

that the lurking suspicion is that language about God has no place in the university. Yet it is just such language that theology is about. A faith statement that says something about God contains a cognitive element that it is the business of theology to investigate by a rational set of methodical procedures. Pannenberg is writing on method in theology, and so are other important theologians. I wonder if Doernberg could read, for example, Bernard Lonergan's new book, *Method in Theology* (1972), and still assert point-blank that there are no "evidences that warrant taking theology seriously as a partner." Perhaps he feels more comfortable with the notion that the idea of God is nothing but the function of a theologian's private faith and that therefore whatever is asserted with reference to God can be dismissed as an entirely fictitious idea. For Pannenberg, statements that refer to God need to be checked out by defensible methods of procedure; there is a subject matter that is open to examination; one's statements about it function as hypotheses in need of corroboration. If this proposition is debatable, it would seem to me that the place to carry on the debate is in the university.

4. Fourthly, Stefon directs his query to the idea of a *Weltanschauung*. It is not clear whether he is piqued by Pannenberg's particular worldview or galled by the suggestion that today we are in need of a universe of meaning to make sense of the particularities of what we experience and know. So Stefon uses sneer words to discredit the project, like neo-Hegelian, shadowy, mystic creation, illusive spirit, mysterious glue-all, asexual stuff, etc. Stefon does not make clear whether he disagrees with the diagnosis that modern man has lots of "the parts in his

hand" or with the prescription that calls for a "connecting band." Perhaps Stefon is frustrated with both notions. It all seems too Hegelian. But, by the way, how did he slip in the charge that I have conveniently forgotten all about Tillichian notions, Niebuhrian principles and Buberian philosophy? True, it would have been a terrible inconvenience to write about all these things in a review of Pannenberg's books. But as history goes on, they also become "parts" in need of a "connecting band." I think the three mentioned saints would want it that way.

Beyond the Anti-Institutional Mood

To the Editors: Anton C. Zijderveld's article on "The Anti-Institutional Mood" (September *Worldview*) has brought to mind the following thoughts on technology and its cultural ramifications:

First, it appears that too many of the dimensions of technological society are being approached from the wrong end of the spectrum. The emphasis on inputs, whether in terms of economic resources, historical perspectives, philosophical insights, institutional imperatives or current events, seems to be overshadowing the vital need to place more time and effort on creating new objectives, goals and value systems.

Second, technology is a phenomenon that demands its own cultural necessities—therefore a projection in terms of what a technological society will demand of man becomes essential, without all the "looking backward" to outdated philosophical ideas, bankrupt economic systems, rigid institutionalized perspectives and archaic political structures. Man

must accept the proposition that he is "a part of nature," and that what he creates becomes an extension of himself and ultimately an extension of nature. In essence technology is natural environment. In essence technology is not artificial; it is not sterile; it is not unliving. Rather, it is the new natural environment. Man must discover new ideas, new perspectives, dynamic life styles and viable social and political structures which will enable him to adjust to the new nature of the technological world.

Third, yesterday is ancient history; man must sever the "albatross" of the past from his neck so that he can invent and create value systems which will allow him to reap the benefits of plenty and leisure that technology will provide.

Finally, love, death, birth and nature must be so radically redefined that it is imperative that man race ahead of his time to explore the philosophical demands of the future, or else he will find himself corrupting the magical abundance that technology promises. Don't corrupt it, learn to live within it. Hell, don't even learn to live within it—become a god and learn to live beyond it!

Ronald J. Stupak

*Department of Political Science
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio*

Correction

A major power was dropped from one of the sentences in Ashok Kapur's letter in the October issue. The sentence should read: "Other meaning can be seen in the relationship between nonalignment and power politics, as, for instance, in Nehru's concern to pursue a defense policy through friendship with the USA, USSR and China. . . ."