Science as a Source for Unitarian Universalism

by Kit Ketcham, with David Cauffman and Malcom Ferrier

Ed. Note: In 2008, Rev. Kit Ketchum delivered a pair of sermons in a series on the Sources of Unitarian Universalism, at Whidbey Island UU Congregation, the first on "Humanisn" with Malcom Ferrier, the second on "Science" with David Cauffman. This article is a combined and edited transcript of the two.

I. The Road to Humanism, personal revelations

Kit Ketchum: One of the most vivid memories of my youth is the day President Kennedy was assassinated. I was 21, still unemployed after college graduation, sitting in front of the TV watching the popular soap opera of that day, General Hospital, with my dad, who was home from the church for lunch. We were in the midst of some medical emergency onscreen when the news that our President had been shot pre-empted everything. We sat in shock as the dreadful news unfolded, awaiting the latest developments in fear and trembling.

Most of us have our own tales to tell about some historic moment in our experience, and how our life was different from that moment on. We tend to remember the events that shape our lives; often the more radical the change, the more vivid the memory. In the same manner I remember the moment when I acknowledged the shift in my religious outlook and said to myself, like Dorothy in the Wizard of Oz, "Wow, I don't think I'm in Kansas anymore."

It was because of a song I heard one day on the radio: "It ain't necessarily so, it ain't necessarily so, the things that you're liable to read in the Bible, it ain't necessarily so." [i] I thought: someone *dares* to say this in a Broadway song? What would my conservative family think if they heard it? What would they say if they knew I agreed?

This was a huge moment of truth for me. I knew I didn't believe all the stuff I'd learned in Sunday School; I didn't approve of God's handling of the Promised Land crisis, when he told the Hebrew children just to go and take it from the Canaanites; I had a lot of questions about water and wine and people being raised from the dead.

I hadn't challenged my parents or my teachers on any of this. I was pretty sure I wouldn't like the answers I got. But here was a popular song which crooned my own heresies in an authoritative and melodious way, resonating in my young heart.

My opinion-forming style is to listen, rather than argue, to use my internal morality gauge and reason to determine right from wrong, to think about consequences, and to allow others to form their own opinions in their own ways. I tend to look for ways we agree, rather than ways I disagree with someone.

So I quietly acknowledged to myself, in my twenties, that I was more of a humanist, in my heart, than I was a traditional believer. At that point in history, humanism didn't have such a red-hot reputation. It was getting a lot of criticism from the orthodox religious world as a philosophy that contended that humans were the be-all and end-all of the universe, the most powerful and highest of creation's huge output.

Malcom Ferrier: When I was a teenager, I lived with a stern Baptist family in Toronto. Their son Murray became my mentor, hero and friend. He flew and lived

through forty missions over Europe in an RCAF mosquito fighter. A marvelous flier, he became a test pilot for DeHavilland, flying some of the first jet planes. He crashed into a mountain in bad weather while testing navigation equipment.

I wrote his folks a note, filling it with conventional condolences and how wonderful Christianity was with its assurances we'd all meet again in heaven some day. But I knew even then that I didn't believe it, and sought more rational ground. I was becoming a closet Humanist, which I define as having a commitment to the search for truth and morality through human means in support of human interests. This commitment rejects the validity of transcendental or supernatural justification or rationale.

One often hears the term "secular Humanism," with the strong implication that Humanism has no component of sacredness. But my Humanism glories in the wondrous joy of human feeling and expression; in that way it is intensely sacred and religious. I think many people would say humanism is a religion in that it is a set of guiding principles to direct life choices.

David Cauffield: In the New York Times I found an excellent editorial by Brian Greene, author and professor of physics at Columbia, entitled "Put a Little Science in Your Life." I'd like to share a bit of it with you: "Science is a way of life. Science is a perspective. Science is the process that takes us from confusion to understanding in a manner that's precise, predictive and reliable—a transformation, for those lucky enough to experience it, that is empowering and emotional. To be able to think through and grasp explanations—for everything from why the sky is blue to how life formed on earth —not because they are declared dogma but rather because they reveal patterns confirmed by experiment and observation, is one of the most precious of human experiences." [ii]

We are all born explorers. Even now, I revel in the "play" aspects of science and analysis. Just as an infant inspects an object and turns it over and tastes it and hits the floor with it, I like to look at questions or ideas from a variety of angles and knock them about a bit to see if I can learn something when I put try to put together everything I have observed.

