

A Theological Basis for UU Religious Education: Wieman's Creative Interchange and the Principle of Free Inquiry

Jennifer J.S. Brooks

Introduction: Unitarian Universalist "Theology" and Religious Education

If there is a bedrock principle of Unitarian Universalism, it is the principle of free inquiry. To call this a "theological" principle seems a bit odd; after all, the denomination that embraces it welcomes within its membership agnostics and atheists as well as theists (along with pagans, and humanists of any ilk). As a technical matter, it probably is wrong to say that the religious principles of Unitarian Universalism are derived from "theology"--literally words about God. The term "philosophy" might be more apt; less pointedly theo-centric, it admits the possibility of principles that do not originate from God or from thoughts about God. Yet "theology" has its uses. In a less literal sense, it denotes religious belief; views about the origin and meaning of life; speculations about the relationship of humanity with the cosmos. And, yes, opinions about the nature and existence of God. If there is a single overarching "theology" that encompasses the range of beliefs and religious practices of Unitarian Universalists, it begins with the principle of free inquiry into theological topics.

It might be said that the principle of free inquiry is the single point from which all other Unitarian Universalist values radiate. To acknowledge another's freedom to inquire into life's meaning (with the risk that the other may form opinions different from one's own), while affirming the other's right to remain in fellowship, is to acknowledge the inherent worth and dignity of the other. Accepted as the single unifying belief of a denomination that comprises a diverse array of believers, the principle of free inquiry compels as well a keen attention to justice in human relations. If the other's right to free inquiry is to be respected, it must also be protected--and the conditions that foster free inquiry must be established for all. Thus from a commitment to free inquiry there must evolve the concepts of toleration, equality, freedom, economic justice, and human rights.

Theology and religious education frequently are connected by the assumption that transmission of religious dogma is not only good for the institution but also necessary for the learner's salvation. In the Unitarian Universalist community, the principle of free inquiry would appear to bar the use of religious education to promote doctrine. Instead, UU religious education usually is conceived of as a program that develops the learner's capacity to learn--thus enabling the learner to exercise freedom of inquiry in his or her unique way. Beginning with the work of creative pioneers like Sophia Fahs, UU religious education has come to rely on processes that encourage self-actualization and independent thought: exploration of the natural world, practice in critical thinking, and training in scientific method. Program content often involves the study of values, with non-exclusive emphasis on UU principles. There is a high level of agreement on these pedagogical precepts, and justifiable discomfort with the linking of UU

religious education and "theology" of any kind. Yet UU religious education cannot effectively serve its pragmatic goals without acknowledging the "theological" imperative of the principle of free inquiry.

Western religion's history of intolerance, and many UU members' personal experience with the inflexibility of illiberal religious institutions, may cause us to associate theology with dogmatism. But the heart of anti-creedal UU theology is the principle of free inquiry. This is a theology of diversity. The principle is not one of mere toleration but of difference-joined-in-fellowship. This community of faith centers itself on the invited question, the infinite range of possible answers. A single congregation that claims as members the Christian, the Jew, the pagan, the Buddhist, the Muslim, the humanist, the Hindu, the agnostic, the atheist--this congregation has embraced as a theological principle the ideal of free inquiry. Perhaps it is inevitable that a religious education program will reflect the congregation's theological orientation. But acknowledging a theological basis for UU religious education is not an automatic step. Nor should it be. Nonetheless, explicit recognition of the theological premise for UU difference-in-fellowship can strengthen not only the UU religious education program, but also the ability of individual UUs to engage in what Henry Nelson Wieman called "creative interchange" with the cosmos. Creative interchange, if construed as the desired outcome of UU religious education, allows for the widest and most diverse exercise of the principle of free inquiry by individuals, and fosters the most favorable climate for the generation of new ideas.

