



Institute for Christian Studies
Institutional Repository

Olthuis, James H. "On Worldviews," in *Stained Glass: Worldviews and Social Science*, edited by Paul A Marshall, Sander Griffioen, Richard J. Mouw. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1989, pages 26-40.

Note: This Work has been made available by the authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research and may not be copied or reproduced except as permitted by the copyright laws of Canada without the written authority from the copyright owner.

On Worldviews¹

James H. Olthuis

The ultimate questions of life lie deep within the heart of everyone. Who am I? Where am I going? What's it all about? Is there a god? How can I live and die happily? Everyone formulates some answer to these questions about the human condition, if only partially or implicitly. The answer we give may be referred to as our worldview, or vision of life. It may or may not be thematized or codified, but it makes up the framework of fundamental considerations which give context, direction, and meaning to our lives.

These questions have been an essential ingredient of every society, and have always engaged people's deepest interest. What is new and remarkable today is our increasing awareness of how worldviews affect both our perceptions of the world and our actions in the world. Conflicts in life and science, we are discovering, come down to differences in underlying worldviews. There is a flurry of activity to refurbish old worldviews, and at the same time impassioned voices insist that our world can be saved from total collapse only if we adopt new worldviews.²

Not only do we have a veritable showcase of worldviews,³ all championing their wares and charms, we also have a plethora of diverging and conflicting explanations of the status and function of worldviews. In the Western intellectual tradition, a worldview, or *Weltanschauung*,⁴ has generally been treated as a comprehensive and unified system of thought, bearing various relations to philosophy: it may

be thought of as forming the basis of theoretical philosophy (Dilthey), as identified with philosophy (Engels), or as opposed to philosophy as a set of ultimate beliefs (Kierkegaard). A worldview has been defined as an "as-if" way of thinking, or as "fiction" (Vaihinger). In any case, worldviews have often been assumed to be the prime mover of the historical process, shaping rather than being shaped by its psychosocial context. Ideas precede action; how we think governs how we live. The assumption is that basic differences among people are in the end reducible to differences in ideas, and to the commitment of faith articulated in these ideas.

In the nineteenth century, these assumptions were challenged through the rise of historical consciousness. Particularly in the work of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche ("the masters of suspicion" as Paul Ricoeur has aptly named them⁵), we have been confronted with the crucial roles played in worldview formation by socioeconomic conditions and the subterranean forces of the unconscious. Nietzsche, for instance, warns us "to be on guard against the hallowed philosopher's myth of a 'pure, will-less, painless, timeless knower,' " and to "beware of the tentacles of such contradictory notions as 'pure reason,' 'absolute knowledge,' 'absolute intelligence.' " ⁶ For Marx, ideas form a "superstructure" built upon the base of class interest, defined exclusively in economic terms. Ideas do not generate action; instead, they are generated *by* action. Finally, Freud tells us we are always comforting ourselves and avoiding facets of our experience we would rather not face. Our ideas tend to be mere rationalizations by which we put a good face on a bad thing.

More recent developments continue to challenge the priority of ideas in shaping human action and culture. In philosophy, language philosophers such as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Heidegger, Gadamer, and Benjamin Lee Whorf have argued that language influences worldview formation dramatically and decisively. In science, the dominant physicalist-empiricist model has been challenged by M. Polyani's "tacit dimension" and by T. S. Kuhn's idea of paradigms as screens that permit certain phenomena to be considered valid objects of inquiry and rule others out. In psychology, our confidence in the priority of the idea has been shaken by recent developments in child psychology that highlight the monumental significance of parent-infant bonding for adult life and thought. In theology, the Frankfurt School and Liberation Theology challenge our preoccupation with orthodoxy (right worldviews), calling us to orthopraxis (right doing). In addition to all this, there is at present an upsurge in sociobiological thinking,

which seeks the prime determinants of human action not in faith, the unconscious, or the socio-cultural context, but in genetic pre-programming and organic predispositions.

