

Unitarian Universalist History

Frank Clarkson

Clarkson wrote this paper in Spring 2004 for Starr King School's online Unitarian Universalist History class.

I grew up in a family that attended church every Sunday, but to me this was never much of a spiritual experience. It was what we were expected to do. Though baptized and confirmed in the Episcopal church, I never really self-identified as more than a cultural Christian. The Jesus story never seemed to resonate with me, and I had a hard time reconciling creeds and stories of miracles with my own lived experience. Religion seemed to be part social convention and obligation and part superstition. Still, there was something about the church that was powerful for me, particularly the gathered community singing hymns together.

After my first child was born, I decided to leave the Episcopal church and become a Unitarian Universalist. The Unitarian Universalist church in Portsmouth, N.H., was a vibrant spiritual community where I could wrestle with my questions and practice being more authentic. I thrived there, discovering a voice and a spiritual life I didn't know I had. After a time I realized that I needed to live authentically not only within the safety of my church community, but in the larger world.

Surprisingly, this path that began in a Unitarian Universalist church led me back toward my own Christian roots, to reading Christian theology and spirituality and to wondering what Jesus' call

for me might be. The spiritual exploration my church sparked led me to enter a Christian seminary and to prepare for Unitarian Universalist ministry. This path has not been without its tensions. I've been told I don't sound like a Unitarian Universalist, and at times I've wondered if I am in the right denomination. Though my experience working in a Unitarian Universalist church affirmed for me that I am, and as one whose faith puts me at the margins of Unitarian Universalism, I am particularly aware of the theological divide in our denomination. How did we get here? Are there limits to internal pluralism? What is our recent theological trajectory, and what is the Unitarian Universalist church being called to be in the twenty-first century? In this paper I will explore the theological trajectory of Unitarianism since William Ellery Channing's "Unitarian Christianity" in 1819, through transcendentalism and the swing back toward a more traditional theism articulated by Bellows, and the humanist response in the twentieth century. I will attempt to describe our current context, and articulate a vision for Unitarian Universalism for the coming decades.

One of my goals for this class has been to come to a better understanding of the theological movement in Unitarian Universalist history, of how we got to where we are today. My hope was that if I understood this progression, I might be a more effective advocate for Unitarian Universalists to claim their own religious tradition. Part of our tendency at the radical edge of the Reformation is to look more forwards than backwards, and so to have little idea of where we have been. I might be able to convince Unitarian Universalists that they are part of the liberal Christian tradition, even if they do not choose to identify as Christian. Perhaps more Unitarian Universalists might come to see Christian faith's potential for transformation and liberation.

Channing's sermon "Unitarian Christianity" articulates the theological differences between the emerging Unitarians and their Calvinist brethren. David Robinson notes the importance of this moment for Channing and for Unitarianism:

The widening of Channing's perspective from the specific rebuttal of Morse and Evarts(1) to the posture of denominational definition in "Unitarian Christianity" is a paradigm for his entire career. Moreover, his career itself is a paradigm for the Unitarian movement in its change from negation of Calvinism to radical affirmation of human nature.(2)

Though the more orthodox Calvinists did not see it this way, Channing was "a reformer, not a radical."(3) Robinson observes that the Baltimore sermon makes it clear "that the Unitarians still saw theirs as a biblical religion well into the nineteenth century. Channing saw the essential difference between Calvinist and Unitarian Christianity as one of scriptural interpretation, with differing methods of interpretation resulting in differences of doctrine."(4) Channing's approach to the Bible is remarkably contemporary:

the different portions of this book, instead of being confined to general truths, refer perpetually to the times when they were written, to states of society, to modes of thinking, to controversies in the church, to feelings and usages which have passed away, and without the knowledge of which we are constantly in danger of extending to all times, and places, what was of temporary and local application.(5)

Channing's call for methods of interpretation that take context into account are, in some circles, still radical today. Would more Unitarian Universalists study the Bible if they felt they had the permission and the authority to wrestle with it, and if they knew Channing advocated this almost two hundred years ago?