Henry Nelson Wieman's Notion of "Creative Interchange"

Wieman and Process Theology

"Process theology" emerged from reflections on the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, whose 1926 book *Religion in the Making* asserted the importance of human experience in understanding the nature of God. Henry Nelson Wieman (1884-1975) was invited to explain Whitehead's views in a lecture at the University of Chicago Divinity School that year, and in the following year he joined the faculty.¹ His initial writing explored the empirical study of religious experience, and later he turned to an examination of the process by which human good grows. The larger process-theology movement sees humanity and the natural world as joined in a dynamic process and contends that human life requires for its authentic development the engagement with an overarching cause or value that stimulates increasing integration of the human personality and the cosmos.² For Wieman, God was not so much a personality as a perceptible natural process through which humanity can achieve salvation (understood as the maximum self-fulfillment of the individual and society).³

In seeking God, Wieman said, "we seek to know what operates in human life to transform people as they cannot transform themselves, to save them from evil and lead them to the best that human life can ever attain."⁴ As Norman Pittinger

describes it, Wieman used God as a label for the "source of the growth of meaning and value in the world." Values themselves are the data through which God can be found, and God is the process of creative good, or creativity, operating in human life through what Wieman called "creative interchange."⁵ Wieman's influence helped to change the focus of the "Chicago School" from a socio-historical orientation to a philosophical orientation, and he became a leading process theologian.

Although Wieman was in his own conception a theist, and more specifically a Christian, in his later years he eschewed labels in favor of a commitment to a process that could bring about the fullest development of good. His early writings were radical for the time; he urged abandonment of anthropomorphic concepts of God in favor of what he called a "theocentric religion"--one that made the "actuality" of God, rather than human ideas or human needs, "the center of our love and devotion."⁶ To the post-modern reader, assertion of the possibility of distinguishing the "actuality" of God from our ideas and needs may seem naive. It is important to recognize that Wieman's context was one dominated by classical theism, with its notions of divine immutability and omnipotent sovereignty; process theologians positioned themselves in opposition to this dominant view, insisting on the possibility of the mutability of God as a result of the dynamic interaction of human and cosmos.⁷

Nonetheless, neither Wieman's ideas about God qua God, nor his optimistic valuation of the scientific method, can be embraced whole-heartedly by Unitarian Universalists. The early twentieth-century view of "scientific progress" as a continuous technological uplifting of humanity rings hollow at the start of the twenty-first--and repetitive God-talk makes many UUs shudder. But Wieman and process theology have a contribution to make to the "theological" underpinnings of UU religious education. Wieman's conception of "creative interchange" as the process that stimulates optimal human development is a useful tool as we seek to create a learning climate⁸ that fosters the full exercise of the principle of free inquiry. It is this aspect of Wieman's work that accords most harmoniously with the articulation of a UU theology that embraces the diversity of Unitarian Universalist thought.

Creative Interchange

In "Commitment for Theological Inquiry,"⁹ Wieman argued for the connection of worship with a commitment of one's "total being" to the service of the greatest good. By "greatest good," Wieman did not mean a utilitarian greatest sum of good, but a more specific, if somewhat relative, "good" that is defined in part by context--"time and place, person and culture."¹⁰ Good is relative, he argued, partly because contexts change and partly because we humans filter our understanding of context through our experiences and personalities. Yet some measuring-stick is necessary, some "ultimate standard for distinguishing good and evil."¹¹ To define "good" and "evil" as comprehensively as we are able

requires a commitment to good (as we understand it) while keeping our minds open to correction and "continuous inquiry."¹² This continuous inquiry takes the form of "interchange between individuals and peoples" so that one's own judgment of good and evil is widened by "appreciative understanding of the basic values motivating the lives of other people."¹³ This sort of "creative communion" between individuals comes about only if people constantly work to create conditions that are favorable for it.¹⁴ Consequently, "commitment to creative interchange means always to strive to correct the conditions inimical to it. . . . to work to change political, economic, educational, international, interracial, and interpersonal conditions in a way to make them more favorable for this communion between individuals, groups, cultures, and peoples."¹⁵

Wieman saw a difference between creative interchange and values or ideals. "Freedom" and "justice" are values; "sanctity of the family" is a value; "honesty" is a value (or perhaps these are all ideals). However variously-defined these concepts may be, their proponents judge them "good" and regard their curtailment as "evil." Creative interchange is a process that allows the formation of values, which are perhaps first absorbed by the child from experiences with family and then developed through more sophisticated interchange as the child grows.¹⁶ Wieman contended that if ideals "are to have their scope extended or if one is to be moved by values at deeper levels, creative interchange must first awaken the ideal or value."¹⁷ Wieman cautioned against the subordination of creative interchange to ideals or values. If an ideal is regarded as "supreme," he argued, human life will be shaped to meet the ideal--and the ideal's sovereignty will suppress and inhibit the creative dialogue that should "correct" the ideal and "expand its range of values."¹⁸ Humans move toward an understanding of the "good" through the exchange of diverse points-of-view; this creative interchange allows transformation of an ideal to account for "those deeper values and wider reaches of good and evil" that are evoked through open discourse with the different other.¹⁹