This kaleidoscope of modern approaches to worldviews gives context and occasion for this paper. My goal is to describe the anatomy of a worldview: its source, structure, and function. Although my chief concern is to deepen our understanding of the nature and formation of worldviews in general, I hope that in the process we come to a deeper consciousness of the worldviews we ourselves hold and why we hold them.

In seeking to locate the source of worldviews, various thinkers have pressed the claims of faith, or thought, or passion, or socioeconomic condition, as the prime determinant in worldview formation. But that route, I believe, leads unavoidably to reductionism and dogmatism. I suggest that no one factor can be said to be the maker of a worldview. All the factors of life—biophysical, emotional, rational, socioeconomic, ethical, and “religious”—affect worldview formation simultaneously and interdependently, one dominating the others at one time, another at another time. My claim is that such an integrated, multidimensional model of worldview formation is comprehensive and flexible enough to explain the existence and persuasiveness of the many diametrically opposed worldviews with their competing claims.

After I have discussed both the formation and the structure of a worldview in its many dimensions, I will turn to the question of its function. I believe that a worldview can be a medium of mediation and integration in a two-way movement between the commitment of faith and all other modes of human experience. Certainty received in the surrender of faith leads via the mediation of a worldview to a way of living. Concomitantly, a way of life, in all its modes and moments, influences via a worldview the commitment of faith. To my mind, only a model that highlights this reciprocity enables us to avoid either canonizing worldviews (as though they were the pure expression of faith or the infallible bearers of truth) or minimizing them (as if they were only the reflex and rationalization of socioeconomic interests, genetic predispositions, or emotional needs).

I want to stress the exploratory, suggestive nature of my analysis. It is meant to stimulate readers to reflect on their own worldviews and also, I also, to help us face, with equanimity and insight, the welter of competing worldviews and theories of worldviews.

A Worldview: Framework of Basic Beliefs

A worldview (or vision of life) is a framework or set of fundamental beliefs through which we view the world and our calling and future in it. This vision need not be fully articulated: it may be so internalized that it goes largely unquestioned; it may not be explicitly developed into a systematic conception of life; it may not be theoretically deepened into a philosophy; it may not even be codified into creedal form; it may be greatly refined through cultural-historical development. Nevertheless, this vision is a channel for the ultimate beliefs which give direction and meaning to life. It is the integrative and interpretative framework by which order and disorder are judged; it is the standard by which reality is managed and pursued; it is the set of hinges⁷ on which all our everyday thinking and doing turns.

Although a vision of life is held only by individuals, it is communal in scope and structure. Since a worldview gives the terms of reference by which the world and our place in it can be structured and illumined, a worldview binds its adherents together into community. Allegiance to a common vision promotes the integration of individuals into a group. At times communality of vision not only binds people together, but also, ironically, provides them with the tools and vocabulary to advance with greater sophistication their internal differences.

What Is and What Ought to Be

For each adherent, a worldview gives reason and impetus for deciding what is true and what really matters in our experience. In other words, worldview functions both *descriptively* and *normatively*. It has what Clifford Geertz calls a dual focus⁸: it tells us both what is (and is not) the case and what ought (and ought not) to be the case. A worldview is both a sketch of and a blueprint for reality; it describes what we see and stipulates what we should see.

To put it another way, a worldview is simultaneously a vision “of” life and the world and a vision “for” life and the world. On one hand, visions are descriptive models that shape themselves to our experience, defining and describing our lives: “this is the way life and the world *are*.” On the other hand, visions are normative models that shape our experience to themselves, forming and leading our lives forward: “this is the way life and the world *ought* to be.”

Through both lenses of its dual focus, a worldview purports to give the true picture of reality. For its adherents, a worldview gives the truth about history, life, and existence, and reveals the way to salvation and

healing. These claims to ultimacy, I suggest, point to the rootedness of worldviews in faith—in matters of “ultimate concern” to use Tillich’s phrase.

At the same time, there is much more than faith that motivates a worldview. As we have already noted, Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche have unmasked the role played in worldview formation by the unconscious, by rationalization, by personality types, and by socioeconomic interests. Worldviews, it seems, depend for validation and correction not only on the commitment of faith but also on all other modes of human experience.