Channing called his orthodox critics to be more Christian with their liberal brethren, and stood strongly against sectarianism. Describing the history of Christian persecution of heretics, he declared:

An enemy to every religion, if asked to describe a Christian, would, with some show of reason, depict him as an idolater of his own distinguishing opinions, covered with badges of party, shutting his eyes on the virtues, and his ears on the arguments, of his opponents, arrogating all excellence to his own sect and all saving power to his own creed, sheltering under the name of pious zeal the love of domination, the conceit of infallibility, and the spirit of intolerance, and trampling on men's rights under the pretense of saving their souls.(6)

It's important to remember that Channing offered this critique of a Christian history he saw himself as standing squarely within. What would he say to Unitarian Universalists today, who struggle with both internal pluralism as well as with interfaith relations?

Church history seems to be full of unintended consequences. One generation opens a door, and the next generation may drive a truck through it! Perhaps this is a reason some cling to orthodoxy. Robinson describes this movement, which Channing and other liberals initiated, the consequences of which they could not have imagined:

Almost as soon as Unitarianism achieved an identity, it produced its own rebellion, Transcendentalism. . . . a highly individualistic version of Unitarianism, disposed against ecclesiastical organization, and more reformist in its political outlook, within the limits of its individualism. The same sort of radical individualism in religion, although based on different philosophical tenants, would emerge later as "Free Religion" and "Humanism" in the denomination.(7)

Ralph Waldo Emerson is the most famous of the Transcendentalists. His own life in and out of ministry epitomizes the tensions that continue to exist within Unitarian Universalism. Called to Boston's Second Church, he liked preaching, but was less enthusiastic about the other duties of being a pastor. When he asked his congregation to allow him not to administer the Lord's Supper, and they were understandably unable to do so, he resigned his pastorate.(8)

Emerson's resignation was only the beginning of his new career as lecturer, essayist, and poet, a career that brought him to the fountainhead of American literature. But his resignation also signaled the stirrings of a movement of rebellion with the Unitarian denomination, called by its supporters the "new views" or "absolute religion" and by the opposition "Transcendentalism" or, more bluntly, "infidelity." Transcendentalism became the popular (and confusing) label for the movement whose fundamental ideas Emerson would later insist were "the very oldest of thoughts cast into the mould of these new times."(9)

Ironically, the Transcendentalists were named derisively by their opponents just as the liberal generation before them have been named Unitarian. Perry Miller understands this movement as one against a different kind of orthodoxy that Channing's generation faced:

Unitarianism, viewed in the larger perspective of modern intellectual history, was a form, the most institutionalized form, in which rationalism, "liberalism," and the cult of social conformity rather than of emotional intensity, were established in America. . . The Transcendentalists did not need to be unified upon any one creed or platform because they were already united in the community of the heart; they had all grown miserable and disgusted with what Emerson called "the corpse-cold Unitarianism of Brattle Street and Harvard College."(10)

Miller asserts that Transcendentalism must be understood in its religious context:

The real drive in the souls of the participants was a hunger of the spirit for values which Unitarianism had concluded were no longer estimable. It had, to all appearances irrevocably, codified into manageable and safe formularies appetites that hitherto in America had been glutted with the terrors of hell and the ecstasies of grace. Unless this literature be read as fundamentally an expression of a religious radicalism in revolt against a rational conservatism, it will not be understood.(11)

I believe both of these movements, early Unitarianism and Transcendentalism, can be seen as efforts to live faithfully and religiously in a particular time and context. Each emerged from the margins and pushed against what it saw as the excesses and faults of the center. But is that the future of liberal re-

ligion—to be continually splitting off, dividing like a cell or expanding ever outward like the exploding universe? If so, what happens to the church as an institution?

These are the questions which concerned Henry Whitney Bellows, whose “place in Unitarian history is that of a ‘churchman,’ rather than a theologian or a preacher.”(12) His address to Harvard Divinity School alumni in 1859, “A Suspense of Faith,” addressed this movement away from the center amidst the general skepticism of the age. Twenty-one years after the Divinity School Address, times had certainly changed. “If Emerson rocked the denomination with a call for radical individualism,” Robinson observes, “Bellows seems to have been almost as disquieting in arguing for a renewal of commitment to institutionalism—to the church in a traditional, although not a confining or conservative, sense.”(13)

I appreciate the fact that Bellows is not calling for a return to the theology or doctrines of the past, but rather he is urging Unitarians to build and maintain foundations under their dreams. His understanding of the human movement toward and away from God might also describe human attraction to and rejection of the church:

There are two motions of the spirit in relation to God, his Creator and upholder, essential to the very existence of generic or individual Man—a centrifugal and a centripetal motion—the motion that sends man away from God, to learn his freedom, to develop his personal powers and faculties, relieved of the over-awing and predominating presence of his Author; and the motion that draws him back to God, to receive the inspiration, nurture, and endowment, which he has become strong enough to hold.(14)

If people could live more into this both/and understanding of spirituality, then their faith lives would be richer and religious institutions would be healthier. Of course this awareness takes a certain level of maturity. The writer Donald Hall’s description of his minister Jack Jensen acknowledges this ebb and flow in human life:

On Saturday afternoons, for most of his life, he wrote his sermons. We heard him when he was spiritually alert and lively, and heard him when he was exiled and thirsty in the desert. When skepticism rode him as a jockey rides a horse, his sermons were historical and philosophical, dry but informative; but then the rains would come, especially during Advent when he waited again for the birth, or in contemplating personal saints like Dietrich Bonhoeffer.(15)

This perspective, and Bellows's, gives us permission to be human, to hold both our centrifugal and centripetal urges, to have more faith in the leadings of the heart. What does it take to have this faith?

David Robinson sees Bellows's importance in the fact that his critique looks beyond his own denomination:

The strength of Bellows's address, however, is his insistence that this phenomenon of doubt is not unique to the Unitarians but is a general condition of Protestantism and even a central fact of nineteenth-century culture. In Bellows's view, Unitarianism had put itself in the vanguard of Protestant development and therefore experienced earlier and more directly the nineteenth-century crisis of faith. "The underlying principles of and sentiments of the Unitarian body have turned out to be the characteristic ideas and tendencies of the religious epoch we live in. Protestantism produced us, not we it."(16)

Though some must have been offended by his call for the church to embrace its particular role, including its unique ability to provide ritual and sacrament, I appreciate Bellows for his willingness to make such a strong case for the church:

No lecture-room can do this; no preaching-man can do this; no thin, ghostly individualism or meager congregationalism can do this. It calls for the organic, instituted, ritualized, impersonal, steady, patient work of the Church—which, taking infancy into its arms, shall baptize it, not as a family custom, but a Church sacrament; which shall speak to the growing children by imaginative symbols and holy festivals—and not merely by Sunday-school lessons and strawberry-feasts; which shall confirm them and take them into the more immediate bosom of the Church as they attain adult years, and are about to step beyond the threshold of domestic life; which shall make both marriage and burial rites of the immediate altar—and give back to the communion-service the mystic sanctity which two centuries has been successfully striving to dispel, without gaining by this rationality any thing except the prospect of its extinction.(17)

I wonder, what would Unitarian Universalism be like today if we had not lost that link to the Christian church of the past, and had not cut ourselves off from our roots? Is it possible to hold both the freewheeling energy of the Transcendentalists and remained rooted in the traditions of the church? Is it possible that a certain amount of tradition and structure actually allow the church the freedom to respond to the times? James Luther Adams agrees with Bellows. He writes "I don't remember any essay by a Unitarian that makes such a cogent statement on the role of institutions as Bellows does . . . The idea is presented there that you can't deal with secularization unless you have some kind of institutionalization. This is his fundamental critique of liberal religion."(18)

Bellows found allies in the “Broad Church” group, whose members shared a pragmatic view of religion. One strength of this group was that its members were varied in their theological perspectives. Some leaned toward Transcendentalism while others were decidedly Christian. The emergence of this Broad Church view created a tension with those who shared “the legacy of Emerson and Theodore Parker, a legacy of individualist noncreedalism.” This legacy continued later in the century in the Free Religious Association.(19)

Robinson describes the early members of the Free Religious Association as:

an advance guard, generally ahead of the religious thinking of mainstream Unitarianism and thus fighting an often frustrating battle. But the direction of their thinking—away from supernaturalism toward science, away from theism toward Humanism, and away from ecclesiasticism toward social reform—charted important directions in denominational development in the 20th century.(20)

This movement among the radicals away from belief in God threatened to split the denomination. Theists believed that abandoning God was tantamount to giving up religion itself. The radicals feared an impending creedalism, which might result in exclusion from the denomination if they wouldn’t claim Christian or theist beliefs.