Wieman made one additional key point about the idea of "good" and the process of creative interchange: "When good increases, a process of reorganization is going on, generating new meanings, integrating them with the old, endowing each event as it occurs with a wider range of reference," and molding the life of the human being into "a more deeply unified totality of meaning."²⁰ This reorganization is the "creative event" by which the various parts and experiences of life are transformed into "a more richly inclusive whole."²¹ The human problem, Wieman said, "is to shape human conduct and all other conditions so that the creative event can be released to produce maximum good."²² The transformative reorganization of an individual's understanding may not achieve its full potential, just as dialogue with another may fail to bring about empathy or a complete grasp of the other's perspective.

But even small strides in understanding are worth pursuing. Wieman urged the seeker of "good" to commit to enhancing the opportunities for creative

interchange and transformation of the self. The "whole struggle of human life, the basic problem of industry and government, of education and religion, of sex and personal conduct, of family and neighborhood organization, is to provide and to maintain those conditions wherein the creative event can produce the maximum of qualitative meaning" without damaging existing structures that enrich the world.²³ Wieman's assertion appears to be normative rather than descriptive; that is, it seems to contend that humans should struggle to enhance conditions for creative interchange and self-transformation, not that they always do. Unitarian Universalist "theology," as expressed in the principle of free inquiry, similarly impels commitment to enhancing the conditions for the thoughtful and empathetic exchange of ideas, because it is creative interchange that allows free inquiry its fullest scope. And it is the shared "theological" principle of free inquiry that allows the UU difference-in-fellowship to emerge. In consequence, UU religious education should be designed to foster the most favorable conditions for Wieman's creative interchange.

Creativity, Religious Education, and the Principle of Free Inquiry

The Relationship Between Creative Interchange and Religious Education

Harold Rosen has previously noted the utility of Wieman's "creative interchange" for UU religious education.²⁴ Rosen asserts that the "great calling of the religious educator is to facilitate creative interchange," and emphasizes that the best religious education "is a dialogue between the mature and the young."²⁵ Wieman summarized the goal of general education as developing the following qualities in every student:²⁶

1. "The ability to get the other person's viewpoint. This does not mean necessarily to agree with the other . . . but it does mean to understand the other [. . .] to see and feel the situation" within the bounds of the other's perspective.
2. The ability to communicate one's own viewpoint, so as to allow the other "to see and feel the situation within the bounds of one's perspective."
3. "The ability to adjust these different viewpoints to one another," perhaps by correcting one's own or the other's error, or by mutual error-correction, or by "synthesis yielding a much more penetrating and comprehensive view of the matter," or by compromise, or by "any one of an indefinite number of different outcomes."

Talking together, Rosen says, particularly talking together about religion, is the sharing of "value-perspectives, thereby generating a progressive and unlimited accumulation of meanings (a culture) which grows from generation to generation"; people cannot grow or expand their value-systems without absorbing culture and transforming themselves in response.²⁷ "When we successfully facilitate religious conversation," Rosen asserts, "we are addressing

the highest calling of the human condition--to co-create, or help bring new values into the world."²⁸

Creative interchange requires an openness to new perspectives; the willingness to use those perspectives to re-formulate one's prior judgments about the meaning of "good" and "evil" and an acceptance of the possibility that one's self will be transformed in response to new insights. All these attitudes (openness, willingness, acceptance) foster creative interchange, and can be developed largely through personal conversation.²⁹ "The best religious educators are those who, on one hand, have enthusiasm and intuition about how to draw people out regarding what is of greatest importance to them [and, on the other hand,] can share their own deepest and highest values effectively."³⁰ Yet talk is not enough. There is a more challenging prerequisite for achieving the conditions that allow optimal creative interchange. Wieman's third educational goal makes it clear that creativity is needed; without creativity, the range of possible responses to the different other will be incompletely explored.³¹ To be fully effective, creative interchange requires creative thinkers. These are the people who are most likely to transform themselves in response to others' values; who are most likely to generate new ideas that can provoke transformation in themselves and others; and who are most likely to consider a wide range of possible responses to differences in points of view. Moreover, it is the creative thinkers who break out of conventional paradigms to pursue free inquiry at its most expansive.