II. Humanism and My Unitarian Universalism

KK: In the front of our hymnal, along with *our UU principles* is the following: "The Living Tradition we share draws from many sources: (One of those sources is described this way): "Humanist teachings which counsel us to heed the guidance of reason and the results of science, and warn us against idolatries of the mind and spirit." [iii]

How do these values compare to the affirmations of humanism as a philosophy, found in the 1931 Humanist Manifesto, signed by renowned scientists, philosophers, and thinkers, including several Unitarian ministers? That document states, in essence, that traditional religion had outlived its usefulness and that a new religious approach *centered* on scientific reasoning and devoted to meeting human needs, was necessary.[iv] Many of its signers envisioned Unitarianism becoming such an approach.

Over the years since, the Manifesto has undergone some changes and re-statements, (1971, 1998)[v] but retains the underlying faith that human needs and abilities and the natural world are a sufficient and necessary foundation for a religious path that does not need supernatural events to bolster its claims. Has Unitarianism and later Unitarian Universalism, become the humanistic religion that the manifesto writers envisioned?

When the document listing the Sources of "the living tradition" that is Unitarian Universalism was adopted in 1960,[vi] the "Humanist source" statement was somewhat different in style from the others: it contains that warning against idolatries of the mind and spirit. What I get out of that language is that humanism is our anchor in the shifting winds of popular religion. Humanism reminds us that we humans are capable of excessive devotion (idolatry) to causes or ideas that do not lead to human growth and human progress as a species.

Humanism as a philosophy, *and* as a source for UUism counsels us to consider our behavior and our attitudes through the lens of reason, to examine the claims of culture and tradition by holding them up to the light of critical thinking, to rely on **our** minds and hearts to know right from wrong, rather than accepting dogmatic or inflexible rules. Humanism reassures us that we humans have an innate moral compass, even though many humans may decline to use it. We do not **need** a supernatural power to tell us what to do; we **can** rely on natural law to inform us of what is best for human survival and human flourishing. The universe around us is our best teacher and we can trust it.

MF: My favorite Manifesto affirmation is the very first one. "We are committed to the application of reason and science to the understanding of the universe and to the solving of human problems." [vii] This is a good alternative my earlier definition of humanism and resonates with me, because my inclinations, training and professional work were all in science. I will not claim that science can explain behavior, and will simply note that the humanist commitment to applying science as much as possible, leads to clarification of behavior. That said, I remain uncomfortable with the "soft" sciences such as psychology, because in my view you can never prove anything, and there is immense uncertainty and variability in the subject matter, plus endless inconclusive arguments on virtually every topic.

Manifesto Humanism also implies free will, and that we have control over virtually everything we do. There is no fatalism about it, as we have the power, individually and collectively to push for changes in humanity and social structure in ways we deem desirable. Humanism is also the source of one of my favorite religious words: creativity. The human mind and will have boundless possibilities for enhancing the individual and the community.

III. Humanism and Traditional Religion:

KK: To see how our take on the affirmations of the Manifesto play out in the religious humanism that is a large part of UUism today, Malcolm and I compared our own views on two traditional religious topics that strict UU humanists, with their scientific inclinations, are often thought not to consider, prayer and immortality.

MF: Prayer is something that many humanists struggle with. Kit, do you talk to your cat? I certainly do, and it is a very fine conversationalist, in that it seldom replies. What has this to do with prayer? When you think or say something in every day life you are using your conscious mind. In the nighttime, your subconscious mind takes over, works on your daytime thoughts and rearranges them and often solves problems. That to my mind is prayer: considering something in your conscious mind, and having your subconscious mind act upon it and often present a solution. When a person "prays" she is simply summoning her subconscious mind.

KK: I'm one humanist who doesn't struggle against prayer, probably as a result of my Baptist DNA! But I don't ask for anything but strength and the knowledge to do the right thing, when I pray, whether I am concerned for myself or for another person.

It doesn't make sense to me that a supernatural being would shift the order of the universe just to make me happy. It does make sense to me that I would have an innate ability to do the right thing, to find the strength I need, by looking for it internally, and I do this through prayer. I pray aloud nightly and as I hear my words and struggle to make them accurate and honest, I am changed, I see my mistakes and my blessings more clearly, and I forgive myself as I acknowledge those mistakes and begin to decide how to make amends. And I do often find the answer waiting for me in the morning, usually in the form of a shift in my attitude and a readiness to change my actions.

