianity, at least of that part which was influenced by Hellenic thought. It is a simple, elemental philosophy easily understood by any Christian, containing no metaphysical subtleties. It is a philosophy which I myself can accept, as it is close to that of my two principal teachers, Rufus Jones and Josiah Royce. Idealistic, pragmatic, and existential — by which I mean a philosophy capable of being lived — its formulation comes largely from the prologue to John's gospel and two epistles attributed to Paul, Ephesians and Colossians.

Early Quakerism made a great effort to resemble early Christianity. But it could not revive primitive Christianity any more than we today can revive primitive Quakerism. The most that can be done is to revive the intention of earlier movements by aiming at the same goal, allowing our methods to be moulded by the cultural patterns of our own day, provided that those patterns are not in direct opposition to the original goal. For example, the unprogrammed Friends' meeting of today has the same goal as the meetings in the days of George Fox, though the messages expressed in contemporary terms may be quite different. The goal is obedience to the Spirit, the expression is spontaneous, and the meeting without human leadership. This process is sometimes successful and sometimes it is not, but the risk of failure is worth taking, for the method can lead to new experiences and new ideas emerging out of the worshiper's inward life.

Today we think of evolution as a lengthy process leading from the most primitive form of life to the highest. Our

primary concern is with the cause of evolution and the type of environment which produces it. George Fox had no conception of evolution in the Darwinian sense, but he knew and said a great deal about evolution within the human species. He called it “the new birth” by which a person rises to a higher level of life. The source of this “new birth” was, in the words of Paul, “Christ the Power of God” (I Cor. 1:24), and the necessary environment was a closely integrated community of persons seeking the same goal.

John used the term “the Word” to apply to the same power, opening his gospel with “In the beginning was the Word ...”. The “Word” in Greek is *logos*, which meant much more than a spoken word; it suggested, rather, a dynamic life force. But whether we use Paul’s term or John’s, the power of which they were both speaking was the Inward Light of the early Friends.

Fox applied this doctrine only to the spiritual evolution of humanity, but is there any reason to believe that it does not apply to the evolution of all life? We believe in some interpretation of “the survival of the fittest,” but who are the fittest? If this early Christian philosophy is true, then the most Christ-like are the fittest, and “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth” is a biological as well as a spiritual statement. I believe this can be shown to be true. God, said Paul, “hath committed unto us the word (or, as in verse 18, “ministry”) of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5: 19). If we use the term “adaptation” instead of reconciliation we might appear to be more scientific. This means the adaptation of all forms of life to their environments.

In my former pamphlet on Fox I considered only the human environment. This essay endeavors to apply Fox’s philosophy or theology to all life. The central question today is not so much what will enable the human species to evolve but what will enable it to survive. The simple answer is the original Christian “gospel of reconciliation,” an effective creed but never easy to carry out.

For several years I have been too blind to read, but nevertheless able to write, though with difficulty. I have much depended on the assistance of my granddaughter, Catharine Forbes, who is a student of philosophy; and as always I am much indebted to Eleanore Price Mather, the editor of Pendle Hill pamphlets.

In this essay the King James Authorized translation of the Bible has been used except where otherwise indicated.

God's Method Of Creation

George Fox believed in the Inward Light as that which produces unity and reconciliation. This was indispensable in a group held together by no human authority and only a minimum of external organization. The only head of the Quaker society was the Christ within. This "Power," a word often used by Fox, is the Creator who creates not out of nothing but by reconciliation. "The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3) is the biblical quotation found oftenest in Fox's later epistles, where he frequently declares that Christ is the Creator. This has cosmological significance. How indeed does the Christ spirit create?

Since Quakerism is based on inward experience, and only indirectly on biblical statements, we must turn for further light on this question to the Quaker journals, or spiritual autobiographies. There are hundreds of these journals extant. In them three stages of development appear, not always sharply outlined. The first or "nature" stage, roughly from seven to twelve years of age, is remembered as continuing some divine revelations, though these were not recognized for what they were until many years later. The child is "natural," to use a term from the older Christian theology, but the Divine Seed of the Kingdom is within and is beginning to grow. He is therefore, to use Wordsworth's phrase in the "Intimations of Immortality," "nature's priest," and these early ecstatic experiences represent a high degree

of the feeling of union with the God of Nature. They are not a result of repentance, nor are they a search for salvation or an evidence of it.

Then follows a transitional period, approximately from the ages of 12 to 20, containing playfulness, subsequently regarded as useless frivolity, and later, an inevitable inner conflict when the desire to satisfy the sensations of pleasure is in sharp opposition to a spiritual pull in the opposite direction. (Paul in Romans 7 expressed this divided self as a conflict between law and spirit; here we can consider "law" as the conventional demands of his Hebrew religion which he could not satisfy, just as he could not satisfy the demands of the Spirit within him.)

This second period is followed in the journals by a third, which consists of complete acceptance of the leadings of the Light. Probably Quakers who did not reach this period did not write journals. In the third period there is seldom that sense of guilt which marked the second period, though there may be occasional inner conflicts when the writer is faced by a concern which is difficult to carry out. But a way is generally found, at least in the journals, and the result is always a profound sense of inner peace. There is no instantaneous "conversion," but a gradual change accompanied sometimes by setbacks. From now on the writer is to some degree in the Kingdom of God, for he or she has fully accepted as a goal the standard of conduct and the ethics of that Kingdom as portrayed in the sayings of Jesus. Such persons are sometimes described by others as perfectionists. Some theologians — Reinhold Niebuhr, for example — say that Jesus intended the Sermon on the Mount only as an ideal which could be striven for but never reached. How can man be perfect in an imperfect society, even though the New Testament calls for pressing on toward "the fulness of Christ"? Such a perfect society is beyond the reaches of historical possibility.

But these theologians do not understand the Quaker conception of perfection. Perfection is not satisfaction with one's own condition. It requires humility and growth. The journalist who described herself as a "poor worm" meant that she really felt like one. Growth is necessary. A seed, however perfect, is imperfect if it is not growing into a plant. A boy, however perfect, is imperfect if he is not growing into a full grown man. The writer of a journal is confronted with the great difficulty of writing about himself and at the same time considering himself of no importance. John Woolman wrote his journal three times. His corrections show that he endeavored to eliminate as many direct references to himself as possible. To be "perfect" in the Quaker sense meant to live up to one's own "measure" of the Light, however small it might be. If that is done more is given. As long as anyone lived up to his "measure" of the Light, however small it might be, he could be said to obey the biblical command "Be ye ... perfect" (Mat. 5:48).

Christ said to Pilate that his kingdom was not of this world therefore his followers did not fight. The Quakers in describing their Society as "not of this world" meant that they were not following the conventional ways of the society around them. They were in the world but not of it. The Kingdom of Heaven, if it is to begin on earth must begin some time somewhere, so why not with the individual who has adopted its ethical code? Generally speaking this has been regarded as dangerous and even fatal, or at least impractical. This essay is intended to show that in the long run it is practical, for if the Christ spirit, which is exhibited most clearly in Jesus of Nazareth, is the Creator, then reconciliation is God's method of creation and marks the survival of the fittest throughout all life.

The journalists realized that the devil might appear "appareled as an angel of light," but this risk had to be taken. Their uncertainty was different from the anxiety which

pervades the spiritual autobiographies of the Puritans. The Puritans were always pilgrims, and like Bunyan's pilgrim they never reached the Celestial City in this life. The journals of Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, for example, reveal a desperate attempt to discover evidence of divine grace afforded them, not because they deserved it — for they thought mankind was totally depraved — but bestowed on them by divine favor. However, they never could be sure about this, and the result was continuous anxiety interrupted occasionally by flashes of rapturous assurance. This anxiety in the Puritans, inspired by fear of hell, is now considered by many as the condition of all men, though now the fear is that of death, and of the boundary around our life experience which we dread because we can not know what lies beyond it. Even though a “leap of faith” beyond this boundary may bring us face to face with God or Christ, some elements of doubt remain, for existentially speaking the idea is beyond the rational.