How can worldviews claim ultimacy and at the same time reflect their historical, intellectual, and psychosocial contexts? Here my own model of worldviews suggests itself. I believe a worldview functions as a vehicle of mediation and integration in a two-way movement between faith commitment and all other modes of human existence. It is a medium through which the ultimate commitment of faith plays out its leading and integrating role in daily life. Simultaneously, a worldview is a medium by which daily life experiences can either confirm faith or call it into question.

In what follows I examine in greater detail both the role of faith and the role of other modes of experience in the making of worldviews. In so doing, the heuristic value of my suggested model will become clearer.

Worldviews Arise Out Of Faith

Living for something, belonging somewhere, searching for final meaning and permanent bliss—in short, having faith—is essential to human existence.⁹ What does it mean to have faith? It is to believe in something, to entrust or commit oneself, to give one’s life over to someone’s charge, to let go¹⁰ to God (or to a pseudo-god). For Christians, faith is an entrusting of oneself to God, through which we receive certainty, connection, and the ground for our existence—an entrusting in which we meet God in ourselves and in creation, even as God meets us. We are graciously renewed, experiencing connection with self, others, creation, and God. Henceforth, God is the healing power and sustaining ground of our lives, the final ground and ultimate power of and for all other grounds and powers.

The risk of faith is unavoidable; it is also existentially terrifying. For if faith proves futile, then our life falls apart. “Our ultimate concern can destroy us as it can heal us. But we can never be without it.”¹¹

The faith mode of being in the world “can be phenomenologically described as an ultimate or grounding dimension or horizon to all meaningful activities.”¹² It is through faith that we explicitly affirm (or deny) our relation to the Ultimate.¹³

By anchoring human life in ultimate certainty, faith gives rise to a vision of the whole of reality in the light of this ultimate. As James Fowler has recently put it: “faith ‘forms into one’ a comprehensive image of an ultimate environment, or worldview, as the means by which the commitment of faith integrates and guides daily experience.”¹⁴ A worldview gives fundamental, seminal answers to the ultimate questions: Who are we? Where are we? What are we to do? What is good and what is evil? Where are we going? Tolstoy asks in his *Confession*: “Is there any meaning in my life that the inevitable death awaiting me does not destroy?”¹⁵ At the end of his philosophical reflections, Heidegger exclaims: “Why is there a Being at all and not rather Nothing?”¹⁶

All such ultimate questions, and their answers about life and death, sin and suffering, hope and healing, finally elude our intellectual grasp and strict logical proof. In the end we say simply, “I am doing this because I believe that this is the nature of life and that my ultimate happiness depends on my acting in accord with my deepest commitment and dearest beliefs.” Every philosophy ends the same way, Gilkey argues, by saying simply, “Look, is this not the way things truly are?”¹⁷ Likewise, Wittgenstein says, “If I have exhausted the justifications, I have reached bedrock, and my spade is turned. Then I am inclined to say: ‘This is simply what I do.’”¹⁸ Finally there comes an end to our reasoning, and we answer such end-questions not in terms of proof or demonstration but rather in terms of the affirmation and surrender of faith.

This is not to say that ultimate answers lack cognitive content, but only that on the ultimate level of faith, reason is impotent to determine what is true. At that level, all the options are ultimates and there is no further standard or norm by which they can be assessed. There is no logical move we can make to reach an ultimate premise beyond doubt.

Ultimate answers are tacitly¹⁹ assumed in faith rather than deliberately produced through rational inquiry. They lie behind all our creative living and thinking. In their coherence they form a unifying perspective—a worldview—which makes sense of all our experience. Such ultimate beliefs found our relations of inquiry into the actual, and ground our living in the world. Consequently, no vision is in its fundamental perceptions subject to proof, in the sense that one can come up

with its basic or ultimate beliefs from a process of thought prior to them. Receiving these ultimate beliefs as revelation²⁰ and dwelling in them is their final and culminating validation.

