

A wide, sandy beach with footprints leading towards a cloudy sky. The sky is filled with large, grey clouds, and the sun is visible through a break in the clouds, creating a bright spot. The beach is covered in footprints, suggesting a path leading towards the horizon.

Faithful

Doubt

The Wisdom of Uncertainty

Guy Collins



FAITHFUL DOUBT

James Clarke & Co

and

The Lutterworth Press

Click on the links above to see our full
catalogue for more excellent titles in
Hardback, Paperback, PDF and Epub!

Faithful Doubt

ISBN: 9780718843755

C

L

Would you like to join our Mailing List?

[Click here!](#)

FAITHFUL DOUBT
The Wisdom of Uncertainty

Guy Collins



The Lutterworth Press

The Lutterworth Press

P.O. Box 60

Cambridge

CB1 2NT

United Kingdom

www.lutterworth.com

publishing@lutterworth.com

ISBN: 978 0 7188 9393 4

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A record is available from the British Library

First published by The Lutterworth Press, 2015

Copyright © Guy Collins, 2014

Published by arrangement
with Cascade Books

All rights reserved. No part of this edition may be reproduced, stored electronically or in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher (permissions@lutterworth.com).

For Kristin, Lyra, and Beatrix

Materialists and madmen never have doubts.

—G. K. CHESTERTON

For the more conscious becomes the belief, so the more conscious becomes
the unbelief: indifference, doubt and skepticism appear . . .

—T. S. ELIOT

With knowledge comes more doubt.

—GOETHE

C O N T E N T S

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction xi

- 1 **Uncertain Truths 1**
 - The Logic of Certainty 4
 - Memory Loss 14
 - On Not Knowing 17
 - Doubting Wisely 21

- 2 **After Reason 24**
 - First Paradigm—The Force 32
 - Second Paradigm—The Cylons 35
 - Intermission—Beyond the Cogito 41
 - Third Paradigm—Scientific Monasticism 43
 - The Future Is Now 46
 - The Sacrality of the Secular 47

- 3 **The Impossible 52**
 - Questioning God 58
 - Divine *différance* 62
 - Tout autre est tout autre* 67
 - The Impossibles: Derrida's Paradoxes 69
 - Forgiving Religion? 74

- 4 **Diabolical Deities 80**
 - Denying Hell 85
 - The Devil Is Not in the Detail 93
 - Beyond Anthropomorphism: Augustine 96
 - Beyond Being 99

- 5 **Holy Agnosis** 102
The Banality of Evil 105
Beyond Augustine? The Challenge of Eleanore Stump 109
- 6 **True Fiction** 119
Ruffian or Saint? 120
Babel 125
The Book of Nature and the Theological Origins of Science 128
Paying Tribute with a Little Help from Augustine 133
The Good Samaritan 137
Fiction Sets You Free 138
- 7 **Redeeming Atheism** 142
The Divinity of Atheism 146
The Potentiality of Atheism 155
- 8 **Breach** 169
Faithful Fragments 169
 On Somewhat Disagreeing with Kierkegaard 174
Miéville's Breach 176
The Fiction that I Am 180
 The Structure of Desire 186
 Beyond Faith or Doubt 189
The Faith of the Faithless 190
Divine Breach 193
The Poetry of Faith 194
- Bibliography* 197

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The idea for this book arose out of experiences as a student first at The University of St. Andrews, Scotland, and later at The University of Cambridge, England. I am grateful both to those who taught me, and those I studied alongside. In particular, I owe significant debts to Daphne Hampson and Graham Ward. Their teaching made possible the trajectory of inquiry that this book explores.

More recently, my thanks go to two communities in Hanover, New Hampshire: the people of St. Thomas, and the students of Dartmouth College. Their hospitality to both faith and doubt has been a tremendous gift.

I remain grateful to Jolyon Mitchell, Gavin Hyman, and George Pattison for giving significant help along the way. All mistakes are very much my own.