In comparison with the Puritan journals the Quaker journals are pervaded by a spirit of peace and relaxation. Even the death of a child or wife, or the failure to successfully carry out a concern, does little to interrupt this peace, which is not self-satisfaction but a feeling of obedience to the divine will. Many of these journalists struggled a long time against the call to speak in meeting, but finally that call was obeyed, and the sense of peace which resulted is always mentioned. After this call was obeyed other calls to service seemed less like pushing oneself forward. Hence, although the journal may begin with a sense of guilt, especially during the period of the divided self, it is for the most part characterized by a sense of peace. In the Journal of George Fox there is no evidence of a sense of personal guilt. His early melancholy was apparently due to the guilt of the world around him.

The Quaker Christology

Whereas the first three gospels give us the ethics of the early Christians, the philosophy and theology came largely from the gospel of John, supplemented by the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians and by Paul's historical concept of the first and second Adam. Fox and the early Quakers, in turn, derived their Christology almost entirely from these sources, and put them to vigorous practical use in holding together a religious group without any human authority over it. It is accordingly necessary to review the interpretation of John's opening passage: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men" (John 1:1-4).

It is evident that translating the Greek *logos* as "Word" is inadequate. "Word" may refer to the light of knowledge but it is not sufficiently dynamic to suggest life. This becomes clearer as we read on. The use and meaning of the word vary. In the Book of Revelation the horseman riding a white horse is called "The Word of God." Other analogous phrases designating the Logos are, "the shekinah of the glory of God," Plato's Idea of the Good, the Idea of Ideas, the archetypal universal not as an abstraction but a dynamic force. The concept bears some resemblance to the divine soul of the world of the Stoics, formless but the creator of forms, the regulating and ordering principle always at work to create a cosmos out of chaos. Such expressions as these and others only approximately translate the word Logos; they are not real equivalents either to each other or to Logos. But since there is no other word in English or in any other language that exactly corresponds to Logos, we shall retain the term, though it may be that George Fox never heard of it.

We now come to the famous ninth verse which Robert Barclay called the “Quaker text” because the Quakers so often quoted it as it appears in the King James translation: “That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.” The Revised Standard Version presents the following rendering: “The true light which enlightens every man was coming into the world” (John 1:9, R.S.V.).

The Greek original permits either interpretation. But the new wording is inconsistent. If the Light enlightens every man it was not just then coming into the world. As John says, it existed at the creation and had been shining into the darkness ever since. “He was in the world and the world was made by him and the world knew him not” (John 1:10).

This indicates that the process of creation by *Him* was still going on and the world did not really know Him until the Logos “was made flesh and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). There is no evidence in the thirteen preceding verses that the writer was thinking of any one but the eternal Christ, the Creator who was both God and from God. In this capacity, before the coming of Jesus of Nazareth, the Logos could give men “power to become sons of God” (John 1:12).

Here the original Quaker Christology becomes explicit. If it is true that the “Light enlightens every man” (and on this point both the King James and the Revised Standard translations agree), then every man is in some degree or “measure” (to use the Quaker term) a son of God (Galatians 4:7), an incarnation of the Light.

But though to each human being is given a measure of the Light, to Christ “God giveth not the Spirit by measure” (John 3:34). This is not merely a metaphysical statement of the nature of Christ, for it is based on the fact that “he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God” (Ibid.). The Revised Standard Version presents the phrase thus: “For it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit.” This is not as

clear as the King James version, for it is obvious in our experience that the Spirit is given with various degrees of limitation, depending on the individual. George Fox in a letter inserted in his *Journal* speaks of Christ as possessing the Spirit without limitation (Ed. Thomas Ellwood. First printed, 1694, 8th ed. [London, 1901], I, 350). This is, as far as I know, Fox's only attempt at creating a rational Christology, that is, an explanation of Christ's relation to God and man.

This doctrine does not detract from the uniqueness of Christ. Jesus is unique in that in him was a full measure of Light. He was the firstborn of many brethren (Romans 8:29). When Jesus says, "I am the Light of the World," he speaks as one in whom the process of creation through the Light has reached its climax. He is therefore the Prototype of man, the highest form of created life that has yet appeared. Even the most rationalistic Friend should have no difficulty in accepting this Christology.

The Functions Of The Logos

In the pages following the prologue John endeavors to describe the functions of the Logos as Creator: operating within and among men, baptizing with the Spirit, turning the water of the old covenant into the wine of the new, healing the sick and raising the dead. John's gospel is a series of so-called "signs" (John 2:11, R.S.V.), each one of which signifies or is a symbol of a function of the Logos. When Jesus feeds the five thousand he declares, "I am the bread which comes down from heaven." When he cures the blind man he says, "I am the Light of the World."

All this might sound grandiloquent did we not recognize it as John's method of describing how the Logos performs in the process of creation. Jesus says, "My Father is working still and I am working" (John 5:17 R.S.V.).

There are no birth stories as in the other gospels, for Jesus does not feel himself to be the Logos until the Spirit descends on him at his baptism. The interpretation of John might seem to disagree with the twentieth chapter when Jesus gives the Holy Spirit to his disciples as if they had not received it before. But I think this act, as well as the other acts enumerated by John, has an eternal as well as a temporal meaning. Jesus has always been giving the Spirit, and this eternal function is symbolized by temporal acts. In John every event is sacramental, a disclosure in the temporal of a hidden communion with eternity.

So Jesus is "The Way, the Truth and the Life." He is not only the goal, but the way towards it. Alice Meynell expresses it as poet in "I Am the Way: "

Thou art the way.
 Hadst thou been nothing but the goal
 I do not know
 If ever thou hadst met my soul: ...

After the first chapter the Logos is not again mentioned in the gospel of John explicitly as creator, but there are many symbols, as have been pointed out, which describe his creative function. For example, "a spring of living water," a vine of which we are branches, and although Jesus frequently declares his dependence on his Father he also speaks occasionally of their unity. "I and the Father are one," and he prays on behalf of his disciples "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us:..." (John 17:21). This unity is also clearly expressed in Christ's exhortation: "If a man love me he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings; and the word (Logos) which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me" (John 14:23-24).

The creative principle of the Logos operates in the disciples as well as in Christ. "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, if ye continue in my word (Logos) then are ye my disciples indeed: And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32). "I know that ye are Abraham's seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word (Logos) hath no place in you" (John 8:37).

The religious philosophy of the New Testament, and therefore also of early Christianity, is not fully given to us in any one place except perhaps in the prologue of John's Gospel, but it appears elsewhere mixed in with other things. Its clearest exposition outside of the Gospel appears in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, attributed to Paul. "For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will according to his purpose to set forth in Christ as a plan for the fulness of time to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth" (Eph. 1:9-10, R.S.V.). In Colossians 1:13-20, (R.S.V.) we read:

He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities — all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in everything he might be preeminent. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things,

whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross.

The bond of unity created by the blood of a sacrificial offering is an Old Testament idea carried over into the New Testament and given a universal rather than tribal significance in the sacrifice of Jesus. As we see in reading John's first Epistle, "If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another" (I John 1:7), John's statement is followed by what at first appears to be a nonsequitur, "and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us all from sin."

I have endeavored to explain this in *The Religious Solution to a Social Problem* (Pendle Hill Pamphlet #2)¹, and in *Friends for 300 Years* ([New York, 1952] pp. 42-47). It comes from the Old Testament conception of a blood sacrifice as a means of reconciliation. The blood of a lamb on the foreheads of two persons who are offering a sacrifice is a bond of unity between them. Thus when the Israelites came to Mt. Sinai they made a covenant with the God of the mountain by killing a lamb, sprinkling the blood on the altar representing the deity and scattering the blood on the people. That was the old covenant or testament. In the new covenant or testament, Christ was the lamb of God "slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8). There was no paschal lamb slaughtered at the Last Supper of Christ and his disciples, for Christ himself was to be that lamb. Thus, the Crucifixion was both a temporal and an eternal event.

Nearly 500 Quakers died in English prisons because they believed that they were saved by the Light of Christ within them and not by the death of Christ on the cross outside Jerusalem, by which an angry Old Testament God was appeased. That such a notion as blood sacrifice should have survived so long in Christianity is surprising.