In summary, it is this rootedness of worldviews in faith that gives them their this-is-the-way-it-is-and-should-be character. As a vision “of” faith “for” life and the world, a worldview first shapes itself to faith and then shapes the world to itself, projecting images of the cosmic order on the plane of human experience. The basic tenets of a worldview are not argued to but argued from.

However, the fact that a vision of life is rooted in faith perceptions received as revelation is only half the story. The other half of the story comes from the other direction: from the rest of life experience.

Worldviews Are Shaped by Experience

We have explored how worldviews are visions *of faith for* life. However, they are simultaneously vision *of life for* faith. In the movement from life experience to faith experience, a worldview first shapes itself to the world and then shapes faith to itself, attuning and adjusting images of the cosmic order so that they mirror experienced reality. As it shapes itself to the world, a worldview is confronted by the demands of life as a whole. In the movement from life experience to faith, the worldview must do more than exhibit internal conceptual coherence and consistency; it also must illuminate experience and guide human action.

The development and formation of worldviews, including their conceptualization, occurs within particular traditions which are embedded in the historical process. Conceptualization occurs as individual and communal reflection seeks to articulate and arrange the ultimate beliefs into a coherent worldview in a way consistent with all the facts of experience. In this process, an ordering takes place, elaborating and reworking the meaning of basic beliefs. Since our basic beliefs receive their meaning in terms of how they fit into a particular worldview, we often have diverging worldviews emerging from the same basic underlying faith commitment. Thus, for example, H. Richard Niebuhr in his classic, *Christ and Culture*, has described five types of worldviews which give form to the Christian faith. A variety of worldviews have likewise emerged within Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam, as well as within secular faiths, such as Marxism.

The formation of worldviews occurs in dialogue with a particular people’s historical experience and categorical frameworks. The con-

cepts fused to form the worldview will express more or less completely the basic beliefs, and will be more or less adequate to experience. As the historical process continues, re-articulations will become necessary as aspects of reality become illumined, as insight increases, and as faith deepens.

The fact that worldview formation takes place in terms of a particular tradition and within a particular psychosocial context emphasizes that it is not the product of faith alone, but of faith as it is founded in all the other dimensions of human experience. Thus, worldviews can and ought to be argued to, even though, as previously noted, in the end it is argued from rather than argued to. This paradox needs to be honored. I suggest that honoring it opens up a path which allows us to slip through the either-or, fideist-evidentialist dilemma.

There is another important implication of understanding worldviews in this way. Though our faith is affirmed and nurtured in terms of our worldview, yet our worldview does not flow from our faith alone. This understanding gives us the room as well as the obligation to acknowledge and honor other worldviews as being significant and worthy formations of a common underlying faith. Such recognition allows us to endorse our own worldview enthusiastically even as we recognize and learn from other worldviews.

Praxis and Worldviews

Worldviews, I am emphasizing, are informed not only by the commitment of faith, but also by tradition, socioeconomic conditions, societal institutions, authorities, science and schooling, mores, family and friends, memory, emotional experience, physio-organic health, intellectual development, volitional temperament, sexuality, etc. A vision of life is nourished and justified by all the realities which belong to the social and personal matrix of its confessors. In what follows, I will outline some of these realities.

Emotional Life

Emotions are a very important part of the personal matrix. A healthy emotional life, appropriately expressing the full range of emotions, is crucial to worldview formation. For although faith commitment cannot be reduced to emotional sensitivity, the way we live and articulate our faith is inextricably connected with our emotional well-being. In our early childhood experiences, certain patterns of emotional response are formed, which, if unhealthy, promote life-denying

rather than life-affirming worldviews. Deeply rooted feelings of loneliness, abandonment, deprivation, inadequacy, and violation undermine the security, intimacy, power, love, and wholeness of faith. Emotionally rooted illusions can be so powerful that we live day-to-day according to their dictates rather than by the faith to which we are committed. The anger, fear, and despair that feed these illusions can be so pervasive that we adjust or change our worldview in order to validate and support them.