Thanks also go to those who have granted permission to use previously published material: A stanza of the poem “AD” by R. S. Thomas from *Collected Later Poems 1988–2000* (Bloodaxe, 2004) appears with permission of the publisher on behalf of the estate of R. S. Thomas; Oxford University Press for permission to include in chapter 3 material of my own from “Thinking the Impossible: Derrida and the Divine,” *Literature and Theology* 14 (2000).

Finally, thanks go to my wife, Kristin, for seemingly endless reserves of patience and perseverance that helped bring this to fruition.

Hanover, New Hampshire
The Feast of St. Lucy, 2013

INTRODUCTION

What is true, then, is an experience of faith, and this is as true for agnostics and atheists as it is for theists. Those who cannot believe still require religious truth and a framework of ritual in which they can believe.

—SIMON CRITCHLEY¹

Theology, it seems, is often most influential where it is least obvious.

—MARK C. TAYLOR²

And, perhaps, the true communion with Christ, the true *imitatio Christi*, is to participate in Christ's doubt and disbelief.

— SLAVOJ ŽIŽEK³

We live in an age of doubt, and we have been living like this for quite some time. This work investigates doubt, and the relationship it has to faith. One of the great moments in the history of doubt was Matthew Arnold's 1867 poem "Dover Beach" and its evocative description of the "melancholy, long withdrawing roar" of a "Sea of Faith" in full retreat. At the end of the twentieth century the theologian Don Cupitt drew upon Arnold's poem to frame his own exploration of the history of

1. Critchley, *Faith of the Faithless*, 3.
2. Taylor, *Moment of Complexity*, 180.
3. Žižek, *Puppet and the Dwarf*, 102.

the flight of faith.⁴ The genius of Cupitt and Arnold was to crystallize how old certainties have long been ebbing away. However, while the sea of faith has been pulling back for generations, the work of exploring the littoral expanse uncovered in its wake is still in relative infancy. Relatively few theologians have studied the absence of faith, just as few non-theologians have felt the urge to think much about a faith perceived as absent. When reflection on the status of faith in non-theological circles does occur it is frequently assumed that the withdrawal of faith is an epochal event that has its natural conclusion in secularization.

Nonetheless, the triumph of the secular is no longer self-evident or uncontested. Religious faith is in decline, barely on life support in many places, yet it refuses to die. While citizens in the West do not take faith as seriously as they did in the relatively recent past, faith is far from entirely absent. Contemporary theology is always situated within this oscillation between the absence and presence of faith. This manifests on the one hand in theologians plumbing the depths of secular atheist thought. On the other hand, significant thinkers who make no claim to faith are returning to examine the nature of faith. As the atheist philosopher Simon Critchley notes, faith is no longer just for the faithful: it is also a key part of the identity of those he names the “faithless.”⁵ Others such as Giorgio Agamben have drawn attention to the dependence on the sacred of secularization itself, revealing the hidden theological genealogy of much that is secular within modern Western society.

This work starts from the assumption that both the religious and the non-religious (as well as the undeclared) have much to learn from those like Agamben, Critchley, and Cupitt who venture out to chart the liminal, uncertain, and ever-changing terrain exposed by the withdrawal of the sea of faith. There is also another purpose to this work. It has never been particularly fashionable for theologians not to believe. The theologian is actually in something of a double bind. Unless central tenets of belief are questioned the theologian can never really come to grips with, far less understand, the deep-seated questions of those who do not have religious beliefs. However, questioning belief too intensely can also lead to trouble. At the risk of getting into trouble this work starts from the premise that if faith is to have intellectual, emotional, or spiritual vitality it will need to come to a more serious understanding of doubt. What follows is

4. Cupitt, *The Sea of Faith*.

5. Critchley, *The Faith of the Faithless*.

therefore an attempt at responding to Richard Kearney's suggestion that faith engage wholeheartedly with atheism in order to properly appreciate the divine.⁶

One of the predicaments facing exponents of doubt is the age-old question of whether the path of doubt leads inevitably into plain denial. Remembering the character of philosophical skepticism can be informative at this point. Philosophical skepticism is less the outright rejection of one specific truth than the realization that there may be more than one way of looking at things. It seems hard to argue that such a kind of skepticism might be of considerable help to theology. However, it is also part of the argument of this book that even outright atheism may be a powerful resource for strengthening theology and faith.