Philo Of Alexandria

All this illustrates the union of Greek immanence and Hebrew transcendence attained in the philosophy of Philo of Alexandria, a contemporary of Jesus. Philo almost undoubtedly influenced the writer of John's Gospel, and also the writer of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians. Through the mind of this Hellenized Jew flowed into Christianity those elements of Greek thought which were to form such an important part in Christian belief.

The Logos philosophy had come to its climax in Stoicism, in which the Logos was the soul of the Universe through which chaos could be transformed into cosmos. It was the Eternal Reason, immanent in man and nature. In one sense it was a combination of Plato's realm of Ideas with Stoic universal causality. In another sense it was the archetype of all archetypes and the ultimate source of all existence. The Logos was also the source of all morality. For the Stoic it was a place of refuge from the wild disorder of the world. Many centuries later George Fox also discovered what he often called the "Power of God," a sanctuary to which the Quakers, while endeavoring to withstand severe persecution, could retreat and be at peace both with themselves and their enemies. But whereas for the Stoics this Immanent Reason was only a refuge from pain and trouble, for the Quakers it was an Inner Voice calling for reconciliation, and the kind of social activity which would create that reconciliation. Hence the Quakers, unlike the Stoics, became reformers in a number of social causes. No philosophy was better able than that of Philo, to include both Greek metaphysical mysticism and Hebrew prophetism, a combination characteristic of Quakerism. For Philo, God is, in himself, transcendent beyond the reach of human knowledge and reason, but reachable by mystical revelation, at least according to Philo's Christian and neo-Platonic successors. God's manward or knowable aspect is his Logos

through whom he made his prophetic revelations and through whom he had created the world from the beginning.

This creative side of God was masculine in John's gospel, but elsewhere it is feminine, as in Proverbs 8, where she is God's Holy Wisdom (*hagia sophia*), to whom the greatest cathedral in Constantinople was dedicated. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water ... when he prepared the heavens I was there: ... when he appointed the foundation of the earth then I was by him ... and I was daily his delight ..." (Proverbs 8:22-30).

And from one of the Old Testament Apocrypha we have:

For she is the breath of the power of God
 And a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty; ...
 For she is an effulgence from everlasting light,
 And an unspotted mirror of the working of God, ...

Wisdom of Solomon 7:25-26 (Moulton)

But wisdom and Logos are not necessarily equated. Wisdom is sometimes considered to be the Virgin Mother from whom the Logos, the Son, is born. This appears in the philosophy of the German mystic, Jacob Boehme (1575-1624) (*The Mystic Will*, H. H. Brinton, New York, 1930, pp. 183-9).

Here perhaps we could say that wisdom is a kind of model or blueprint of the universe which the Logos uses in his creative work to draw all the disorderly fragments into higher and higher degrees of unity. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John 12:32). But we read in Corinthians that "Christ is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:24), a favorite quotation of George Fox. This leads to confusion of wisdom and Logos.

Such confusion is unnecessary if we consider ourselves made in the image of God. We all have something within us

which is transcendent and is quite inaccessible to other persons, that which we are in ourselves. No one outside ourselves can know exactly how we feel or think. But we have in addition a part of ourselves which we expose to the world in what we say, act, and create. Jung calls this our "*persona*," the part of ourselves which we are willing that other persons should know about, while we suppress into our "shadow" what we do not want them or ourselves to know.

Our *persona* is known by the sensations (sight, hearing, feeling, etc.) which we cause in other persons. But the exact character of our own feelings, seeings, and hearings can not be communicated. Perhaps all we can completely communicate are quantities designated by numbers. For this reason the physical sciences dominate all other forms of knowledge as if we lived in a world of numbers, a world we do not see, feel, or hear. Our sensation of red is very different from an electromagnetic wave of a definite measurable length, and a sensation of sound is very different from the motion of air particles which cause it. But in spite of these limitations of perception and communication we do have a kind of mystic knowledge of each other quite different from the light and sound waves coming from another person. We can in some mysterious way get beyond the *persona* and feel to a limited extent what that person is from the inside. That would not be the case if he or she were only a very complicated mechanism, for a mechanism can be fully known by quantitative measurements.

This knowledge of what might be called the "inside" of the other person is possible only because we all share in the Logos of God. Or, to use another symbol in John's gospel, "the Light which enlightens every man" is one Light, the same in all persons though different persons have different "measures" of it. Hence the Light is a community-creating agent and seeks, unsuccessfully so far, in bringing all men into one community. This means that creation is not yet completed, but it does indicate the goal toward which we

are moving. The Logos as a community-creating agent would be more successful if it were not for the natural limitations of communication and perception and the repression of some aspects of the self into the "shadow."

It follows from all this that the Inward Light not only unites us with God but with one another. This, says Robert Barclay, "is that cement by which we are joined as to the Lord, so to one another" (Barclay's *Apology* Prop. XI, sec. VII). Hence the two commandments by which Jesus sums up all the law and the prophets: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," are two sides of the same coin. Jesus says the second is like unto the first. Hence anyone who claims to be an atheist and at the same time claims disinterested love of his neighbor is contradicting himself. Such love, as Paul says in I Corinthians 13:5, "seeketh not her own," is *agape* in Greek, not *eros*, which seeketh her own.

When George Fox calls upon us to "answer that of God in every man," he is appealing to the creative life which is at work in every part of the universe, and which seeks to bring all things into one universal community. Accordingly, as John Donne says, "no man is an island." There is a divine dimension to all existence which is not an abstract Idea but a dynamic Power which seeks to hold us together, although we often try to resist it. In all religions self-centeredness is the chief sin from which all other sins are derived.

Evolution By The Logos

If it is true that creation has occurred and is occurring now, by methods described in the Sermon on the Mount and other sayings of Jesus, the personification of the Logos is important as an illustration of the final goal of evolution. This requires careful examination. I believe it can be defended by scientific experience. We are not attempting primarily to explain the nature of Christ, but rather the basis of Christian

ethics in the process of creation. We are not attempting to reduce ethics to biology, but rather to show that ethics has its primitive beginnings in biology.

The myths of creation in the Old Testament give us no information of scientific value, except the conception that creation was a process. In Hebrew prophetism we find some real insights into the nature and significance of man. One such insight is Jeremiah's prophecy that some day the law would be written not on tablets of stone but on the heart (Jer. 31:33, echoed in II Cor. 3:3). All the prophets anticipated the Quaker rejection of empty ritual and the advice of Samuel to Saul that "to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams" (I Sam. 15:22). Jeremiah states exactly the Quaker position when he rejects the cisterns of stagnant water and accepts instead the springs of living water. The stagnant water, of course, represents the dead rituals and tradition of the past; the spring is the outpouring of the Spirit in the immediate present on which all truly prophetic ministry depends.

In the New Testament we have a contribution of Greek philosophy with a genuine scientific significance, though not in the limited sense of modern physics which has existed for only three centuries and which deals only with the relations between material objects.

But knowledge of spiritual and psychological relationships more fundamental than physics is as old as the human race. The logos philosophy which formulates these relationships, is one of the oldest as well as the newest of all philosophies. Beginning with Heraclitus in the 6th century B.C., who, as Heidegger shows, used the word *logos* to designate that which gathers together and unites, thus creating a cosmos out of a chaos, it is acknowledged by such various moderns as Josiah Royce, Alfred North Whitehead, and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who have all agreed that the function of the divine is not to create out of nothing but to gradually bring into an orderly unity

diversified and individualistic elements of being. Creation develops not by bringing about uniformity but by creating diversity which then requires a greater degree of integration. These integrated organic wholes then respond to the upward pull of the divine Logos to form an integrated whole on a higher level. Millions of years ago our human bodies began as a single cell, just as they begin now at birth with a single cell. The marvelous thing is that this single cell, then as now, contained the plan of the whole. And every cell of our present body still contains the plan of the whole to some extent, otherwise a wound would not heal in the way it does. But every cell does not contain the complete plan as the germ cell does, for if a leg is amputated a new one does not grow on a human body, though it may on the body of a "lower" form of life. This original plan in the first cell in history contained God's Logos, or plan of creation, which was not just a primordial idea of what the universe would be, but was — and still is — an active creative power, the Christ Spirit. Thus every living thing can be said to have a divine dimension.

