

D0123

143, Feb. 11, intro

1. The main point of the last class  
was to establish a ~~connection with~~  
correlations between religions and  
culture.

The carrier of the new culture  
is the individual,  
and the place of its birth pangs  
is our own inner space.

But religion is what the individual does  
with his or her own inner space.

And so the form of the emergence of the new culture  
is religion.

Religion and the culture-bearing capacity  
of men and women  
are one and the same thing,  
bound together by a middle term,  
what the individual does with his or her own  
individuality.

2. Note again  
that this notion of religion  
does not make of it  
something other than the process  
of becoming oneself.

Relating to God  
is not something one does  
over & beyond this process,  
but something one does  
in this process.

If the divine is to be found in human life,  
it is to be found in the process of self-constitution  
as this particular man or woman.

143, Feb. 11, intro (2)

Inauthenticity in religion is inauthenticity in life,  
the failure to assume the burden of the charge  
of individuation.

Inauthenticity in life is, conversely, the failure to deal  
with this burden,  
and is inauthenticity in religion.

Authenticity in religion  
is assuming the charge to become oneself  
in free & responsible self-constitution.  
It is authenticity in life,  
and it is nothing beyond that.

3. There seem to be two difficulties  
with this position.

First, does it overly privilege religion  
and the task of creating a culture?

Second, modern culture  
is conspicuous for its denial  
of ultimacy in experience,  
for its refusal  
to admit that talk of God  
has any meaning  
or validity.

The first of these difficulties  
involves us in a study of the  
1<sup>st</sup> half of Whitehead, L.M.

The second is the burden of the  
next part of the course.

143, Feb. 11

①

1. Today we begin to investigate the question  
of whether our notion of religion,  
emphasizing as it does  
the individual as bearer of culture,  
is not a privatizing doctrine.

Does it not overly de-emphasize  
the communal nature of  
both religion  
and culture?

Does it perhaps remove both religion  
and our responsibility for culture  
from the sphere of the social and political,  
and render religion and culture merely private affairs?  
Affairs that have nothing to do with  
the task of establishing a just political order  
and a community of conviviality among men?

The question, then, is:

what is the relation of the individual  
and the community?

Is the individual, the subject, as we have portrayed him,  
merely private?

Or is the discovery of one's individuality ipso facto  
the most radical discovery of community possible?

We will look in some detail now at Hitchcock's treatment of  
this question in the first half of Religion in the Making.

1st, ~~then~~ I will briefly indicate

the contributions of Jung & Lowmyer  
to an answer to this same question,

saving a more detailed investigation of Jung  
for later in the course.

But, re: Jung, remember Marc Zeller's dream: the reversal of the  
Tower of Babel. ↑

Re: L. the grid

2. Today we will study Chapter I of Whitehead to see what light he brings to this question in this chapter.

The chapter begins by telling us something we might already suspect, as a result of what we have seen already in this course with regard to various stages of meaning or epochs of culture:

namely,

that our understanding of religion today will probably be very different from what it has been in past generations or ages.

The meaning of religion in general, of religious truths, the discrimination of true & false religion, and the meaning of particular religious doctrines or positions

seems to change with the development of history.

And yet religion in some forms has been manifest in every age of human history. (pp. 13 f.)

Euclid vs. John's Gospel or poems  
- symbolic  
mg = nonunivocal

3. We will see in the second part of our course, "Theology and Modernity,"

that in modern Western culture, for the first time in human history, or at least in our cultural heritage,

we seem to find a pervasive challenge to the meaning and truth of all God-talk,

and that this challenge has, oddly enough, been developed even within the churches in the form of "radical theology."

In part, due to a loss of the symbolic attitude.

143, Feb. 11

I will argue that this challenge  
forces us to rebuild the very foundations of theology,  
is a sign, if you want,  
of the death of the second stage of meaning,  
and of the imperative to shift  
religious understanding into an entirely new context  
than what was operative in the second stage,  
the context of what Jung called the "new religion," based

4. W. emphasizes  
that the presence of religion  
as, till recently,  
a universal phenomenon in human history,  
questioned only as to its meaning  
but not as to its undeniable role  
within the fabric of human living,  
has involved a ~~so~~ particular commitment as to man's nature.  
Religion, he says, in its foundation,  
is not something men use.  
Rather, we are religious (p. 14).  
The presence or absence of religion  
has been a factor determining what men & women are,  
not simply what they do.  
Religion has been a transforming agent  
in human life,  
not something people have used to get things done,  
like arithmetic,  
but something that affects them in their being,  
that justifies them, i.e. puts them right as human beings,  
in their totality,  
cleanses them.  
W's first definition of religion is, thus, "force of belief  
cleansing the inward parts" and demanding

on a retrieval of  
the symbolic  
attitude in  
its roots.

193, Feb. 11

④

a "penetrating sincerity."

In terms of religious positions or doctrines,  
a religion is "a system of general truths  
which have the effect of transforming character  
when they are sincerely held  
and vividly apprehended." (15)

Religion, in this sense,

has always been something  
human beings have felt they have needed  
for character,  
moral living,

the conduct of their life.

These things have depended on a set of deeply cherished  
convictions,

and these convictions have been provided by religion,  
which has affected primarily the internal life of men and women  
before bestowing some quality on their external relations  
with persons & things,  
on their role in the drama of living.

This internal agency of religion has always been important,  
even if interpreted in different ways at different periods of time.

Thus Whitehead proceeds to two more definitions of religion:

"The art and the theory of the internal life of man,  
so far as it depends on the man himself  
and on what is permanent in the nature of things."

and "what the individual does with his own solitariness."

(p. 16)

From the beginning, then, it is denying directly  
that religion, <sup>today</sup> is primarily a social fact,  
a matter of collective emotions.

Religion is always a matter of the way one deals with  
"the awful ultimate fact,"

more  
contemporary  
definitions,  
as we shall see.

143, Feb. 11

(5)

which is the human being,  
consciously alone with itself,  
for its own sake." (p. 16)

Religion, then,

is always a matter of existential subjectivity,  
of subjectivity as concerned with its own self-constitution,  
with the question of what kind of person I am going to be.

To this extent,

religion in its primordial experience

is solitariness,

and collective phenomena result from it  
as changeable and changing trappings.

Changes in community

are rooted in changes in individuals,

and it is these latter changes that constitute the end of  
religion, its finality.

In this first section,

Dr. also tells us essentially  
what these radical changes consist in.

He uses the word "cleansing,"  
in fact "cleansing the inward parts."

Precisely what needs to be cleansed

may have changed from one age to another

(e.g., prophets effected a change,

Jesus attempted a change)

but the avowal of fault, the confession of guilt,

the sense of sin,

is a permanent feature in religion,

the sense that we need to be put right,

justified,

redeemed,

saved,

is always present in religion.

\* While soli-  
tari-ness becomes  
discernible as the  
heart of religious  
importance only late  
in the history of religions, Dr.  
needs to say it is the  
"central fact" that is the  
root of all religions.  
Does he? Later,  
which is right.