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I read with great interest the article by William S. Hatcher. The addition of a fifth unseen force of evolution (God) “different from all other [four] forces that science has so far discovered” (13) makes me ask again about the unity or oneness of creation. I wonder if gravity, the strong and weak nuclear forces, and the electromagnetic force are not themselves what the author calls “relative but temporary equilibrium states” (8) that, in the name of the oneness of God and the oneness of creation, could be considered modifications of the one force “in continual motion” (8). When the author argues that “according to our present knowledge, no other force [other than a quite different one] could have produced the phenomenon of evolution” (13), I wonder if the four forces in their temporary equilibrium have settled into a plateau and remained there not as fossils but as self-contained dynamisms. This leads me to ask if we should not distinguish between force and its various states of relative equilibrium and, with reference to the untapped and therefore still disordered operations of the human brain, recognize the necessity of those states of equilibrium for the radical, disequilibrating ascent of humankind beyond them. Does the order which equilibrium provides allow for the radical disorder that attends the recent emergence of the “end product” of evolution? Evolution might then be, in and as humankind, not a different force, but the one force in a more recent and far more complex state of disequilibrium, its continual motion having not yet resolved itself in humankind, because of the very nature of subjectivity, into something analogous to, though more complex than, the less complex equilibrium of the force of gravity. The author invites us to imagine a “chaos” before gravity when unsupported objects moved randomly in all directions rather than downward. Subjectivity can still appear similarly unsupported, moving randomly in all directions.

I think particularly of the modern rediscovery of the unconscious as a crucial factor in that subjectivity. Freud, for example, dealt almost entirely with such lawless psychic motion (which is how the unconscious appeared to manifest itself) in an effort to formulate a hypothesis that would impose an order or law upon it. Evolution, he was convinced, would not be raised to the full stature of its inherent order until the law governing the psyche (psychology) was discovered. Sexuality, Jung was persuaded, was not that law.

I myself wonder if the ultimate “mystical” state of that subjectivity—the true poverty and absolute nothingness described in Bahá’u’lláh’s The Seven Valleys and the Four Valleys, which is in some sense the annihilation of subjectivity—may perhaps in those few persons who achieve it complete the work of God, the creation (force of evolution) itself settling into an ultimate equilibrium that is
the continual objective motion or the motion of the unmoved Prime Mover. Does this state in part describe the station of the Manifestation, the knowledge of which is identical with our knowledge of our true selves? Do we, in this state, know the God who is closer to us than our own life-vein? Dante describes such motion in the concluding cantos of his *Divine Comedy*.

My reservation about this article resides in the statement in the abstract that the phenomenon of evolution “represents a persistent movement from disorder towards order of the kind that strongly suggests the action of some unobservable force different from all other forces [that science has] so far discovered” (1; emphasis added). If God, as presented in this article’s scientific proof, is an “unobservable force different from all other forces [that science has] so far discovered,” is not the author suggesting that we have only recently discovered God in and as the force of evolution, which is “different from all other forces [that science has] so far discovered”? Is he not suggesting that we have only very recently discovered God? I would willingly acknowledge that the force of evolution, as the author explains it according to the logic of scientific truth, is a new revelation of God that radically changes our earlier nonevolutionary perception of the creation. On the basis of the author’s “scientific proof,” I would indeed identify this force with Bahá’u’lláh’s “new creation,” which has replaced our earlier conceptions (“Lo, the entire creation hath passed away!”).1 Indeed, I am made vividly aware of the central role of evolution in the Revelation of Bahá’u’lláh including, above all, Progressive Revelation.