That this plan applies not just to human beings but to all living creatures is illustrated by the Old Testament prophet, Isaiah (11:6) in his concept of the Peaceable Kingdom. The Quaker painter, Edward Hicks, was very fond of this theme and used it in over one hundred of his paintings.

God's plan is in some way latent in all creation as it slowly evolves, sometimes going backward, but in the long run forward toward the Kingdom of God. There is darkness as well as light, for as John says, "the light shines in the darkness and the darkness has not overcome it" (John 1:5, R.S.V.). Thus, although God is Eternal Goodness, evil exists because God's plan for creation is that it should slowly evolve toward perfection. Evil will in the end be destroyed because evil destroys its environment and hence itself. Evil does not

permit reconciliation, the only condition for survival. Reconciliation requires that each side give up something in order that reconciliation may take place. But the unique individuality of each remains.

If the plan for the whole is in every cell of my body then the Kingdom of Heaven is in every individual in the community of living things. The Kingdom of Heaven, says Jesus, is working in you. The true light enlightens every man (John 1:9 R.S.V.). This is the gospel which has been preached *in* (wrongly translated *to*) every creature under heaven (Col. 1:23). God's plan is within, but it is also beyond, for it is not yet completed.

Here the "Logos" in John's prologue must be supplemented and redefined by another word, *agape* (agaph), or love, which appears in John's first epistle. Both words mean that which unites and reconciles. When John says that "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God and God abides in him" (I John 4:16 R.S.V.) we have perhaps another word for the Logos which, like the word reconciliation, describes its method of creation. As Albert Schweitzer says in the epilogue to his *Out of My Life and Thought* (Trans. C. T. Champion [New York, 1949] p. 238): "... in God, the great first cause, the will-to-create and the will-to-love are one; ..." Jacob Boehme had a similar conception of evolution: for him evolution was completed in Eternal Nature, though in temporal nature it was far from finished.

The Beloved Community

Here we are coming close to the philosophy of Josiah Royce, prominent at Harvard early in this century. Royce was an idealist, but his ideal was not the Absolute Idea of Ideas of Hegel, but the Absolute Community of Communities of the Kingdom of Heaven. Hence Royce, though classed as a neo-Hegelian, was dealing with concrete realities. He called

himself an Absolute Pragmatist, even though he carried on a continual debate, to which I often listened as a student, with his intimate colleague and friend, William James, a pragmatist who rejected all Absolutes. Royce was especially concerned with what he called “the beloved community,” or the “redemptive community,” by which he meant the religious community as distinguished from, for example, a community of scientists or bankers. We can and must remain part of a community, though we still keep our own individuality. Our main virtue must be our loyalty to our community, however much we may disagree with it. For Royce religion is loyalty to loyalty.

The “Beloved Community” can only exist in religions which seek to be universal and to redeem all mankind. The scientific community also seeks to bring mankind into one universal acceptance of scientific truth, but it does not seek to be redemptive. For Royce the community was of primary importance because only through it can we check the truth or falsity of our ideas, and it is only through one’s social relations to other persons that one can become a person himself. The individual must not be so merged in the community that he loses his individuality. When that occurs the community becomes a mob and is controlled by demagogues and advertisers. But if the individual asserts his individuality so strongly that he disregards the community, anarchy results. This problem is resolved when the individual finds in the community a cause to which he can be loyal and which represents the self which he aspires to be.

For most orthodox Christians the community which requires their loyalty is the Kingdom of God, “a city out of sight” which can never be realized in history. The early Christians had expected it to occur in history, but this belief gradually faded, and loyalty must now be expressed by faith in a spiritual order of being higher than any in this world.

William James had established the fact that religion is based on experience. Royce acknowledged this, but went further in an endeavor to deal with all the orthodox Christian beliefs through philosophy. He accepted the belief that the true church was the body of Christ, and that it was a community which had been restored and recreated by Christ's atonement.

Atonement for Royce meant not the removal of sin, but the restoration, through sacrifice, of a redemptive community which had been broken by the sin of disloyalty. Christ by his atonement on the cross became the founder of a church which, though far from being the Kingdom of Heaven, was at least that kingdom potentially. In accepting the Christian doctrine of atonement Royce rejects the theory that Christ's death was an offering to appease an angry God. Even if this did reconcile God it did not reconcile man to himself, for the reconciliation took place entirely outside of man. Royce also rejects the moral theory that Christ suffered as an example for us. This theory was too subjective, as the other was too objective. Man must be reconciled both to himself and to God.

Christ expected that his death would bring in the Kingdom. And his death did historically mark the beginning of a community animated in some degree by his Spirit, a "church" — his body — greater and more universal than that of the older Hebrew Messianic expectations. The official creed of the Christian churches today leaves the incarnation and atonement a mystery and a miracle beyond human comprehension. Jesus Christ is declared to be fully God and fully man. The early Greek fathers, for example Clement and Origen, like some Christian mystics such as Eckhart and the early Quakers, had approximately the same view as Royce. The incarnation and the atonement are not irrational but have their roots in human experience.

Royce's philosophy, based on the metaphysical

character of social relations, differed from that of the early Hellenistic Christians, but it had a strong family resemblance to it. Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son is another example of the Logos philosophy. It is extraordinary that the unschooled Fox should have discerned an early form of this philosophy. It was known, of course, by Robert Barclay and William Penn, who were thoroughly versed in the history of Christian theology. But where Royce believed that the celestial city could never be achieved in human history, Barclay, Penn, Fox, and other early Quakers believed that it could be felt in mystical experience and entered in some measure by those who lived in accord with the teachings of Jesus.

Quaker Perfection

The Quakers were "children of the New Covenant" as opposed to the children of the Old Covenant: the Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans who defended the Old Testament doctrines of war, swearing, ritualism, and the priesthood. They were, accordingly, perfectionists in the sense of Paul's ambition to live up to "the stature of the fullness of Christ" and become a co-heir with Christ, a friend of God, and not a slave obeying law and a master, as he declares in Galatians. But Quaker perfectionism did not mean arriving at the goal and remaining there. It meant the intention to live up to the highest Light vouchsafed, which would in the end lead to complete compliance with the Sermon on the Mount. And having attained to that height a fall from it was always possible, even probable.

Living as if you were already in the Kingdom would not bring it about, but it would at least give it a start. The Crucifixion and Resurrection must be reenacted by the crucifixion of all fleshly desires and the resurrection of the "new creature," a rebirth through the Spirit within. Perhaps also (although this was never, as far as I know, mentioned

in Quaker literature), the sufferings of the Friends in prisons for forty years, under conditions often resulting in death, could be considered an atonement for the acts of both the Catholic and Protestant churches which had broken the original Christian community, in the hope of reproducing that original community. Certainly the Quakers believed that their movement was a restoration of the original structure and beliefs of early Christianity.

But while I am concerned here with the historical origin of the Quaker doctrine of the Inward Light, which, as I have tried to show, has its roots far back in history, long before the gospel of John was written, I am much more concerned with the present. As creator, and as the aspect of God turned toward man and nature, the Logos creates by exerting an upward pull through love and reconciliation. This has been called a *fronte* causation as opposed to a *tergo* causation. Thus in Plato's philosophy the Idea of the Beautiful draws toward itself the beautiful in nature, but is checked by the obstinacy of matter from being molded into any perfect form. As Shelley writes in "Adonais," his elegy on the death of John Keats:

He is a portion of the loveliness
 Which once he made more lovely: he doth bear
 His part, while the one Spirit's plastic stress
 Sweeps through the dull sense world,
 compelling there,
 All new successions to the forms they wear;
 Torturing the unwilling dross that checks its
 flight
 To its own likeness, as each mass may bear;
 And bursting in its beauty and its might
 From trees, and beasts, and men, into the
 Heavens' light.

Limits Of Materialism

But alas, the dazzling results of the physical sciences have dimmed all other attempts to explain nature and man. Physics is the supreme science and all other sciences imitate it as far as they can. Biophysics and biochemistry attempt to explain life in terms of physical and chemical reactions. Huge and well financed attempts are being made to get at the secret of life by exploring the germ cell which gradually develops into the extremely complicated structure of the human being. Nobel prizes are given to those who have proceeded even a very little way towards the goal. It is believed that by altering or rearranging the genes in the double helix in the nucleus the cell life can be altered in any way the experimenter desires. This theory reduces life to a physical-chemical mechanism operating by the fixed laws of mechanical causation. A certain stimulus produces a fixed response, and life is made up of billions of such stimulus response mechanisms. Once we find out what they are, scientists, not the Logos, will be given the credit for a new mutation or life form.