MF: My views on immortality likewise reflect a standard humanistic perspective: immortality simply means memories of you live on in the minds of others, particularly those in your family. Better yet, if you can write almost anything really, your words have a certain measure of immortality. It is to me a sobering thought that whatever you do has some prospect of lasting for some considerable time, so you better give your best thought to what you're doing.

My other favorite affirmation (comes from Manifesto III—it speaks of "a planetary duty to protect nature's integrity, diversity, and beauty in a secure, sustainable manner.") [viii] I'm so glad to see more and more people appreciating and trying to do something about protecting and enhancing the earth and preserving it for our children and grandchildren. I'm obsessive about doing as much as I can to save energy—altering my lifestyle to appreciably cut down on travel, waste and pollution. The thought of our generation leaving any other legacy to our grandchildren is an abhorrent concept.

The subject of immortality leads me to this thought about dealing with dying—an immensely difficult subject for everyone, humanist or not. You might think that dying would be harder for the non-religious—for us, dying is final. However falsely, believers *can* look forward to eternal bliss, or if not this, at least Justice, or resolution of some kind. Picturing a deity's hand upon the cosmic helm, believers can hope for all accounts to be settled. How strange then, that despite the comfort and support their beliefs are said to bring, most religious people appear to fear dying. My perception of the humanistic view of living fully is totally satisfying. I seek no more, and if I feel I have tried my best to live well, and to contribute socially, I am in need of no more.

KK: Immortality as a religious concept is reliant on supernatural forces, but I see it in a somewhat different, though related, way. Certainly human memory is a form of life after death, as is our art: writing, music, all our creative products, as well as the human beings we have nurtured in the many ways we can nurture.

But I think we experience extended life in a very biological way as well, and that is as our human bodies return to the earth to become part of the earth, whether buried and disintegrating naturally or by cremation and scattering of remains. However our families choose to dispose of our bodies, we live on in the ecosystem of the earth.

DC: This general topic relates to the question of how Science influences Unitarian Universalism. I'll be comparing and contrast three different cultural traditions, or "ways of knowing" that have matured since the Enlightenment. These three are: (1) science; (2) Unitarian Universalism; and (3) traditional religion—that eclectic mix of Western

Christian denominations that have moved with glacial speed to reconcile their beliefs with science, although even those glaciers are moving faster these days.

And while I don't know enough to talk about Eastern and nontraditional religion, (also favorites of UUs) I will share with you an enlightened quote from the Dalai Lama: "My confidence in venturing into science lies in my basic belief that as in science so in Buddhism, understanding the nature of reality is pursued by means of critical investigation: if scientific analysis were conclusively to demonstrate certain claims in Buddhism to be false, then we must accept the findings of science and abandon those claims." [ix]

A parable: Three friends liked to fish together: one a physicist, one a Unitarian minister, and the third a minister in a traditional religious denomination—we'll make him a Lutheran. Luther, you recall, advocated that salvation was to be achieved by faith alone, and at the time that was a great improvement over salvation by buying indulgences.

The three went out fishing in a small boat on a shallow lake, where they could see the fish were biting. They weren't too far from shore when they realized why the fish were biting, as the three were surrounded by swarms of insects. The physicist said "wait a minute—I'll get the insect repellent!" He leaped out of the boat and raced to shore on the surface of the water and back with the repellent. The Lutheran minister was quite impressed, and glanced at the Unitarian, who didn't seem at all surprised.

After an hour of fishing they began to get hungry. The Unitarian minister bumped himself on the side of the head, saying "I forgot to put the lunch knapsack in the boat—but don't worry—I'll get it now!" and he too stepped out of the boat, ran across the surface of the water, and returned with the food.

Thirst soon followed. The Lutheran was supposed to bring the beer but he had forgotten to put the cooler in the boat! [You may not want to go fishing with these three.] Not to be outdone by his water-walking friends he announced, "I'll go get the drinks!" and silently uttered a prayer: "Lord, I put my faith in You; teach me what I need to learn." Then he, too, leaped out of the boat. With a splash he immediately sank up to his waist. The Unitarian turned to the physicist and said, "You didn't tell him where the rocks were, did you?"

We are on the lookout for the rocks of scientific truth underlying Unitarian Universalism. Scientific knowledge is dependable because it can be used to make accurate predictions. Science has a limited goal: to understand (to know) how the world works. Traditional religion's way of knowing is through divine revelation. Its goal is the salvation of souls and it values faith higher than any other virtue, including good works.