In noting that theology is at its most influential "where it is least obvious," Mark C. Taylor invites us to recognize the theological underpinning of disciplines not known for their theology. The original context for this remark was an exploration of the similarity between Charles Darwin's model for evolution and Adam Smith's theory of the invisible hand of the market. Both offer models of complex systems that construct meaning by understanding the interplay between multiple parts and a wider whole. To put it another way, both are secularized versions of the idea of God's guiding providence. Taylor understands that trying to effect a clear demarcation of the theological from the secular can be a losing battle and ultimately incoherent. Evolution and economics may (for some at least) epitomize faithless rationality, but more and more thinkers are discovering quite serious theological genealogies and underpinnings. If theology remains enduringly influential where least obvious, then what could be less obvious, and therefore potentially more influential, than secular questions of doubt, denial, and disbelief?

This is not, of course, by its very nature altogether obvious. Christianity does not have a good track record when it comes to doubt. Skepticism, doubt, and even disarmingly simple questions have all been viewed negatively at one time or another—which is somewhat strange given the history of Christian theology. Christianity has always had an uncanny knack for adapting to different cultures, adopting their various principles and neuroses. It is also hard to think of a single significant theologian who did not explicitly develop theology as the exploration of lines of questioning. During the Middle Ages such lines of inquiry,

6. Kearney, *Anatheism*.

questions (*quaestiones*), were the very lifeblood of theology. However, throughout history theology has been concerned with translating and shuttling between the divine and the secular, adapting to new categories of thought and continually learning from changing contexts. It is a truism, but nonetheless helpful to remember, that there has never been a point of universal harmony within theology. Instead, through succeeding centuries Christianity has continued to morph and adapt against a backdrop of new questions and fresh concerns.

A thought-provoking illustration of this process of change and adaptation is seen in the critique Søren Kierkegaard leveled against the church of his day. Not content with the unchallenging theology coming from the pulpit, Kierkegaard accused the clergy of being cannibals. Kierkegaard could see how nineteenth-century clerics had turned the radical message of Jesus into a set of comfortable social conventions off of which they could make a good living.⁷ While Kierkegaard's language may have been intemperate, he realized that Christianity had fused into Christendom, and, along with it, the contemporary concern for ethics and morality over faith. Yet while Kierkegaard and others since have railed against Christianity accommodating itself too much to the world, today the situation is more often reversed. Rarely is Christianity accused of being too comfortable or congruent with the insights of our contemporary situation. More often Christianity is perceived as carrying a torch for views that are distinctly old-fashioned at best, and unhealthily world-denying at worst. To media and the academy alike, Christianity is often identified with criticisms of evolution and denials of scientific methodology. Add to this the perception that sexism, homophobia, and patriarchy are justified in the Bible and you have a recipe for viewing Christianity as a social and intellectual pariah. It is therefore little wonder that many thoughtful people find religion something incomprehensible and alien. Humanists reject beliefs that pit human against human as fundamentally incompatible with highest human aspirations. Atheists correctly note that there is neither overwhelmingly good evidence nor compelling logical arguments for there even being a God. The existence of evil, the hypocrisy of institutional religion, and the moral failings of ordinary believers all add to the case against faith.