The difficulty with this theory — that life is a mechanism — is that no one really believes it. The professor of biophysics may base his lecture on it, but when he goes home he does not treat his wife and children as complicated mechanisms. He treats them as sacred human beings, we hope, free to make their own decisions and experiencing love or hate, joy or pain, duty or irresponsibility, acting truly or falsely, correct or mistaken, and none of these feelings or thoughts can possibly be attributed to a mechanism. He has in himself a sense of freedom so deeply felt that no theory of physics or chemistry can explain or remove it.

Bewitched by science, some schools of philosophy today have deserted idealism, which at least asked ultimate questions, and have resorted to playing with the symbols of

logic and language. As a result many are turning away from the philosophers, who have little of importance to say, and are turning to the theologians, especially the theologians such as Paul Tillich who emphasize the validity of mystical experience.

To these seekers we can say that Christ is not simply the Galilean who offered himself as a sacrifice for the sins of men at a certain time and place. He is that, but he is also the Eternal Creator, the manward side of God, the Logos whom he incarnated and personified in himself. The Word became flesh in him completely, but it also becomes flesh to some extent in every human being, however virtuous or debauched, and also to a lesser extent throughout all life and all nature. The Eternal Christ is both the Holy Spirit and the only begotten Son. The Eternal Christ is the only begotten son of God because God has only one Logos, at least on this planet.

William Penn wrote a book with the title, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, in which he denied the doctrine of the trinity. For this he was imprisoned in the Tower of London. He then wrote a second book entitled *Innocency with Her Open Face* in which he called Christ God and Savior. He was then believed to be orthodox and was set free. The Quakers appeared to be more orthodox by Puritan standards than they really were because they used the same language regarding the Eternal Christ that the Puritans used regarding the historical Christ.

It is possible to describe a temporal event in terms which apply to an eternal process, and in doing this the Quakers had a solid basis in the New Testament. Paul was a Hebrew and thought in terms of historical events, but much that he wrote could be applied equally to a Hellenistic eternal process, "the Process of Christ" as Jacob Boehme called it. When Paul wrote to the Romans, "For if ... we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled,

we shall be saved by his life" (Rom. 5:10), he was interpreting the sacrifice of Christ in terms of the sacrifice of a lamb on the altar as in the Old Testament. And being saved by the life of Christ meant communion with his risen spirit until the time he should return in glory. All this for Paul is temporal rather than eternal. The Old Testament did not predict that the Messiah would die, though he might be persecuted, as prophesied by Isaiah (50:6). Paul found a meaning for his death which Hebrew Christians could understand.

It is fortunate for New Testament Christianity that it includes both the Eternal Christ of John and the temporal Christ of Paul. All true religion resides at that moving point where eternity intersects time. Without time eternity would be beyond our grasp, and without eternity time would be too limited to require our reverence and worship.

An Alternative Theory

It is generally asserted in scientific classrooms that the evolution of life on this planet has proceeded by a series of accidents in which the fittest survived. But it is very difficult to imagine that the world around us has resulted from an almost infinitely long game of dice. To use a familiar figure, it would be just as easy to think that if a group of monkeys pounded at random on typewriters they would in time produce the works of Shakespeare. This might be a real possibility, but it is so remote that it could only be expressed by one chance in a number which would reach from here to Saturn. To solve this riddle we should not look on nature around us, known only indirectly by our very fallible senses. This paper on which I am writing feels smooth, but actually it is made up of molecules in rapid vibration. If this were not so, its temperature would be absolute zero, more than 400 degrees below our normal zero.

Instead of this inadequate view through our senses, why not try to take a view of the only matter we know from the inside, namely ourselves? We feel entirely free to act on an idea not yet fulfilled, but which pulls us toward it. This is our logos, which makes us creators as we bring the idea to reality. God also has his Logos, his only begotten Son toward whom he is gradually bringing his world.

In the Community of Communities all creation will be reconciled. Whether, as Royce thinks, this consummation will be for ever “a city out of sight,” or whether it will finally be accomplished, we can at least be loyal to it through faith and love, and begin it whenever and wherever we can. There is, as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin maintains, a direction to evolution which is determined by its final goal. We ourselves feel, in our religious and moral experience, a pull from in front as well as a push from behind. What is obviously happening on the highest level of evolution can happen, though far more obscurely, on the lower levels.

We find that as evolution advances to higher and higher levels on each level something new has been added which was not there before. In other words, a mutation occurs rather than the long slow series of changes described by Darwin in explaining the evolution of a new species.

But are we not still in our game of dice in which there are millions of mutations and only the fittest survive? I think not, for this game could only rearrange the chaotic mass of electric particles and atoms which originally composed our universe. Nothing radically new and different could be produced. And evolution is the story of higher levels of existence being produced in which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The parts have become united or reconciled in such a way that a new creation has resulted. Thus electric particles, protons, electrons, neutrons, unite to form an atom, atoms unite to form a molecule, molecules unite to form a living cell, cells unite to form a living body,

bodies unite to form communities of plants, animals, or men. This is of course an oversimplification of a very complex process. To take the simplest possible example, an electric spark can be used to ignite a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen gases so as to form water, which is quite different in its qualities from the two gases. The spark does not produce the union of the atoms into the molecules of water. It is only a catalyst which enables the atoms to fulfill their "desire" for each other, and unite. This "desire" existed before the spark occurred. In the same way it could happen that a cosmic ray would strike a germ cell and cause a change. The cell responds by reaching out into a new area of existence in which it is capable of adapting to a new environment.

The word "desire" as applied to an atom is, of course, only a human symbol of something which it might only very faintly resemble. In the mechanical age of the 19th century it would have been nonsense, but the electronic age of the 20th century is different. We are now dealing with electromagnetic fields rather than material objects. The old stimulus-response mechanism may apply to rats running through a maze, but not to life in general. In life the response is also the stimulus, for life reaches out ahead of itself in order to create and to fulfill a mutation. The future as well as the past influences the present, which makes possible the emergence of genuinely new forms in the process of evolution.

In regard to the inadequacy of scientific materialism, Alfred North Whitehead writes in *Science and the Modern World* ([New York, 1929] p. 149):

We can now see that the adequacy of scientific materialism as a scheme of thought for the use of science was endangered. The conservation of energy provided a new type of quantitative permanence. It is true that energy could be construed as something subsidiary to matter. But,

anyhow, the notion of *mass* was losing its unique preeminence as being the one final permanent quantity. Later on, we find the relations of mass and energy inverted; so that mass now becomes the name for a quantity of energy considered in relation to some of its dynamical effects. This train of thought leads to the notion of energy being fundamental, thus displacing matter from that position. But energy is merely the name for the quantitative aspect of a structure of happenings; in short it depends on the notion of the functioning of an organism.

The same relegation of matter to the background occurs in connection with the electromagnetic fields. The modern theory presupposes happenings in that field which are divorced from immediate dependence upon matter.²

In a mechanistic world the cause precedes the effect. All things operate by a push from behind. But in a gravitational field an object falling toward the earth seems to be pulled from in front and not pushed from behind. The same is true of a piece of iron in a magnetic field. Thus an intangible invisible field does not operate by the laws of mechanics. Mechanics has no explanation of how one mass can act upon another across a completely empty space. We have here, instead, a *fronte* causation, a pull from in front, rather than a *tergo* causation, a push from behind.

Einstein was never able to complete his Unified Field Theory which could express in mathematical formulae all kinds of fields both gravitational and electromagnetic. But we can use the term "spiritual field" as an analogy to the physical fields of science. Every member of the Society of Friends who is acquainted with genuine Quakerism knows that a spiritual field exists in what is sometimes called "a

gathered meeting,” that is, a meeting for worship which is gathered into a single whole by the Spirit in its midst. It is this spiritual field that is the community creating agent and a manifestation of the Logos of God. The gathered Friends meeting feels that it is being pulled up by a Divine power beyond it and above it. And it is not difficult, by using such analogies, to think of the primordial Logos, the Creator of John’s prologue, as generating a field of spiritual force to gradually pull our world toward itself into a single unity, the Community of Communities. Royce never used the term, field of spiritual force, to describe his Beloved and Redemptive Community, but that is clearly what he meant.