How do UUs know what they know? Of the various ways, I think the most powerful are our trust both in conscience and in rational thinking. Our goal is a just community of fully actualized human beings. We value results: good works matter more than faith in anything.

IV. Science As A UU Source

KK: Expressing our humanist values through the filter of non-humanist religious concepts, we ask that our central UU Source be regarded with honor and respect, and

express a willingness to regard our other UU Sources with honor and respect, in the face of the paradox that humanism, with its reliance on reason and science, is often at odds with other UU (and wider-world) religious expressions, while forming together with some of these strands, the core of Unitarian Universalism. We need them all, as we create a religion in these days that is capable of rising to the many challenges that our evolving world faces. It is important work.

Recognizing that importance, the UU congregation on Whidbey Island have asked whether other Sources make a foundational contribution beyond the stated six. We have decided that the Creative Arts are certainly foundational for our religious life. In addition, we have come to the conclusion that science's influence on UUism represents a Source, apart from it's mention of the value of it's results under "Humanist teachings."

Science offers more than results: it is basic to our thinking patterns, the very patterns that have led us to question supernaturalism and all human legends that are perhaps true, in a sense, but not factual, not reproducible.

Michael Heller, winner of the Templeton Prize and a Roman Catholic priest, said:

> I always wanted to do the most important things, and what can be more important than science and religion? Science gives us knowledge, and religion gives us meaning. Both are prerequisites of the decent existence. [x]

DC: Going back to those three cultural traditions, let's look at the reality with which each concerns itself, and how it evaluates that reality. Science is interested in knowledge about a physical reality that is discoverable through objective experience by test and observation. At the other end of the spectrum, traditional religion sees the world in dualistic terms, part spiritual and part material. Spiritual reality, the realm of the soul, is investigated through subjective experience.

UUs, by contrast, allow for a range of beliefs and so a range of realities, but the humanists among us see a unity of the material and spiritual: the body houses the mind which contains our sense of self. We don't all believe the soul to be separate from the body, although many of us do. Science has little to say about the soul because it can't be detected or measured. However, if science were able to explain all observable phenomena without invoking the hypothetical existence of a soul, then the concept of a soul would be superfluous. Superfluous isn't the same thing as false, but Ockham's razor advises that the simplest theories are the most likely to be correct.

A similar triage exists for views of the supernatural, such as the omniscient, omnipotent God and life after death. Science can't study what there isn't evidence for, but it has been explaining a lot that used to be considered miraculous; it has forced our concepts of God to grow up. Traditional religion, however, still embraces and defends the supernatural as an essential part of its worldview. UUs are in the middle; we honor our doubts but allow for a variety of mystical beliefs. We credit objective experience, but we want emotionally satisfying philosophies so we look for meaning in subjective experience as well.

Many of us are on a spiritual path that at one time included beliefs from the traditional denominations we were brought up in—Lutheran, in my case. We have noted that the lack of definitive evidence against there being a God is pretty well balanced by the lack of any evidence for. Over time, many of us have reached the point on our paths where we conceive of the supernatural elements of religion as metaphors; useful, perhaps, but not objective reality.

Many of us, like Professor Greene, respond to the awe and wonder of the universe revealed through science: for example, the beauty, order, scale, and intricacy revealed by Hubble Space Telescope photos. We have an emotional response to these, and humility in the face of the revealed certainty that the world is far more complex and interesting than anything we have imagined. Some have cited this complexity as possible evidence for a Creator; the master watchmaker, if you will, or other metaphysical suppositions.

But science, and physics in particular, is famous for its high standards for rules of evidence and for truth. Its ideal is repeatability. A consequence is that science "knows what it doesn't know," at least to a specific probability. Science welcomes challenge as necessary to develop confidence in its theories. It is inherently and unapologetically skeptical. That is its salvation, because there are many ways that science can go wrong, most of them clustered around human error. Like democracy, constant vigilance is required, and doesn't always happen. Nevertheless, if you take the time to listen to the caveats and label the extrapolations as such, you'll find generally accepted scientific knowledge to be true.

Traditional religion, by comparison, appears credulous and uncritical; in place of rules of evidence it tests for conformance with orthodoxy. Traditional religion suppresses alternatives as heretical. It has no systematic way of eliminating untruth. UUs again take a position in the middle, informed by the strengths and weaknesses of both of the other traditions. We look to science for knowledge but look to the subjective experience of the spiritual for meaning. We tend to trust doubt as an indicator that there's more truth to be sought.