Education for Creativity

Creative thinking is developed in part through the educator's modeling of inquiry. Rosen offers an example reminiscent of Socratic dialogue.³² From the educator's perspective, the teacher's questions are more important than the student's answers--because one purpose of the dialogue is to encourage independent (and thus potentially creative) thought. The fourth-grade teacher in Rosen's example asks "Have you ever wondered what the most important thing in the world is? . . . But what is God? . . . Like what? . . . But what do you think? . . . Is God, then, something found only between people? . . . Does God, then, make earthquakes and diseases? . . . And how are things meant to grow? . . . Then God does not cause any bad things? . . . Then your God is not in charge of everything?" until finally the learner asks the teacher, "What do you think?" This sequence of questions provides guidance for the learner's thought process while encouraging the learner to consider and express his or her own views. In the process of creative interchange, these views are likely to change and develop. But the learner's initial articulation of ideas, and the teacher's respectful reception of them, helps to generate the confidence that allows scope for creativity.

Even so, some thought could be given to a conversational strategy that gives the learner's creativity free reign. Active listening, for example, is used in the pastoral care setting to encourage the speaker to express religious issues that may be unspoken but acutely felt. The active listener responds with open-ended

statements, not questions; validates the speaker's worth; and reflects back the speaker's feelings. Part of the listening strategy is to keep the speaker focused on the central concern, and part is to avoid inadvertently shutting down the flow of talk by a comment or question that challenges or invalidates the speaker's feelings. In the educational setting, the teacher might use a variant of active listening so that, instead of guiding the learner's reasoning (as Socratic dialogue is intended to do) the teacher allows a more free-flowing exploration of the learner's ideas.

Rosen touches on the idea of active listening when he identifies six attitudes that should be transmitted through a teacher's behavior:³³ respect for time; preserving quality by focusing on the significant rather than the trivial; the use of expectant silence; the perception of divinity in the gifts each learner has to offer; modeling the "golden rule of face-to-face interaction" (listen to others as you would have them listen to you); and reliance on the "threefold procedure" of expressing one's own experience, allowing the other to express his or her experience, and exploring the interrelationships between viewpoints. If teachers evince these attitudes in the educational setting, Rosen says, "religious conversation will be generated, and the creative unfolding of each participant becomes more likely." Rosen's description of ideal teaching behavior is very like active listening in the pastoral care setting, with the exception that the teacher is also responsible for sharing (at some point) his or her own perspective, and may also help the learner to discover the opinions of other thinkers.

Unitarian Universalist religious education programs, which must take into account the diversity of theological views that may exist within a single congregation, are probably more likely than traditional Christian Sunday schools to allow learners scope for creative thinking. But training creative thinkers should not merely be a likely outcome of a UU religious education program--it should be an affirmative goal. Terry Hokenson has argued that the teaching of "answers as mere answers" ignores "crucial opportunities to cultivate the spirit of creative interchange."³⁴ He urges that learners be allowed to play a more active role in the learning situation by developing themes for investigation based on their own experience. Adult religious education programs that offer a wide range of options, from drumming to yoga to courses in "Building Your Own Theology," allow learners to shape the learning experience by sheer diversity of options. In childhood religious education, a learner's choices are likely to be more limited. Limitations arise in part from the enormity of the task of finding willing and capable teachers for each age group, Sunday after Sunday. But limitations also are imposed on programs by assumptions about how children should be taught and what they should learn. Hokenson argues that allowing learners more voice in determining topics of exploration may be "more or less effective in inculcating an assortment of facts and belief, but its crucial value is in reorienting the relation of teacher to student and student to stuff in an ultimately more creative way."³⁵

Hokenson's work is based on the writings of Pablo Freire, who has examined

extensively the pedagogy of oppression. What Hokenson calls a "dialogical" approach to education (allowing learners a hand in the design of their curriculum) is a way to avoid the subordination that occurs when process is regarded as merely instrumental to the transmission of substance. Drawing on Freire, he contends that the mind is not merely to be "molded" by a process that works upon it, nor is a particular subject matter to be "funneled into the passive receptacle of mind."³⁶ Instead, the process should be conceived of as a mediation between the learner and the world, whereby the student is freed to imagine and create using data acquired in the learner's active investigation of life and meaning.