There is, as Tennyson says, “one divine event toward which the whole creation moves” (“Locksley Hall”). This is the philosophy of Idealism, the only philosophy which attempts to answer ultimate problems. Modern philosophies such as logical positivism or language analysis have no answers to ultimate questions. But if our universe is opaque to reason philosophy is impossible, for genuine philosophy is an attempt to understand our world by means of our minds.

One difficulty is that in our efforts to understand we use only the outer cortex of the brain, which was developed by the use of tools. It understands therefore only mechanisms used as tools. But the deeper parts of the brain, dominated by feeling rather than thought, have a deeper insight into the nature of things. Although mechanistic thought rejects freedom of the will, feeling accepts it. And feeling can become a mystical apprehension of God, who, by his Inward Light or Logos, is pulling us up toward Himself through reconciliation with human beings and the world around us (II Cor. 5: 19).

But reconciliation implies that each side gives up something to adjust to the other. Does the Infinite God give up anything? Perhaps the word “atonement” answers this

question. I mean not just the atonement of Christ, but the ultimate death of all life in order that new and higher life can be born. As Jesus says in the Gospel of John, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John 12: 24).

Survival By Reconciliation

If it is true that the Logos of God is the Creator who is still creating, and if Jesus of Nazareth was the temporal personification of this Creator, then the words of Jesus as recorded in the gospels tell us how the creative process proceeds. I cannot, of course, summarize here the whole very long process of evolution. A large number of factors are involved. But I do wish to point out that in the long run reconciliation and love, the main characteristics of the divine Logos, as expressed in the New Testament by its greatest human incarnation, triumph over the aggressive forms of life which, by destroying their environment, eventually destroy themselves.

Assuming that evolution proceeds by the survival of the fittest, as it undoubtedly does, then on this theory the fittest is not the best fighter but one who best complies with the gospel of reconciliation or love. Our guide to survival should be the Sermon on the Mount. "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon," the battle cry of the Puritan army of Cromwell, must be replaced by the New Testament gospel of reconciliation. Cromwell's army defeated the monarchy but with Charles II the monarchy came back almost as strong as ever.

Those who make violent changes in the organic structure of society are bound to fail. War does create changes, but they are generally superficial. The Civil War in the United States freed the slaves, but it has left us with a very difficult race problem. In the West Indies the slaves

were freed gradually by purchase, and as a result the race problem there is small. The United States secured its "freedom" by a revolutionary war, but Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, and other countries have secured it without war and as a result remain part of a greater community, the British Commonwealth. The Russian Revolution appeared to make a great change, but we find there an autocracy and government by an elite group, much as in Czarist times.

Arnold Toynbee in his great study of *History* (Oxford, England, 1947) has shown that militarism is a fatal disease. Militarism, whether in men or animals, gives rise to 'ubris, pride, the second term in the Greek triad: *koros*, 'ubris, *ate* (superfluity, pride and doom). Fate brings about a fall from pride in every Greek tragedy. The most militaristic of the great empires of antiquity, Assyria, had the shortest life. The present mood of the United States of America is militaristic. Tremors of an approaching fall can already be felt. But we cannot with assurance make any prophecies, and it is not necessary that history should repeat itself. Germany and Japan met defeat in spite of their militarism, but now that their militarism has been abandoned they are rising again so rapidly that they are outstripping their conquerors. Perhaps all that we need in the U.S.A. to suppress our 'ubris is a good defeat, and we are soon likely to experience it in southeast Asia.

The two countries whose culture have lasted the longest are India and China. In India the priest was the top man, and in China, the scholar. But Chinese culture has suffered a serious setback recently. England is a comparatively stable country today because there:

Freedom broadens slowly down
 From precedent to precedent

Tennyson: "On a Mourner"

We cannot make such large historical generalizations without noting exceptions; human history as a whole is too complex. We are attempting here only to draw a few conclusions about life on this planet, both human and "subhuman," which show that in all life reconciliation is the key to survival in the long run, even though it often appears to fail in the short run.

Perhaps adaptability is a more inclusive word than reconciliation. A rabbit today survives only because of its swiftness in fleeing from its enemies. This may not appear to be "reconciliation." But reconciliation, in its broadest sense, does not mean peace by the domination of one individual over another, but rather the creation of a situation in which both survive. We should not look at just a fragment of the picture, but at the whole. As we look around the world we can see that the animals with the strongest claws, the biggest horns and jaws, the toughest hides, are disappearing and the smaller, more sensitive animals are surviving.

Gerald Heard in his *The Source of Civilization* (London, 1935) considers sensitivity and awareness the principal assets in the struggle for survival. These make adaptability possible. A greater sensitivity and awareness are not generated by a long slow process of natural selection as described by Darwin, but by cells functioning in an entirely new manner. Biologists today accept such mutations as an important factor in evolution. When a member or members of a species attain to new and different areas of sensitivity and awareness it is not by better adjusting to the old environment but by finding a new one.

Adjustment to environment may be so successful that there is no change to a "higher" species. Thus shellfish are so well protected by their shells that they have changed little in millions of years. The fins of a shark are so successful in moving the fish through the water that it has remained unchanged. The shark was too efficient in its own element

to evolve further. As Gerald Heard says, quoting Dean Inge, "Nothing fails like success."

On the other hand, the same author points out that there was at one time a fish whose fins were not good for swimming; they resembled hands or legs. By means of them the creature crawled on the bottom, and having a larger area of awareness, crawled up on land and began to breathe air. And so it became the ancestor of all reptiles and land animals. Its very lack of success in one environment enabled it to function in another. If this epoch-making event did not happen as described here, something like it certainly did happen. From this successful and revolutionary mutation human conservatives should learn that their satisfaction with the *status quo* may halt the process of further human evolution.

Into Higher Forms

If further human evolution does occur it will probably be social rather than physical.

Assuming that Gerald Heard is right in thinking that greater sensitivity and awareness are necessary, not only for survival but for evolution into higher forms, then we should consider how this sensitivity and awareness can be secured. By "higher" I mean a greater diversity and generalization of functions, accompanied by an increasing integration of these functions. For example, the human hand is not as good as a fin to swim with, it is not as good as a wing to fly with, it is not as good as a claw to climb with, it is indeed weaker than any of these three kinds of forelimbs. But it is much more sensitive and much more generalized in its functions; that is, it is capable of dealing with a greater variety of environments. It is therefore "higher" than the fin, claw, or wing. The brain is the least specialized part of

the body and is also the most sensitive and therefore the "highest."

Those forms of life which form a community either in one physical body or in many, in which the whole directs the parts and the parts the whole, have the greatest survival possibility. Such, for example, is a large flower made up of many smaller flowers. There is an optimum size for such a community depending upon the character of the species concerned. It might be as small as a family of two parents and children, or as large as a tribe or a city state, the *polis* of the latter stage of Hellenic culture in Greece and Asia Minor.

The *polis*, at its best, was an ideal human community. The Greeks had a word for the individualistic person who would not conform to the pattern. He was called "idiot" because he lived only in his own world. In these "city states" (not a good translation for *polis*) Greek art and literature reached a climax. They were destroyed by the greater might of the Macedonians and Romans, who had little to contribute to posterity except their destructive power. But the art, literature, and philosophy of the Greek city states survived to profoundly influence Western Europe. The modern nation state cannot be a community because it is too large to function successfully as such. It is more like a mob than a community, and currents of irrational emotion sweep through it to determine who shall attempt to govern it. Sometimes reconciliations do occur, but they are generally superficial and do not affect the deep and often unknown psychic currents in the unconscious. When these currents run wild and do not coalesce, the state must resort to stem authority to avoid anarchy.