None of the three cultural traditions is static. What are the current trends? Science is increasing its penetration of biological, social, and psychological realms. Traditional religion is retreating to realms un-addressed by science, such as the will of a supernatural God that we live moral lives, his concern for the salvation of our souls, and the promise of a rewarding afterlife. The need for authoritative moral voices, the conservative need for anchor points in a rapidly changing world, and the ancient but still- strong fear of death provide continued longevity for a variety of traditional religious viewpoints.

Unitarian Universalism has been evolving from its traditional Christian roots by building on its strengths: a strong foundation of scientific truth, a trust in the power of human conscience, a group commitment to social justice and a caring society, and a realistic recognition that we must each make our own journey of discovery. The free and responsible search for truth and meaning, a key UU principle, has been an effective antidote for atrophy and irrelevance.

Science provides us with a rigorous standard of truth. It would be foolish to ignore it. Among all possible UU sources of knowing truth, you should give science priority, if science has something to say. But science by itself is not a religion and it is does not provide us the moral compass needed to be fully human, for example, to be compassionate. You can pick and choose from the other sources of wisdom what your conscience finds right, or your culture has conditioned you to believe, or you find useful in coping with the world. But know where the rocks are.

KK: My experience has been more with the soft sciences of psychology and sociology. The physical sciences didn't appeal to me as a high school student in such a way as to turn me into a scientist, but it did teach me the value and the thrill of curiosity, as well as a logical method for exploring what I saw around me. It gave me an

appreciation for the natural world and I extrapolated from my learnings far beyond earthworm dissection and chemistry. I began to examine what I heard against the standard of "is it natural?"

This helped me sort out some of what society was telling me I needed—cute clothes, perfumes, fancy food. It didn't necessarily mean that I lived so simply—I was a teenage girl, after all, and I still am not quite so simple in my living. But if an early human being didn't naturally need something, probably I didn't either. That was my version of scientific reasoning, at the time. Though now I am somewhat more sophisticated in the ways I view the world, I still make many value judgments based on my "is it natural" standard.

Of course, some of my thinking had to be tempered by my inner moral plumbline, that core value system by which I measured good and bad. Though my moral plumbline had been largely shaped by Christianity, there were ways that Christian ethics didn't quite compute. How, for example, could a supernatural event be a reliable indicator for a reasonable human response?

I liked Jesus' approach to ethics—love your God, your neighbor, and yourself.

In other words, love the created world, be kind to others, and remember that you are part of the creation and therefore a good being, not a mistake. Measuring myself by these two standards—the logic of Science and the moral code I found within myself—I came to understand that as a human being, I was innately worthy and able to sort out for myself the conflicting values of human culture.

If it was natural, surely it was part of creation and good. For example, homosexuality, I reasoned, because it is natural and is increasingly demonstrated to be natural by Science, is part of creation and therefore good. There must be something useful to the universe about a different sexual orientation if it naturally occurred on the earth.

For much of my life, particularly after I had gained some education and some wider horizons than my home life as a young Christian offered, I have been wary of others telling me what to think and what to believe. The automatic questions that would come to mind were "who told you that was true? And how do they know that it's true?" I wanted authoritative, credible sources for what I believed. And the most credible, most reliable sources I found were those of my teachers who did research, who did experiments, who were curious enough to pursue understanding through reading about the discoveries of science.

In seminary, I learned scholarly criticism and interpretation of scripture. Exegesis of a scripture includes the analysis of significant words in the text, translating them accurately, examining the historical and cultural context of the passage, if possible knowing something about the writer of the text and his or her place in history as well as any hidden agenda in writing the passage.

Studying the Bible in this scholarly and scientific way, attempting to gain understanding based on what had been discovered by archaeologists, linguists, and carbon dating specialists was deeply satisfying and led me to understand the Bible in entirely different ways than I had been taught.

Scholarly interpretation of problematic texts, such as those dealing with homosexuality, for example, reveals that these ancient writings had nothing to do with gay relationships as we know them today. Examination of the creation and miracle stories

in the Bible through a scholarly and scientific lens reveals that these stories, accepted as fact by many traditional faiths, are adaptations of far more ancient stories describing the emergence of humans on the earth, the great floods of ancient times, and even the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

As you might expect, my more traditional classmates were very uncomfortable with this new knowledge. Some of them questioned whether or not they could ever share this information with their future congregations. Some were distressed enough that they left seminary and chose other careers. Some argued with professors and fellow students, accusing them of heresy.