In 1887 the Western Conference of the American Unitarian Association attempted to resolve this conflict by drafting a statement of principles, “The Things Most Commonly Believed To-day Among Us.” Written by William Channing Gannett, this statement “has been recognized since as one of the most moving and accurate statements of faith among Unitarians.”(21)

Ironically, though this statement was explicitly theist, it opened the door to a wider Humanism in Unitarianism.

Although Gannett’s declaration was clearly conciliatory toward the majority of theists in the denomination at the time, it left open a distinctly naturalistic interpretation of religion . . . A “God” that could be thought of as “that Love with which our soul commune” was not necessarily a supernatural or transcendent being or even a being at all. God might be thought of simply as a name or symbol for the aspiring religious sensibility of humanity.(22)

Once again, a significant theological shift was underway in Unitarianism. As before, those at the more radical end of the spectrum, influenced by changes in the culture, moved in a new direction. In the past it had been away from the Trinity, or away from the institutionalized church. This time it was away from belief in God.

Humanism gradually gained ground in the twentieth century, until it became the most significant theological movement in the denomination since Transcendentalism. “Advocating science against supernaturalism, democracy against tyranny, reason against superstition, experience against revelation, humanists plowed new ground among the Unitarians, eventually achieving parity in numbers and influence with the liberal Christian position,” Conrad Wright observes.(23)

Two of the most active and vocal proponents of humanism were Curtis W. Reese and John H. Dietrich. Reese proposed “a ‘Democratic’ approach to theology, one that upset all hierarchy, even that of God.”(24) Both men came to Unitarianism after serving as ministers in other more conservative denominations, Reese as a Southern Baptist and Dietrich in the Reformed church. The tendency toward radicalism that pushed them out of their original churches led Dietrich and Reese to also push against the margins of Unitarianism. Charles F. Potter, originally a Baptist minister, was another humanist leader. Robinson observes that:

these men represent a challenge the denomination had to face increasingly in the twentieth century, especially in the West—to provide an institutional home for many who outgrew their previous one, “come-outers” from other denominations who were not committed to Unitarianism by birth or tradition but saw in it something they could not find in another more conservative faith.(25)

In 1920, Harvard was the site for yet another momentous address. Speaking to the Harvard Summer School of Theology, Reese opened by saying “Historically the basic content of religious liberalism is spiritual freedom.” Robinson says “content” is the operative word:

As Reese phrased it, freedom is not the attitude, the stance, or the gesture of liberalism but its content. In other words, there is no content to liberal belief in the ordinary sense of a set of accepted beliefs or truths or in the sense of a creed, even an unofficial one. The initial rejection of creed, stated as an affirmation of freedom, led Reese to argue that ‘Liberalism has insisted on the essentially natural character of religions.’ For Reese,, the ultimate goal of liberal theology was a purely naturalistic faith, which he saw emerging in the Humanist movement.(26)

Like their predecessors in the Free Religious Movement, “the Humanists were convinced that the acceleration of change in the modern world would necessarily change religious faith. They saw themselves less as innovators of a new faith than as men working to preserve the essential elements of religion in the face of radical change.”(27)

What are those essential elements? John Haynes Holmes saw Humanism as evidence that “the supernatural is everywhere giving way before the natural,” bringing forth a new kind of religion. In this way the Humanists saw themselves following in the footsteps of Emerson, Parker and others who sought “the pursuit of religion in a perfect and absolute sense.”(28)

Of course not all Unitarians saw it this way. Some feared this movement away from God would mean the end of religion. Others were wary of Humanism’s ability to sustain the spirit, given its focus only on the human sphere. Dietrich argued that Humanism “is merely an expansion, and a more rigorous application of Unitarianism.” He saw Channing’s emphasis on human worth as a precursor to Humanism: “Even Channing rested his idea of the dignity of man upon the thought that he had within him the germ of the idea of God. . . . But our idea of the glory of humanity is not based on any reflected glory.”(29)