Unresolved issues in personal or communal life can cause an enormous split between what is confessed in faith and what is acted out in fact. When such a split becomes a way of life, incongruities become increasingly difficult to live with, and an internal pressure for resolution builds up. Though the pressure and turmoil can lead as far as delusions and schizophrenia, more commonly release occurs through a modification or adjustment of one's vision of life. In an effort to restore peace and unity, we adjust our view of life through rationalization and other defensive postures. When our vision of life is thus contaminated, both faith and praxis are threatened.

Societal Dislocations

Not only emotional anxieties lead us astray. Hidden desires to gain or maintain socioeconomic positions of privilege and power can lead us to adopt postures which justify injustice and economic oppression. Thus, many of us judge the worldviews of racist, sexist, fascist, capitalist, or Marxist societies as cover-ups, formulated to serve the material interests of particular groups. Visions can easily become ideologies: "not being transparent-to-oneself ... is the defining characteristic of 'ideology.'" ²¹ Visions become ideologies when they are disguises for ulterior motives, projections of unacknowledged fears, or blinders blocking out reality.

In short, instead of facing and dealing with our personal anxieties and societal dislocations, we tend to rationalize and project, hiding from ourselves the reality of the situation. We end up adopting a vision of life that puts a good face on a bad thing. Without Freud and Marx, we might not have seen how such self-justifying and illusory factors operate in our beliefs.

My conclusion at this point in our discussion is as simple as it is crucial: emotional health and societal status deeply influence for good or ill the kind of worldview we adopt. This in no way denies that worldviews help shape personal identity and either foster or hinder

wholeness and health—physically, emotionally, and socially. It is rather to insist that the movement is two-directional. That is, if there is a change in worldview, our body awareness, feelings, and actions will tend to change accordingly. And, conversely, increased body awareness and greater emotional and social openness will tend to modify our worldviews as we seek to establish new harmony.

Worldview Crises

There are times when the gap between worldview and experience remains difficult to bridge. No doubt, a wide range of factors can give rise to such situations: the vision may be inadequate or out-moded, the commitment to it half-hearted, the environment hostile, the emotional anxieties overriding. Whatever the reason, whenever there is a gap between vision and reality, there is crisis, frustration, and tension.

If people are not able to re-focus and make sense of reality again—whether through new understandings, revisions of old views, or adoption of a new vision—they are likely to suffer breakdown. Even the remotest indication that a vision may prove unable to cope raises for all of us “the gravest sort of anxiety,”²² as anthropologist Clifford Geertz puts it. If anxiety about a worldview is shared by a sizeable segment of the community, the entire community is rendered vulnerable and liable to breakdown. If the crisis involves the dominant visions of society—as is the case today—the entire society is prone to massive breakdown.

Worldview crises are so deep and pervasive, and the fear of losing one’s moorings so strong, that many people and groups retrench themselves in their views and deny reality rather than face the consequences. Sometimes reality pushes through anyway, and one is forced to abandon the familiar confines of his or her worldview. Then an existential crisis erupts.

The disruptive power of a worldview crisis results from the fact that the worldview concretely embodies a person’s surrender in faith (though, as we have noted, a commitment of faith is not exhausted by nor identified with the worldview which gives it expression). The existential entrusting is always embedded in a historical process: it happened here, at this time, in this community, through this particular vision of life and meaning, at this stage in its cultural unfolding. Thus, when a vision fails its people, it is a crisis of vast proportions. The very scaffolding on which they are standing is collapsing. Home is being dismantled before their very eyes.

Although a worldview crisis is unavoidably at the same time a faith crisis, it does not follow that one must either deny one's faith or remain committed to it insincerely. Sometimes, no doubt, this choice must be made. The result can be conversion from one faith to another: from Buddhism to Islam, or from Christianity to Marxism. What frequently happens, however, is that faith remains and only the worldview changes. Such a change in worldviews may, in fact, be a sign of growth in faith. In such moments of deep disquiet, people may make the startling discovery not only that their worldview is inadequate, but that fidelity to their faith—as they now understand it—itself demands the adoption of another vision of life. Thus, Christians seeking fidelity to Christ may move from an ascetic Christ-against-culture worldview to a more accommodating Christ-and-culture two-realm vision, or from a Christ-above-culture Thomism to a Christ-transforms-culture perspective.