This approach does not mean that UU religious educators should completely abandon the transmission of information. Creative thinkers need data. Teachers are well-positioned to direct learners to data sources and, as well, to provide information themselves. A balance is necessary. For example, the structure of the Neighboring Faiths curriculum, which allows middle-school students to explore a variety of religious beliefs through off-site visits, expects students to select the faiths they will study.³⁷ Students may already be at least vaguely aware of a number of "different" religious practices; their choices may be motivated by hotchpot of reasons: a desire to learn more about the religion of someone they know, or interest in the religion of their favorite sports star, or curiosity about a religion they regard as "weird" or "gross." Whatever reason a learner offers for choosing to learn, the fact that it is the learner's own reason means that creative interchange is more likely to occur. When learning is motivated by the learner's desire to answer a question personal to the learner, the information obtained in the process serves the learner's unique need. The encounter of the learner's curiosity with the data is thus unique, and the learner is more likely to interact with the data in a creative way. This kind of learning "engages the passion" of the learner, and can evoke a life-long commitment to learning and personal growth.³⁸

Recent research on the physiology of learning suggests that creative thought involves disruption of normal brain activity. Routine thought involves the firing of neurons in a regular pattern. Innovative thought, which occurs when the individual learns something new, involves a period of chaotic neuron activity. Researchers have observed that learning is not possible without this period of chaotic thought.³⁹ Yet most people, including teachers, are uncomfortable when their normal brain activity becomes chaotic and confused. A normal response to the discomfort of disrupted thought is an effort to discover a pattern or system in the new data that triggered the chaotic activity. The more possibilities the learner can generate to explain the data, the more likely the learner will integrate the new material in a useful way. Okechukwu Ogbonnaya notes that to "live intelligently in a world as complex as ours requires that we constantly solve the problems of how to act in a new situation in a way that achieves the best possibilities. The ability to exercise the power of intelligence in problem-solving entails searching and finding new possibilities."⁴⁰ Creativity may be the capacity to identify many

possible ways of explaining new data, and to generate new possibilities from old data. In other words, creativity may not be merely the ability to ferret out the "best" solution to quell chaotic brain activity, but also the ability to self-generate chaotic thought.

How to teach creativity is a problem that needs further research. Wieman acknowledged in 1968, "We do not know nearly as much about the conditions most favorable for the interpersonal responsiveness that creates the expanding vision."⁴¹ He was certain that a learner experiences the creation of new values "only when the teacher cannot determine what the added range of values may be that the student gets from the teaching." This notion seems to fly in the face of conventional ideas about the need for "teaching objectives." But if the teacher's previously-set goal is that the student learn a stated, value-laden content, the student may never engage creatively with the values under discussion. "This is so," Wieman said, "because the added range of values [from true creative interchange] will not be merely what the student receives from the teacher" but will be the result of the student integrating what is received "with the values constituting the individuality of the student."⁴² The learner probably needs to be taught, first, to identify the "values constituting the individuality of the student" and, second, to challenge or disrupt those values in a situation that permits the acquisition of new information. The Neighboring Faiths curriculum, which combines at least some in-class value identification with off-site exposure to diverse beliefs, seems well-designed to achieve this goal when taught effectively. Perhaps one facet of UU teacher-training programs should be to teach teachers how to introduce productive chaos into every classroom.

The UU "Theological" Imperative for Religious Education

The hallmark of Unitarian Universalism and its predecessors has been the open mind. The principle of free inquiry is the bedrock "theological" idea of our denomination, but is of limited utility if members of the faith don't have the mental and emotional tools needed to inquire creatively. True learning (as opposed to mere ingestion of information) requires creative interchange, and creativity requires chaotic, uncomfortable thought. Yet students can learn that after confusion comes integration, that chaos will give way to ordered growth--self-ordered growth, which Wieman argued is the only kind available. "An educational process taking the 'lure of unexplored possibilities' seriously," Ogonnaya says, "is courage-forming."⁴³ Seeking out the new idea, embracing diversity, tolerating the disruption of old pathways, generating challenges to one's own values--these are not easy tasks. Creativity requires courage, which can be gained only through experience. Where will UU students learn the mental and emotional skills that the principle of free inquiry demands?