In light of all this, it is only natural to wonder whether the divide between critically thinking doubters and religious adherents can ever

7. Kierkegaard's title to chapter 5 is revealing: "The priests are cannibals, and that in the most odious way." *Attack Upon "Christendom,"* 268.

be bridged. Two hundred years ago the German theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher wrestled with similar issues. In the educated opinion of his day, religion was perceived as crude and unsophisticated. In response Schleiermacher penned one of the great apologetic tracts of Christian thought, *Speeches to Cultured Despisers*. Schleiermacher was writing at the height of the Enlightenment, when philosophy and science seemed to be unconquerable. While many religious people feared the new Enlightenment insights, Schleiermacher was convinced that Christianity had nothing to lose from wholehearted engagement with new thinking. He believed that at its heart religion was the “sense and taste for the infinite.”⁸ To truly understand the infinite Schleiermacher was committed to the notion that educated skeptics might have something to contribute, and something to discover.

There are relatively few of Schleiermacher’s mindset in our own age. Pressure to disengage from debate comes from both church and academy. Many churches find appeals to emotions more successful than robust intellectual debate. Meanwhile higher education has increasingly retreated behind a smokescreen of sociology that sees theology and faith as quaint and old-fashioned practices of a dim and distant man-eating tribe. Worse still are the occasional public forays into debate of scientific skeptics and militant believers. In the mud-slinging that accompanies these mercifully rare exchanges, it is hard to discern much on either side to commend healthy debate or mutual understanding. Churches themselves bear a large burden of responsibility for the paucity and shallowness of contemporary debates. Christianity is far from perfect; and there are more than enough good reasons for people not to believe based on the actions and words of professing Christians. This work is not an attempt to argue anyone out of their profound reasons for disbelief. Many of the things educated skeptics do not believe are things that millions of other religious people simply do not believe. A literal seven-day creation, a four-thousand-year-old planet, the subjugation of women to men, the prohibition of shellfish, and rules against clothing of more than one fabric are all to be found in the Bible. However, doggedly believing such things to be timeless truths is profoundly inimical to Christianity and theologically incoherent.

Christianity’s worst enemies are not intelligent questioners, but those who produce the most noise in proclaiming their trust in Christ.

8. Schleiermacher, *On Religion*, 23.

This work hopes to present the case for an alternative response to Christianity. This alternative empathizes with those embarrassed at religion while making the case for a form of religious belief that is not entirely intellectually moribund. As such this work is neither a traditional apology for Christianity nor a rebuttal of atheist objections. Instead it is a friendly critique written from the perspective of someone who believes that Christianity's most impressive resources are sometimes better understood by outsiders to the church than insiders.

There is wisdom in the Christian church just as there is wisdom in the critiques and questions of skeptics. If educated twenty-first-century people are to make sense of religion it will be necessary to suspend embarrassment for a moment at the same time as keeping a tight grip on critical faculties. Believers also need to be willing to entertain the question that what they take for Christianity may actually be nothing more than a particularly popular and persistent form of idolatry. Each of these propositions is challenging in different ways for the skeptic and the believer. However, until the thought that something is not quite right with traditional views of Christianity is entertained it will not be possible to discover its uncomfortable truth.

G. K. Chesterton wryly noted how the only good argument against Christianity is Christians. However, just as individual Christians are the first to admit that they are individual works in progress, so theology reminds us that Christianity is still emerging, still being discovered, still "to come." The role of educated skeptics in this is unique: they are not the ones Christianity needs to fear, so much as the ones whose perspective and participation is essential to the future of theology and religious practice.

This book is not an attempt to prove central doctrines of Christianity beyond all reasonable doubt. That does not seem to be a sensible claim to make. Instead, the question that animates this book is whether reasonable doubt can tell us more about Christianity. We will see how theology makes more sense, not less, when doubting is affirmed and critical questions are allowed into the heart of theology. We will also discover how some of the most brilliant and illuminating theology has been inspired by, and originates in, sources and thinkers who have no particular loyalty or commitment to Christian theology. The atheist John Gray has written that Western humanism is itself a child of Christian theology.⁹ Atheist

9. Gray, *Straw Dogs*.

humanists and religious believers alike therefore share a common theological inheritance. It is therefore imperative to look more closely at the other in order to understand oneself. The remainder of this introduction gives an overview of how the book attempts to do this.