When a faith and its worldview empower its adherents to make sense of life and when it sustains them in sorrow and distress, it evokes deep and pervasive attachment and occasions moods of deep satisfaction, joy, and peace. However, when there is little or no emotional attachment to the vision of life confessed, people are divided against themselves. Acting contrary to their ultimate beliefs, they struggle with guilt and lose self-esteem. No matter how sound the vision, if its adherents are not emotionally committed to it and to others who share it, they cannot live out the vision in a way of life. On the other hand, deep emotional commitment and long-term community support of a worldview give health and power to individual and communal life.

Worldviews in Process

A worldview is a human formation open to all the foibles of human subjectivity. On the other hand, it functions as ultimate truth for its adherents. What conclusions may we draw from this apparent contradiction?

We have no option but to confess and act on our perception of reality as true—if we didn't believe it was true, it would not *be* our perception of reality; we would have another perception. Yet we may not canonize our interpretation of reality as an infallible blueprint for life. Absolutizing our views conveniently absolves us from the need constantly to test and refine our perceptions, and precludes any serious consideration of other perceptions of truth and reality. Indeed, it blocks us from being truly open to God's revelation.

If we canonize our worldview—or even if we adopt a static worldview—the development of faith, and the development of insight in the light of faith, are stopped cold. The natural flow towards the actualization of our commitment in life-praxis becomes sluggish and eventually freezes over. The worldview and its adherents stagnate at a certain stage of development. This means trouble in our constantly changing world.

Worldviews, if they are to remain viable, need to be changed continually as faith deepens, as insight into reality grows, and as individuals and cultures move on to new stages in their development. Refusing to allow reality to question or correct our views, refusing to modify our views to meet changing reality, leads to isolating ourselves and our views more and more from life. Eventually we will either be forced to retrench as we continue to deny reality, or else the dam will break and we will have to abandon our views altogether. The subjectivity of being human, the changing nature of life, and our sense of our own fallibility all help us to realize that insight into the truth must remain open-ended, in process. Worldviews develop in the reciprocity between faith and the rest of life experience. Not only do worldviews develop in process, but individual members of a community subjectively appropriate their worldview in stages and phases which correspond to the developmental stages of their lives.

At the same time, these features of subjectivity, relativity, and continual development need not lead us to the relativist position that one worldview is as good as any other. On the existential level, some worldviews have shown themselves to prevent growth and to promote injustice. Moreover, as we noticed much earlier, adopting a vision of life involves committing oneself to the ultimate (or at least what is taken to be ultimate), as the unconditional ground of existence. Thus, although the vision I adopt is my vision, I adopt it because it affords me the experience of total peace and healing. That is its compelling character. And if it compels my allegiance, shouldn't it do the same for others? If not, why do I believe in it? What we believe to be true for ourselves, we must also implicitly believe to be worth the commitment of others.

In the end, I suggest, right beliefs and a right vision will reflect God's universal order which calls to life and makes for life. Visions of life need to be judged in that light: are they life-affirming or life-destroying? How much freedom and dignity, hope and healing, do they offer? And for whom—only for the dying or for the living as well?²³

Integration between Faith and Praxis

For its adherents, a vision of life is a framework of ultimate beliefs that forms the decisively true perception of and for reality. From the direction of faith, a worldview is the integrator through which the commitment of faith seeks incarnation in a way of life. From the direction of life experience, worldview is the integrator through which human experience—conscious and unconscious, individual and societal—seeks a validating vision and grounding faith.

As integrator between faith and way of life, a worldview:

- grounds life in the confessed ultimate certainty;
- relates life to the universal order of existence;
- serves as the interpretative and integrative framework for all of life;
- acts as the cohesive, motivating, and pervasive “mind” binding adherents into a community;
- is expressed in symbol;
- is crucial in shaping personal identity;
- evokes and occasions deeply held emotional attitudes and moods of deep satisfaction, inner joy, and peace;
- induces intellectual assent and deepened conceptual reflection;
- sanctions sacrifice on its behalf;
- once shaken, shakes its adherents to the very core;
- induces and invites incarnation in a way of life.