The answer seems to be a theological imperative for UU religious education. To foster free inquiry and to develop the skills it requires, religious education programs should be designed establish the conditions most favorable to creative

interchange. Those conditions include an environment that validates the learner's religious concerns, boosts the learner's self-esteem, and treats with respect the learner's ideas, values, and questions. But key to fostering creative interchange is to teach, explicitly and proactively, the skills of creative thinking. UU curriculum writers and RE directors should immerse themselves in the scientific research on creativity and the learning process. They should develop learning situations that enable students to choose the areas they will explore. They should allow time for students to articulate the values they hold, and enable learners to interact with new data that may disrupt those values. And this process should be transparent--the students should be told what the teachers are seeking and how the activities offered in the program contribute to the development of the capacity for creative interchange. For, in the end, learning and growth take place--or fail to take place--within the learner. The UU teacher's only significant task is to empower each student to engage creatively with others and the world. If UU religious education accomplishes this goal, the principle of free inquiry will be well-served by each succeeding generation of thinkers.

Conclusion: Wieman's Legacy

More than any modern thinker, Henry Nelson Wieman linked the idea of theology with personal growth. His notion of "creative interchange" suggested not only a process for personal growth, but also for resolution of issues that divide the peoples of the world. From his cogent articulation of the need to establish conditions favorable for creative interchange, Wieman went on to deduce the need for social and economic justice, good education, good nutrition, and an end to barriers erected out of racial, religious, or ethnic bias. Wieman's interest was in the philosophy of religion and "process" theology; he defined "God" as a transformative, creative process that transcends the individual. Unitarian Universalism requires a "theology" that does not assume a transcendental being or even a transcendental process, even though many UUs find Wieman's ideas compelling. Instead, UUs need a "theology" that matches the fundamental beliefs of all Unitarian Universalists.

From the diversity of theologies, and perhaps anti-theologies, of UU members, there emerges a common pattern of difference-in-fellowship. This pattern suggests that Unitarian Universalism's fundamental theology is the principle of free inquiry. Wieman's legacy for Unitarian Universalists is a process--creative interchange--that promises to allow and enhance free inquiry among UU members. If UU religious education expressly fosters the conditions most favorable to creative interchange, the denomination can guarantee future generations not only the opportunity for free inquiry, but the availability of new ideas, new values, and new theologies.

Notes

1. John B. Cobb, Jr., and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition* 177 (Appendix B) (1976).
2. W. Norman Pittinger, "Process Thought: A Contemporary Trend in Theology," in Ewert H. Cousins, ed., *Process Theology: Basic Writings* 23, 33 (1971).
3. Emanuel S. Goldsmith, "Henry Nelson Wieman: Introduction," in W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone, eds., *The Chicago School of Theology--Pioneers in Religious Inquiry, Volume II, The Later Chicago School, 1919-1988*, 55, 57 (1996) (hereafter Goldsmith in Peden and Stone).
4. H.N. Wieman, "Knowledge, Religious and Otherwise," 37 *Journal of Religion* 12-28 (January 1958), excerpted in Peden and Stone at 108-127; quotation is from Peden and Stone at 119 (hereafter Wieman, "Knowledge," in Peden and Stone). To adjust Wieman's language to gender-neutral usage, the words people, they, themselves, them, and them have been chosen to replace, respectively, Wieman's words man, he, himself, him, and him.
5. Goldsmith in Peden and Stone at 57.
6. Henry Nelson Wieman, "Theocentric Religion," excerpted in Peden and Stone at 62.
7. Terrence W. Tilley, *Postmodern Theologies: The Challenge of Religious Diversity* 1 (1995).
- 8 The utility of Wieman's "creative interchange" for religious education has been noted in Harold Rosen, *Religious Education and Our Ultimate Commitment: An Application of Henry Nelson Wieman's Philosophy of Creative Interchange* (1985). See also A. Okechukwu Ogbonnaya, "Education for Human Maturity: The Implication of Henry Nelson Wieman's Theology of Human Maturity for Religious Education," 100 *Journal of Theology* 53 (Summer 1996); Mary E. Venable, "Ventures in Creative Interchange," 72 *Religious Education* 642 (1977); Padraic O'Hare, "Religious Education as Inquiry: The Thought of Henry Nelson Wieman", 70 *Religious Education* 317 (1975); Terry Hokenson, "A Process Pedagogy for Education," 68 *Religious Education* 575 (1973). See generally Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully, eds., *Process and Relationship: Issues in Theory, Philosophy, and Religious Education* (1978).
- 9 H.N. Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," 42 *Journal of Religion* 171-184 (July 1962), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy* 129-147 (1975) (hereafter Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith*).
- 10 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 129, 133.