In Unitarian Universalism there has been little if any distress about the contributions of science and the scientific method to religious faith, except the recognition that Science has also made possible such dubious inventions as weapons of mass destruction and environmentally damaging pesticides. At the same time, we recognize that it is not the fault of Science that damage has been done; it is the responsibility of humans to use Science to further life and not destroy it.

My present day Unitarian Universalism has been shaped by my understandings of and my respect for Science, not only for what it has discovered about the natural universe but for its honesty and its resistance to the unverifiable, for its need to know, not just believe, for its reliance on proofs, and also for its admitted inability to explain everything—at least yet.

So what is the mission of a religious faith for which Science is a foundational Source? What does it mean that we want our beliefs and understandings backed up, as much as possible, by empirical evidence? What does it mean to us as individuals? How can we use the importance of Science to reach out in a meaningful way to the larger community? What has our reverence for Science done to prepare us to meet modern day challenges to morality and to culture?

A few years ago, my congregation developed a mission statement: "The Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Whidbey Island: "Sharing a spiritual journey of service toward a loving and interconnected world."

How might Science figure into such a mission? Using our science-based knowledge of the earth and its systems, how can we share our understanding that Science and Spirituality are not mutually exclusive? Can we serve the larger community in ways that are based on logic and scholarship? Can we bring about a more loving and interconnected world through our use of technology and new discoveries in the fields of health, environment, and human relationships?

I can think of a few obvious ways: if there were a move in our local school district to begin teaching creationism, I hope we would be there at the school board meeting to support science.

If there were an effort to start a Gay-friendly club at the local High School, I hope we would be there to help. And I hope we would be there always for equal civil rights for all and as supporters of our BGLT neighbors and friends, based not only on our interest in justice but also on the science that reveals sexual orientation to be innate.

When there are challenges to our water supply or the waters of Puget Sound, I hope we would be there, sharing what we know about the scientific research that reveals the dangers of damaging our Watershed, and expressing this in a religious context.

When the critics pooh pooh the idea of climate change and global warming, I hope we are there to support the science behind that idea.

When others say that Science and Religion are incompatible, I hope we would challenge that assertion and speak of our own experience as UUs who respect and use the revelations of Science in our spiritual quest.

Each of our Sources gives us a springboard from which we can offer Spirituality and Service to our larger community. Each of us probably has our own preferred Source, the one most important in our own religious life. For some it is Science; for others, it's the Creative Arts or Christianity or Buddhism or Humanism.

My favorite Humanist Affirmation isn't in the Manifesto, it's this one from a far more secular and contemporary humanist source: "we believe in optimism rather than pessimism, hope rather than despair, learning in the place of dogma, truth instead of ignorance, joy rather than guilt or sin, tolerance in the place of fear, love instead of hatred, compassion over selfishness, beauty instead of ugliness, and reason rather than blind faith or irrationality." [xi]

This, for me, is the human heart of religion, expressing human aspirations, acknowledgement of reality, hope for a brighter future for self and others, and the value of learning as a tool for overcoming fear, hate, and selfishness.

May we respect and revere the wisdom of each Source, together a bright rainbow whose colors represent multiple angles and beams of light. And may we always remember that our deepest roots lie in the warm soil of human love and compassion.

Notes

---

[i] Ira Gershwin and DuBose Heyward, lyrics to "It Ain't Necessarily So" from Porgy and Bess, 1935.

[ii] New York Times, Opinion Section, June 1, 2008.

[iii] Unitarian Universalsit Association, *Singing The Living Tradition,* Beacon Press, Boston, 1993, frontispiece.

[iv] Roy Wood Sellars et al., *Humanis tManifesto,* The New Humanist (May-June, 1933) The text is maintained online by the American Humanist Association, at www.Americanhumanist.org.

[v] American Humanist Association, *Humanist Manifesto II & Humanism and its Aspirations.*

[vi] Unitarian Universalist Association, *Singing*

[vii] Sellars, *Manifesto.*

[viii] American Humanist Association, *Humanism And ItsAspirations.*

[ix] Dalai Lama, *The Universe in a Single Atom: The Convergence of Science and Spirituality,* Morgan Road Books, NY, 2005 pp. 2,3.

[x] Michael Heller, *Statement at the Templeton Prize News Conference, March 12, 2008,* www.templetonprize.org/heller_statement.pdf.

[xi] Council for Secular Humanism, *The Affirmations of Humanism,* www.secularhumanism.org