Specialization is a great enemy of community living in our modern cities, making reconciliation more difficult. Another problem is their sheer size. Aristotle thought that a *polis* of ten thousand could act as a unit, but this is probably

too large. Real unity can exist only when all the individual parts are acquainted with one another. The Hutterites of north central United States and south central Canada are very successful community builders. When the population of one community exceeds 150 it divides. If our large cities could be broken up into small communities their problems could be solved. In their present form they are attacked at the core by the same fatal disease which has eliminated many forms of life. They are like the dinosaurs of antiquity, with a body too large and a brain too small. These dead forms either had insufficient awareness to adapt to a new environment, or their various parts were not so reconciled and integrated with each other as to form an organic whole.

Police action in a city is a mechanistic, not an organic, procedure; and the result is a mechanism too large and intricate to function as a whole. All mechanisms sooner or later wear out. Organic forms die, but unlike mechanisms, they reproduce their species. The evolutionary series, which begins with a single cell dividing so as to produce two similar cells, ends at present in man, who has an astonishing capacity for producing mechanistic tools to aid his survival. But, as has often been pointed out, these tools may destroy him if his brain is unable to carry forward the “ministry (Logos) of reconciliation” as described in the New Testament. Man is like a ship on a collision course with another ship, and is as yet unwilling to change his direction.

How can we secure the sensitivity and awareness to avoid catastrophe?

We find an answer to this question if we place together the ethical teachings of the first three gospels, and the Logos philosophy of John, and the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, which together compose what I think we can fairly call the philosophy and ethics of early Christianity and also of George Fox.

By using the words, “In the beginning,” to open his

prologue John is echoing Genesis. In Genesis the world began without form, and then gradually the forms emerged, culminating in man. John confines himself to the Logos in relation to man. But in Genesis "when God dawned on chaos," to use Shelley's words in "Adonais," and when "the anarchs fled," to quote another of his poems, there was still much to be done before man appeared. And that is our view of evolution today.

Evolution proceeds by increasing diversification, which survives only if accompanied by increasing reconciliation and adaptation, or, in other words, integration. Such diversification is due to mutations. The cells of some organisms act as if they were reaching out toward some new and unexplored region of life. In this effort they may fail, but not if the Logos, the Eternal Christ, acts upon them to make them part of a community which is better able to survive than a lone individual.

In the Gospel of Matthew we read: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you that ye resist not evil" (Mat. 5:38-39). It is not surprising that Nietzsche called this a "slave morality." Yet this "slave morality," even though it became much corrupted by its alliance with government, ruled Europe for a thousand years after Christianity became the religion of the Empire under Constantine.

Even though it was corrupted, there were within it closely integrated communities of monks and nuns who made some effort to live up to the commands of Christ as they understood them. They were in the world but not of it, a claim later made by the Quakers. Through these religious communities and not through the Roman armies the best part of the culture of the Graeco-Roman world passed into the culture of Western Europe. Unlike the Quakers, these groups were not held together by the Spirit alone but also by rigid rules and authority.

The Quaker Community

Having discussed matters on which I have little specialized knowledge, I now come to a subject about which I do have some first hand information: the characteristics of the Quaker community as it existed in its purest form in early Pennsylvania and in numerous parts of other colonies.

If we consider Catholicism, Protestantism and Quakerism as the three distinct forms of Christianity, then it could be said that Catholicism is based on the feudal form of society out of which it first grew, Protestantism is congenial to capitalism, and Quakerism to what I might call Communitarianism.

The Catholic form of priest, bishop, archbishop, cardinal, and pope, is obviously feudal in character; but the connection of Protestantism with capitalism will need further explanation. Max Weber in his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London, 1930) shows clearly a strong connection between these two. For the Protestant, one's vocation or calling was an important part of religion. This was especially characteristic of early Protestantism. "Vocation" is a religious word designating that to which God has called you. Thus devotion to a calling which could be any form of business, industrial or agricultural, is a religious obligation. But the early Protestants condemned spending resources on luxuries or undertakings resulting only in giving pleasure. This was a waste of time and money. Accordingly, since money was earned and not spent, capital accumulated and was invested in other businesses. Thus 17th century capitalism resulted in making a religion out of carefulness in business and prudence in spending.

If feudalism is the social order of Catholicism, and capitalism of Protestantism, then quite a different social order is congenial to Quakerism. This is Communitarianism. To discover what kind of social order is produced by a religion, it must be left to itself to develop spontaneously

according to its nature. This happened to Quakerism during the early days of William Penn's Holy Experiment in Pennsylvania, especially between 1682 and 1740, and to a lesser extent in parts of the other colonies. After 1740 the Quakers maintained their majority, though weakened, in Pennsylvania's representative Assembly until 1756, when they deliberately gave it up as pressure was increasingly brought upon them to appropriate money for the French and Indian war by the English government and by the proprietors who were the non-Quaker children and grandchildren of Penn.

When, contrary to former practice, an oath was required of all office holders in Pennsylvania, most, but not all, of the Quaker Assemblymen resigned, hoping by that means to save the very liberal frame of government given them by Penn, which allowed conscientious objection to war. It is not true to say that Penn's Holy Experiment failed, for it succeeded in so far as it was let alone by the English government. Friends did succeed in making peace with the Indians after the war had begun, a war unlawfully declared by the non-Quaker governor contrary to the judgment of the Assembly. A law abolishing slavery in Pennsylvania was canceled by the English government.

But we are concerned here with the social order of Pennsylvania Quakerism. This consisted of a large number of semi-independent contiguous communities, each called a monthly meeting, which met to conduct business once a month and also met for worship twice a week. This community was closely integrated on three levels: religious in the meeting for worship, intellectual in its school house and library, and financial in its care of all members, providing economic help for all who needed it. A participating person was not called a "member" but one who was "under the care of the meeting." This "care" meant not only economic aid but help in correcting delinquencies of all kinds and reconciling differences and disagreements. If an individual

continued to be obstinate and noncooperative he was “disowned,” which meant that he could no longer attend business meetings. But disownment occurred only after he was labored with for a long time. The records of these communities, consisting of the written minutes of their business meetings, are preserved and available to researchers. Most of these communities were agricultural, but many were urban. They still exist, though not so completely integrated, as their members today are much more scattered geographically, special committees taking over what was formerly the function of the whole meeting.

In their meetings for business the Quaker communities never reached a decision by taking a vote. There was no majority rule, nor was there rule by any human authority such as a priest or bishop. They were held together only by the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. 4:3) which each individual felt within himself and in others, joining them to God and one another. This unitive element was the Logos, the spirit of reconciliation through which God creates all life. When this Logos is not present, life comes to war with itself and dies.

I have spoken of the Quaker communities because I know more about them, but there are an endless number of other examples, including primitive tribal communities. All successful ones are held together by a religion. These include the *polis* of the later Greek culture. Even after the Greek intellectuals had lost faith in the Olympian deities they preserved a titular deity for each city state. About two hundred planned communities have existed in America. A study I made of these showed that those which had a religion as an integrating force had a life span about ten times longer than the secular communities.

It may be contended that the many religious wars show that religion is not an integrating power. But fighting any war is contrary to the teachings of Jesus, the personification of the Logos, and also it is contrary to the philosophy of

early Christianity, especially the philosophy of the Greek Church Fathers. The Latin Church Fathers departed somewhat from this early philosophy.³ The Greek mystical philosophy and the Latin pragmatic philosophy are still at odds with each other. This difference has some slight resemblance to the differences between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church today.

The Logos philosophy is mystical, because man's relation to the Logos, and through it to other men, is mystical and not rational. "The Light which lighteth every man" is known only by experience and not by any logical deductions, though these have their place. To know God's creative side, sensitivity and awareness must be cultivated. The Quakers have a definite method for this cultivation. The Quaker meeting, which sits in silence until someone in it has a message which he feels impelled by divine authority to give in order to help others along the way, is a deliberate attempt to cultivate sensitivity and awareness of the Light. The early Quakers did not use the word sensitivity, as at that time it referred only to the senses. They used the word "tendered." A person who joined the Quaker movement was described as becoming tender, not "converted." Total conversion might be a long process, with some backward steps as well as forward ones, but becoming "tender" meant acquiring the ability to grow spiritually and to increase one's "measure" of light.