- 11 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 135.
- 12 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 135-136.
- 13 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 136.
- 14 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 136.
- 15 Wieman, "Theological Inquiry," in *Seeking a Faith* at 136.
- 16 Wieman, "Achieving Personal Stability," in John Knox, ed., *Religion and the Present Crisis* 69-86 (1942), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy* 194-208 (1975)
- 17 Wieman, "Speech in the Existential Situation," *47 Quarterly Journal of Speech* 150-157 (April 1961), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy* 182-189 (1975) (hereafter Wieman, "Speech," in *Seeking a Faith*).
- 18 Wieman, "Speech," in *Seeking a Faith* at 185.
- 19 Wieman, "Speech," in *Seeking a Faith* at 185.
- 20 H.N. Wieman, *The Source of Human Good* (1946), excerpted in Peden and Stone at 85-108; quotation from Peden and Stone at 99-100 (hereafter Wieman, *Source of Human Good*, in Peden and Stone).
- 21 Wieman, *Source of Human Good*, in Peden and Stone at 100.
- 22 Wieman, *Source of Human Good*, in Peden and Stone at 104.
- 23 Wieman, *Source of Human Good*, in Peden and Stone at 104-105.
- 24 Rosen, op. cit. note 8, at 87-93.
- 25 Rosen at 88 (emphasis supplied).
- 26 Wieman, "Education for Social Direction," in Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein and R.M. Maclver, eds., *Perspectives on a Troubled Decade: Science, Philosophy, and Religion*, 1939-49 493-506 (1950), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy* 209-223; quote from page 211 (1975) (hereafter Wieman, "Education," in *Seeking a Faith*). To adjust Wieman's language to gender-neutral usage, in point (1) the words person's the other, and the other have been chosen to replace, respectively, fellow's, him, and him.

27 Rosen at 89.

28 Rosen at 89.

29 Wieman, "Speech," in *Seeking a Faith* at 185; Rosen at 91-92.

30 Rosen at 88.

31 See generally William Sherman Minor, *Creativity in Henry Nelson Wieman* (1977).

32 Rosen at 101.

33 Rosen at 92-93.

34 Terry Hokenson, "A Process Pedagogy for Christian Education," op. cit. note 8, at 599. Hokenson is writing from the perspective as a Christian educator; his views should carry more force in a UU context.

35 Hokenson at 601. Padraic O'Hare, a Catholic who has written favorably of Wieman's approach to creativity and inquiry in religious education, suggests that the goal is "to transmit" our affection, loyalty to, and appreciation for a process of questioning, testing, criticizing, and amending," that is, Wieman's process of creative interchange. Padraic O'Hare, "Religious Education as Inquiry," op. cit. note 8, at 321.

36 Hokenson at 601-02.

37 Christine F. Reed and Patricia Hoertdoerfer, "What Faiths Do We Want to Learn About?" *Neighboring Faiths*, Session 2, 18-22 (1997).

38 In the words of Okechukwu Ogbonnaya, "A Wiemanian education engages the passion of those within its purview. A. Okechukwu Ogbonnaya, "Education for Human Maturity," op. cit. note 8, at 64.

39 David Peak and Michael Frame, *Chaos Under Control: The Art and Science of Complexity* 361-364 (1994) ("chaos underlies the ability of the brain to respond flexibly to the outside world and to generate novel activity patterns, including those that are experienced as fresh ideas") (quoting researcher Walter Freeman, at 362). See generally James Gleick, *Chaos: Making a New Science* (1987).