In conclusion, three matters bear repeating. First, the crucial role played by a worldview in shaping personal and communal existence highlights the fundamental importance of having a life-affirming worldview. A faulty, inadequate vision of life works against growth and healing in life. Second, our emotional anxieties and societal insecurities can lead our basic beliefs astray, contaminate them, or cause us to abandon them. Third, although a worldview is open to justification, challenge, modification, and change, it receives its culminating validation in the entrustment of faith.

These concerns need our full attention if we are to avoid either underplaying or overplaying the importance of worldviews, and if we wish to develop worldviews which, adequate to the facts of common human experience, make for wholeness, reconciliation, and hope.

Footnotes

1. This paper was originally published in *Christian Scholar's Review* 14 (1985):153-164.
2. Three new books of this kind come immediately to mind. In *Entropy: A New World View* (New York: Viking Press, 1980), Jeremy Rifkin champions his alternative to the dominant Western mechanical, rationalistic, materialistic worldview. In *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982), Fritjof Capra pleads for a synthesis of modern physics and Eastern mysticism as the only viable escape from the collapse of the dominant Western worldview. In *Contours of a World View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), Arthur Holmes offers his biblical alternative to the naturalistic humanism of our day.
3. Ninian Smart has recently examined both the major religions and the secular ideologies of the world in his book, *Worldviews: Crosscultural Explorations of Human Beliefs* (New York: Scribners, 1983).
4. The German concept *Weltanschauung*, translated into English as "worldview" is found in Kant's *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790). See the paper by Wolters in this volume.
5. Paul Ricoeur, *The Conflict of Interpretations* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974), 148-49.
6. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals* (New York: Doubleday, 1956), pt. 3, no. 12, 255.
7. "If I want the door to turn, the hinges must stay put." Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1969), 343.44e. See also 211.29e.
8. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 93.
9. "Religion is universal in human societies. This is an empirical generalization, an aggregate of a multitude of specific observations." Raymond Firth, *Elements of Social Organization* (London: Watts, 1951), 216.
10. In his recent *Faith and Belief* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), chaps. 5 and 6, Wilfred Cantwell Smith has documented in detail that the Latin *credo* and the early Modern English "believe" meant respectively to "give my heart to," "to commit myself to," "to hold dear," "to cherish." Believing a proposition (belief-that) was a rare and derived form which has in our day unfortunately become dominant, almost to the exclusion of belief-in.
11. Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1957), 16.

12. David Tracy, *Blessed Rage for Order* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 55.
13. Herman Dooyeweerd talks of the "transcendental terminal function" of faith with "its immediate relatedness to the transcendent root and to the Origin of temporal existence." *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1955), 2:304.
14. James Fowler, *Stages of Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), 28.
15. L. Tolstoy, *A Confession* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 24.
16. M. Heidegger, "The Way Back in the Ground of Metaphysics" in *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*, ed. W. Kaufman, (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), 219.
17. Langdon Gilkey, *Naming the Whirlwind: Renewal of God-Language* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), 440. For a phenomenological unveiling of the dimension of ultimacy, Gilkey's book is unsurpassed.
18. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967), Section 217.
19. Cf. Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966).
20. Revelation is "that definite mode of experience in which a particular answer to these ultimate questions that arise in relation to all secular life manifests itself, is received, and so 'known' ... Revelation so defined is universal in human existence." Gilkey, 426-27.
21. G. Radnitsky, *Contemporary Schools of Metascience* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1968), 228.
22. Geertz, 99. Peter Berger describes such crises in *The Precarious Vision* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961). Together with Thomas Luckmann, Berger talks of the need to "switch worlds" in *The Social Construction of Reality* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), p. 157.
23. See Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death* (New York: Free Press, 1973), 202-204.