Conclusion

The Logos philosophy presented here is the simplest and most profound of all philosophies, the newest as well as the oldest. There is only one other philosophy of the same importance and that is materialism — in its most extreme form, the attempt to explain man and all life, however complex, in mechanical terms. The latter was dominant up to a few years ago, due to the enormous success of physics

and chemistry. All other sciences such as psychology, sociology, economics, etc. attempt to imitate physics, but they fail because they are dealing with human beings who share in the life and power of the Logos which is “unscientific” in its aims and methods.

Those psychologists who reduce human behavior to a simple stimulus-response mechanism are called by Arthur Koestler in his *The Ghost in the Machine* “Flat earth psychologists” (New York, 1968). A surveyor in surveying a small piece of ground, perhaps five or ten acres, treats it as if it were flat, but if he is surveying a large area, determining, for example, the boundary of the state of Kansas, he must take into account the curvature of the earth. The psychologists or philosophers who base all reasoning on what can be observed or measured, in other words, those who wish to imitate physics, and so share its success, are like the flat earth surveyors who can ignore the curvature of the earth because they are surveying only a small part of it. Many of our activities can be defined in terms of stimulus and response, but it does not follow that our bodies are simply very complicated machines. Though a mechanistic explanation can be useful to a biologist for purposes of observation and measurement, the life process itself is entirely different.

The thinking part of the brain is concerned with means and not ends. The ends are known only by feeling, which may be feelings of love or hatred. Only the feeling of love would permit the species to survive through cooperation and mutual support. The feeling of hatred destroys the possibility of cooperation which is essential to survival. Hatred destroys the environment on which life depends. Love is not only the greatest virtue, but the most practicable. If those who profess the Christian religion would take seriously the commandments of Christ, our chances of survival would be enormously increased.

Life is holy not because it is the goal, but because it is the way toward the goal. It is true that sometimes some life must be sacrificed. We who think that we stand at the top of the pyramid of life are sometimes called upon to decide what life should live and what should not. This is a fearful responsibility. John writes in his Gospel (1:4) "In Him was Life; and the life was the light of men," but there is no good reason for confining the light to man. Though the Christian religion is man-centered, the religions of Asia include all life. Albert Schweitzer's "Reverence for life" is adequate both as a philosophy and as an ethic. It is also a religion, if we think of life as the Logos, the Son of God, whose plan for the universe is not yet fulfilled.

I will admit this Logos philosophy may be quite properly criticized as being too anthropomorphic, but we have nowhere else to go, other than to man, to understand acts of creation. Man has a Logos by which he creates. And he creates insofar as he cooperates with the creative Logos of the universe. If in this essay I have made God in the image of man, there is nothing else I can do, especially if we consider man to be the highest form produced by the long creative process on this planet.

Man has, as everyone knows, both an inner side known directly to himself, and perhaps indirectly to some extent by others, and an outer side, known to other persons and, to some extent, to himself. Likewise God, insofar as He is a person, is a duality rather than a trinity. I am known outwardly by what I do and say, much of which is subject to scientific analysis. However, I know myself inwardly by my hopes, despairs, my joys and pain, my love and anger, none of which can be measured. I am able to create through my participation in the Logos by which inward patterns are externalized.

In the same way, God creates through the Logos. Obviously His creation is not finished, and if man acts too

absurdly and destructively it may never be finished. Man has been at war with himself throughout his recorded history and this war has become more destructive as time goes on. Man, in his long struggle upwards, has clearly taken at some point a wrong turn in the road, and is now blindly wandering about not knowing where to go or why. He has now reached a stage in his development in which he can completely destroy himself together with all other life on this planet. Does this mean that the long process of evolution must make a new start and become civilized? It seems unlikely that life will make a new start, as hydrogen and atomic bombs may leave the earth unfit to support life at any time. If the ethics of the Christ, whether conceived as the Logos of God or the Galilean peasant, are not followed, the human race and perhaps all life will become extinct.

But I am writing as though Christianity were the only religion which has attempted to get man back on the right track. In 7th century China Lao-Tse, in the *Tao Teh Ching*, said many things that are said in almost the same words found in the New Testament. In translating John 1:1 into Chinese, the word *tao* is used for Logos. *Tao* is a better translation than the English "Word." *Tao* in Taoism means the Way of the Universe, that is, the path along which it evolves. There is much of primitive Christianity and primitive Quakerism in Hinduism and Buddhism. All the great religions were pacifist in their beginnings except Islam, which, like many Christian sects, is largely based on the Old Testament, though it accepts Jesus as a great prophet.

When at their best, the great religions of the world have taught not only that the results of war are always evil, but also that war itself is an evil regardless of its results. Religion at its highest teaches that there is another way than war, which will secure results of another and better kind. Religion does not appeal to physical forces working upon man from without, but to spiritual forces working within him. It teaches

that these spiritual forces are, in the long run, the only ones which can produce the right results. Man is a spiritual being. He can be changed only by spiritual forces. The Supreme Being does not work in the world as one physical force among other forces, but as an invisible spiritual power which produces understanding, cooperation, and love. Real religion therefore always makes for peace.

I am here not speaking of the primitive tribal religions, each of which is interested only in a small section of mankind. These tribal religions may produce peace within a small group, but they generally teach enmity to other groups. I am here speaking of the great universal religions which seek the salvation of all mankind. These religions all began in Asia. Sometimes they have degenerated into tribal religions, but when they remain faithful to the teachings of their founders they maintain that humanity is one, and that all life is based on and derived from a Supreme Life. This has been the message of Asia to the world.

We are all branches of the same vine, to use a figure from the Christian New Testament. We are all radii of the same circle and however far we may be apart at the circumference we are all one at the center. This teaching of the unity of all life is expressed in many ways, whether by saying that we are all expressions of one Universal Self, or of one Universal Buddha Nature or Children of one Universal Father. Friendship, good will, and love — these are not just ideas, but represent a real power which draws men together because it comes from the one Life which we all share. Because of this, the Incarnation of the Supreme Being whether in the Bhagavad Gita, or in the Lotus Scripture, or as the Logos of the New Testament — can say, “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me” (Mat. 25:40).

From HINDUISM:

“Always look upon all creatures as one’s self. Abstain totally from inflicting any kind of injury.”

From BUDDHISM:

“A truth finder laying aside cudgel and sword, lives a life of innocence and mercy, full of kindness and compassion for everything that lives.”

From CONFUCIANISM:

“There are men who say ‘I am skillful at marshaling troops, I am skillful at conducting battles.’ They are great criminals.”

From TAOISM:

“Arms however excellent are unblest instruments, detestable to all beings. Therefore he who possesses the Tao does not abide them.”

From JUDAISM:

“The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.”

From CHRISTIANITY:

“Blessed are the peace makers for they shall be called the children of God.”

From ISLAM:

“God will guide to paths of peace him who will follow after God’s own good pleasure. He will bring them out of darkness to the light, and to the straight path will he guide them.”

Notes

1. Published at Wallingford, Pa. in 1934, this pamphlet has long been out of print, but it is still available in certain libraries. See pp. 45-47.
2. In this essay I am dealing exclusively with the earth, the only body which, as far as we know, contains life. When I stopped teaching physics in 1928, a great many new important discoveries were being made by Planck, Einstein, Schrödinger, Bohr and others. The last time I attended a meeting of physicists one of them tried to show that an electron was a wave but he was not taken seriously. This fact is now well established. The huge cyclotron has produced a great number of new particles which do not obey the mechanics of Newton. The Quantum Theory and the Theory of Relativity have revealed to us an entirely new world. Large visible bodies obey Newtonian mechanics, but the small particles in the nucleus of the atom do not. The viewer has become as important as that which is viewed. This leads Schrödinger to say, "This is you. I am the whole world." Here he approximates a mysticism very much like that of the Hindu Vedanta philosophy. I do not have the space to show how Schrödinger goes from the principle of uncertainty to this Vedantic mystical conclusion. Eddington in his book *The Nature of the Physical World* arrives at a similar scientific type of mysticism, as I have shown in my *Ethical Mysticism* (Pendle Hill Pamphlet 156 [Wallingford, Pa., 1956], p. 36).
3. See Alexander V. G. Allen, *The Continuity of Christian Thought* (Boston, 1900).