40 Ogbonnaya at 65.

41 H.N. Wieman, "Creativity in Education," in *Religious Inquiry: Some Explorations* 177 (1968) (emphasis supplied).

42 Wieman, "Creativity in Education," in *Religious Inquiry* at 176. See also Sara Little, "Ways of Knowing: An Approach to Teaching About Teaching," in Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully, eds., *Process and Relationship*, op. cit. note 8, at 15-21. This essay includes a useful table summarizing how teachers can use a variety of methods to encourage students to generate their own ideas. See also Mary Elizabeth Venable, "Ventures in Creative Interchange," op. cit. note 8, at 649 (describing the creative and educational value derived from a study that engaged parents of young children in an assessment of children's loving behavior).

43 Ogbonnaya at 67.

Bibliography

Cobb, John B., Jr., and Griffin, David Ray. *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Cully, Iris V., and Cully, Kendig Brubaker, eds., *Process and Relationship: Issues in Theory, Philosophy, and Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1978.

Gleick, James. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. New York: Penguin, 1987.

Goldsmith, Emanuel S. "Henry Nelson Wieman: Introduction," in W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone, eds., *The Chicago School of Theology--Pioneers in Religious Inquiry, Volume II, The Later Chicago School, 1919-1988*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

Hokenson, Terry. "A Process Pedagogy for Education," 68 *Religious Education* 575 (1973).

Little, Sara. "Ways of Knowing: An Approach to Teaching About Teaching," in Iris V. Cully and Kendig Brubaker Cully, eds., *Process and Relationship: Issues in Theory, Philosophy, and Religious Education*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1978.

Minor, William Sherman. *Creativity in Henry Nelson Wieman*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1977.

O'Hare, Padraic. "Religious Education as Inquiry: The Thought of Henry Nelson Wieman," 70 *Religious Education* 317 (1975).

Ogbonnaya, A. Okechukwu. "Education for Human Maturity: The Implication of Henry Nelson Wieman's Theology of Human Maturity for Religious Education,"

100 *Journal of Theology* 53 (Summer 1996).

Peak, David, and Frame, Michael. *Chaos Under Control: The Art and Science of Complexity*. New York: W.H. Freeman & Co., 1994.

Peden, Creighton. *The Chicago School: Voices in Liberal Religious Thought*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press, 1987.

Pittinger, W. Norman. "Process Thought: A Contemporary Trend in Theology," in Ewert H. Cousins, ed., *Process Theology: Basic Writings*. New York: Newman Press, 1971.

Reed Christine F., and Hoertdoerfer, Patricia. *Neighboring Faiths*. Boston: UUA, 1997.

Rosen, Harold. *Religious Education and Our Ultimate Commitment: An Application of Henry Nelson Wieman's Philosophy of Creative Interchange*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985.

Tilley, Terrence W., *Postmodern Theologies: The Challenge of Religious Diversity*. Maryknoll, New York: Obis Books, 1995.

Venable, Mary E. "Ventures in Creative Interchange," *72 Religious Education* 642 (1977).

Wieman, Henry Nelson. "Achieving Personal Stability," in John Knox, ed., *Religion and the Present Crisis* 69-86 (1942), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.

. "Creativity in Education," in *Religious Inquiry: Some Explorations*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

. "Education for Social Direction," in Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein and R.M. Maclver, eds., *Perspectives on a Troubled Decade: Science, Philosophy, and Religion, 1939-49* (1950), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.

. "Knowledge, Religious and Otherwise," *37 Journal of Religion* 12-28 (January 1958), in W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone, eds., *The Chicago School of Theology--Pioneers in Religious Inquiry, Volume II, The Later Chicago School, 1919-1988*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

. "Speech in the Existential Situation," *47 Quarterly Journal of Speech* 150-157 (April 1961), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays*

on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.

. "The Source of Human Good" (1946), in W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone, eds., *The Chicago School of Theology--Pioneers in Religious Inquiry, Volume II, The Later Chicago School, 1919-1988*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

. "Theocentric Religion," in W. Creighton Peden and Jerome A. Stone, eds., *The Chicago School of Theology--Pioneers in Religious Inquiry, Volume II, The Later Chicago School, 1919-1988*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

. "Theological Inquiry," 42 *Journal of Religion* 171-184 (July 1962), reprinted in H.N. Wieman, *Seeking a Faith for a New Age: Essays on the Interdependence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1975.