My one quarrel, then, is with the author’s phrase “different from.” I would suggest that the force of evolution might be a radical modification of the one force (Shelley’s “one Spirit’s plastic stress”) released from the equilibria the author describes to produce the “chaos” of a transition from one state of a dynamical system to another infinitely more complex state, which after some 50,000 years remains yet disordered. This article makes me aware of how recent this new state of disequilibrium actually is: 50,000 years is hardly long enough to establish the kind of equilibrium toward which evolution is moving at the human level. The process from one-celled animals took some 600 million years, and from algae perhaps 2 billion years. The Earth itself has existed for perhaps about 4.5 billion years. Therefore, 50,000 years strikes me as, relatively speaking, minutes ago. And, then, beyond time itself, there is God, “veiled in My immemorial being and the ancient eternity of My essence” knowing love for all that is eternally mentally present to God (“I knew My love for thee, therefore I created thee”).2 That this love is now consummating itself as the earth itself, the physical reality of humankind (“we will mean the physical human being and

---

not the human being in any metaphorical, cultural, or spiritual sense" [Hatcher 12]) is, I suspect, the evolutionary work of the next 500,000 years, which is the length of the Baha'i dispensation understood as the fulfillment as distinct from preparation. In short, I see the force of evolution producing in the brain as a physical organ the body's consciousness of itself, which is to say, creation's consciousness of itself as that consciousness exists from all eternity in the mind of God. Evolution achieves its highest state of equilibrium in the achievement of a consciousness of its own process, as the physical human being's consciousness of itself. Psyche and soma, mind and body, are one. The Cartesian split is healed, the split being merely the condition necessary to consciousness, though not consciousness itself.

Perhaps the greatest immediate value of the author's "scientific proof" for me is the removal of chance, which in its own way affirms what is the opposite of chance: providence. The radical disorder that currently confronts humanity on every side does indeed become "providence" rather than "calamity." I try, often in vain, to "Know this, O servant."3 According to the second law of thermodynamics as the author describes it, the "calamity" arises from a deluded effort to inhabit an isolated (or abrogated) system, such as a previous dispensation, or my own (or humanity's) infancy, childhood, or adolescence. Such systems, when viewed in isolation as fixed and final (arrested developments), will, as the author argues in a different context, necessarily "degenerate toward disorder" (10) unless energy from without (as in photosynthesis within the leaf subsystem of the plant) is absorbed. I associate that absorption of energy from without (Progressive Revelation) with maturity, the coming of age of myself and of the human race.

Though it is easy enough to view this coming of age psychologically as a growth from within grounded in biology (as the atheist Freud did in his sexual theory and the atheist Marx did in his notion of dialectical materialism), Hatcher's scientific argument persuades me that the force is indeed objective and without. The coming of age is the action of God. To view my own maturity in this way is to view it very differently indeed. It is the action of an ultimately unknowable force, which reveals itself in Baha'u'llah.

The author points out that photosynthesis uses direct sunlight as an outside energy source. Direct sunlight is the metaphor that both Baha'u'llah and 'Abdu'l-Bahá use to describe the energy of God progressively released like the sun's rays by the Manifestation. Scientific metaphors of this sort become the parables through which 'Abdu'l-Bahá tended to teach. If I compare 'Abdu'l-Bahá's teaching to that, say, of Christ, I note how Christ compared the Kingdom in his time to a little child and how 'Abdu'l-Bahá consistently compared it to the mature adult. In other words, he identified creation with

maturity, coming of age, while Christ tended to identify it with childhood. I would say that the degeneration of the Christian system lay in the persistence of this now outworn identification. Christianity became, with time, humanity arrested in childhood. The infant Christ at the breast of the mother became one of its major icons.

Clearly, the author follows in ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s footsteps when Hatcher declares that he is presenting “a somewhat detailed reformulation of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s argument using certain contemporary scientific terms that were not current at the time ‘Abdu’l-Bahá wrote” (1). I am sure some of Hatcher’s readers will find the mature demands of his scientific logic a painful break with the now easier, less conscious demands of childhood and adolescence.

If the force of evolution did not operate objectively from without, we would remain bound to these earlier stages of our own human growth. The energy that Bahá’u’lláh released would, if bound to infancy, childhood, and adolescence, destroy humanity in its arrested state, as indeed it has (“The time for the destruction of the world and its people hath arrived” 4). To read and grasp this article is one way of escaping that destruction by embracing the coming of age which the author’s argument demands. There are, of course, many other ways, those that relate directly to the heart being finally more essential because the heart is, as the Hidden Words declare, God’s human home. Fully to reside there, as a part of its sanctification, the intelligence or rational soul must, however, be brought into play. This, I believe, Hatcher has in the spirit of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá done superbly.
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