Though there were clear differences between Humanists and theists, Robinson stresses that there was also some things held in common. Frederick May Eliot, though a theist, judged Humanism by its fruits, and saw it as providing what more orthodox religion had offered in an earlier age, a way to sustain people in an honestly lived faith. Further, Humanism offered its adherents a way to live out that faith. Eliot observed “The really important thing about those people (Humanists) is that they care, and care tremendously, for human values. It is moral passion that provides the dynamic for their intellectual efforts and their homiletical endeavors.”(30)

I appreciate this articulation of Humanism. Its focus on the real life impact of one’s faith is an honest check on religion’s tendency toward self-serving piety and moralism. All religions ought to be humanist, in that they strive to make life better on earth. But why should we stop at humanity? I know some Christians who see the animal kingdom as an equal part of God’s realm. Does Humanism tend to elevate homo sapiens and therefore lead to the domination of other species?

In my own experience in the Unitarian Universalist church, I have experienced some Humanists whose theology is more negative than positive. They define their beliefs not by what they are for, but by what they are against. This has been a long-standing issue for those of us at the radical edge of the

Reformation. In my experience, some people identify as Humanist because they are not-theist and definitely not-Christian. This becomes a problem when this perspective is coupled with the attitude that one's beliefs are superior to those of others. Reacting against Christian exclusivism (which Unitarian Universalists rightly challenge), Humanist exclusivism is no better.

In some instances this may be more of a pastoral than a theological issue. In the twentieth century, Unitarian Universalism became an attractive alternative for many people who experienced other churches as unwelcoming or abusive. At its best, the Unitarian Universalist church is a place where people can come to terms with their previous experiences. At its worst, the cycle continues. The following is a posting I found on the UUA web site, part of an ongoing dialogue about the "language of reverence" conversation initiated by UUA president Bill Sinkford:

I attended Sinkford's sermon at U.C. Evanston, Ill., on May 4, 2003 and found it very reminiscent of my childhood Church of England in concept and vocabulary (theology, sin, forgiveness, god). I asked him afterwards about the inclusion of humanists in Unitarian Universalist and he replied that Unitarian Universalist is pluralist. It does not seem that way to me.

This is a retreat to the reassurance of religion when we are not in control (witness post 9/11, near death of Sinkford's son). Worldwide it seems the more fundamental the religion the more attractive in uncertain times. Not a good thing, in my opinion.

It seems that here are plenty of other religions with dogma much like the one Sinkford spoke of on Sunday. Is his new vision pluralist enough to include all non-godly, non-spiritual people? Or are we a minority breed that are disappearing? I get my sense of order, hope, and comfort from science and knowledge not from god. Maybe we are few in number but we might help to prevent a reversal to the Dark Ages. And we don't have any other place to go.(31)

It is my sense that those whose belief systems are based primarily in opposition to other faiths are missing the life-affirming message of Humanism. I'm reminded of an old Peanuts cartoon, in which Linus says, "I love humanity, it's people I can't stand."

Is Unitarian Universalism bound to spin itself apart, victim of a theological centrifugal force? At times I have had this fear. Is this Association strong enough, flexible enough, to hold such seemingly divergent beliefs as Christianity, Humanism and even Atheism? Like Henry Bellows, I believe in the church as a unique institution in society. I think Bellows would be pleased by the emergence of an

effort to intentionally address Unitarianism's struggles with its own pluralism—the Commission on Appraisal.

I was struck by the self-critical tone of the first C.O.A. report, published in 1936. It offered an unflinching critique of the challenges facing the denomination, some of which persist today—tendencies toward isolation, individualism, self-satisfaction, defensiveness. The report said “the supreme need of the denomination today is a revival of faith in itself as the instrument for bringing spiritual forces to bear upon the immediate problems of the world.”(32)

In 1997 the Commission on Appraisal published a new report, titled *Interdependence: Renewing Congregational Polity*. It addressed some of the same issues listed above, and suggested that the time for individualism is past. “We are calling for a paradigm shift from individualism to interdependence, from the autonomy of the congregations to the community of autonomous congregations. . . The future integrity and vitality of the Unitarian Universalist movement depends most directly on deepening our sense of mutual accountability.”³³ Concerning the theological diversity that has been the focus of this paper, the C.O.A. observed that “in an attempt to address both majority and minority theological views, some of our congregations have approached theology from ‘the least common denominator’ perspective so as not to offend anyone.” The report also addressed theological biases within Unitarian Universalism: “In spite of our fourth Principle—to affirm and promote ‘a free and responsible search for truth and meaning’—it seems fair to say that both anti-Christian and anti-Pagan biases exist among a significant number of Unitarian Universalists.”(34)

My study of Bellows and others in the broad church movement causes me to wonder if the theism/Humanism debate, or other theological disagreement, are dangerous sidetracks, arguments about things we can never finally prove or resolve. Perhaps we all need to be more concerned about being faithful (however we may interpret that), and less concerned about how orthodox or unorthodox one's faith is. Can we all affirm that we are people on the way together, “walking together,” as Conrad Wright would say?

Christian feminist theologian Rosemary Radford Ruether has critiqued Christianity's tendency toward dualism which denies its own syncretistic history. She argues that “today this role of Christianity as synthesizer of of major Hebraic, Oriental, and Greco-Roman thought should be recognized as a strength, rather than a ‘secret’ to be denied. . . Today's eco-spiritual crisis demands a synthesizing creativity of ever greater expansiveness.”(35) I believe this dualistic tendency does not belong just to Christianity, but is an integral part of the Western philosophical tradition. The early Christian communities seemed to enjoy quite a range of theological diversity, and heresy was not the pressing issue it

later became. Might we begin to question our own Western, post-Enlightenment assumptions? Might we move beyond dualism to a greater appreciation of both our particular faith commitments and our rich diversity of religious expressions?

I conclude with these words from Jack Mendelsohn, who calls us to remember what liberal religion is, and to live into that faith:

“Nothing is secure,” says Emerson, “but life, transition, and the energizing spirit.” With this perspective, we achieve a larger and revitalized conception of liberal faith. If we would find solid ground beneath our feet, we must have courage enough to give up our illusions of a protected life and accept our role as servants of life, agents of transition, and incarnations of the energizing spirit, subject to all the stresses and shocks of life, but confident and buoyant through them all. This is the liberal spirit at its greatest, not a petty search for protection or a pinched hope of piecemeal benevolence, but the wonderful adventure of life itself, as solemn as a world that is dying and as supple as a world that is waiting to be born; as expectant as souls who see clearly what is required of them and rise empowered to make and meet a better future. This kind of liberal spirit is solid ground, and when we have discovered it, and made it our own, nothing can take it away.(36)

Notes

1. Jedidiah Morse and Jeremiah Evarts, Calvinist defenders of the orthodox faith.
2. David Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), 33.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, 32.
5. "Unitarian Christianity" [web site on-line] (accessed 5 May, 2004) available from Transcendentalists.com.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Robinson, 5.
8. *Ibid.*, 253.
9. *Ibid.*, 75.
10. Perry Miller, *The Transcendentalists: An Anthology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 7-8.
11. *Ibid.*, 8.
12. Robinson, 88.
13. *Ibid.*
14. "The Suspense of Faith, A Discourse on the State of the Church" [web site on-line] (accessed 5 May, 2004) available from Meadville.edu.
15. Donald Hall, *Life Work* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993), 7.
16. Robinson, 89.
17. "The Suspense of Faith, A Discourse on the State of the Church" [web site on-line] (accessed 5 May, 2004) available from Meadville.edu.
18. James Luther Adams, *An Examined Faith*, ed. George K Beach (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), 30.
19. Robinson, 88.
20. *Ibid.*, 107–08.
21. *Ibid.*, 121.
22. *Ibid.*, 143.
23. Conrad Wright, *A Stream of Light: A Short History of American Unitarianism* (Boston: Skinner House Books, 1989), 111, 113.
24. Robinson, 144.

25. Ibid., 145.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., 148.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 149.
30. Ibid., 150.
31. Unitarian Universalist Association [web site on-line] (accessed 5 May, 2004) available from the Internet.
32. Unitarian Universalist History [web site on-line] (accessed 5 May, 2004) available, only privately, from the Internet.
33. Commission on Appraisal, Unitarian Universalist Association, *Interdependence: Renewing Congregational Polity* (Boston UUA., 1997), 3.
34. Ibid., 145–46.
35. Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1992), 230.
36. Jack Mendelsohn, *Being Liberal in an Illiberal Age: Why I Am a Unitarian Universalist* (Boston: Skinner House Books, 1995), 16.