The first chapter explores the nature of the relationship between faith and doubt, and how the two are ineradicably connected. This leads into a discussion of fundamentalism, and an exploration of different forms of fundamentalist discourse. In chapter 2 science fiction is analyzed in an attempt to understand how rationality and religion have been imagined and creatively reimagined in the light of recent philosophical thought. The opposition of faith to reason that was dominant in modernity is not essential and it has been fruitfully reconfigured in both literature and film. This introduces the question of postmodernity, a topic that chapter 3 explores in greater depth through the thought of Jacques Derrida. New possibilities for making sense of religion arise from the decidedly non-theological experience of deconstructive thought. Derrida also reveals the importance of understanding impossibility as a philosophical concept that is not entirely foreign to the theological concept of paradox. Chapter 4 turns to more traditional theological questions with an examination of the dangers of anthropomorphism. Concentrating on the question of hell and the devil, this chapter explores some of the consequences of overly simplistic religious imagery. In chapter 5 more sophisticated responses to questions of evil are explored. The first part explores the question of the nature of evil, while the second part explores Eleanore Stump's case for discerning a reason for suffering and evil. The chapter concludes by noting how the atheist Slavoj Žižek essentially repeats the insight of both the book of Job and Donald MacKinnon in refusing to ascribe meaning to evil. Chapter 6 tackles the question of scriptural understanding, and asks whether there is a way of responding to the thorny problems raised by the Bible. This leads into a discussion of the relative purposes of theology and science, and how different narratives relate to one another. Chapter 7 focuses on atheism and is divided into two sections. The first part examines the links between emancipatory atheists and theologians who have anticipated certain atheist readings of Christianity arising from the death of Christ on the cross. The second part concentrates on the thought of Giorgio Agamben, and asks how his thought might prove beneficial for theology. Finally, chapter 8 returns to the question of how faith and reason might relate. Connections are drawn between the way Kierkegaard, Jacques Lacan, and Žižek theorize subjectivity. Unlike the certainty of the

Cartesian cogito, all three posit a broken, divided notion of subjectivity that requires an understanding of the importance of the other. Using the theme of breach as developed by China Miéville, the chapter argues for a reconfiguration of the relationship between faith and doubt.

In the New Testament Thomas the apostle is portrayed as doubting the resurrection of Jesus. It is significant that for the scriptural writers Thomas's experience is not excised. Instead, his doubts are held up as a legitimate response laden with meaning. Thomas is not deplored, rather he comes across as understandably human, asking for evidence before he commits himself. The question that runs through this work is whether Thomas might not simply be a saint but also a hero for our own times. Thomas's doubts did not derail the Christian narrative so much as draw attention on the marvel of the resurrection. By extension, what if critical skepticism is not a stumbling block but rather the only thing that can save Christianity from itself?

I

UNCERTAIN TRUTHS

I propose to establish progressive stages of certainty . . . But the mental operation which follows the act of sense I for the most part reject; and instead of it I open and lay out a new and certain path for the mind to proceed in, starting directly from the simple sensuous perception.

—FRANCIS BACON¹

But eventually I am forced to admit that there is nothing among the things I once believed to be true which it is not permissible to doubt - and not out of frivolity or lack of forethought, but for valid and considered reasons.

—RENÉ DESCARTES²

AT THE DAWN OF the seventeenth century two thinkers laid down foundations for modern science and modern philosophy. Francis Bacon affirmed the importance of the empirical, and matters of sense. René Descartes took the opposite approach, denying that anything could be proved other than the existence of the mind, and whether it was doubting or cogitating. Both thinkers have come to influence successive centuries of scientific and philosophical thought. While science has taken

1. Bacon, *The New Organon: Or True Directions Concerning the Interpretation of Nature*.

2. Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, 16.

2 Faithful Doubt

the Baconian “new and certain path,” philosophy has found it difficult to escape the Cartesian emphasis on both doubt and the centrality of the reasoning mind, the cogito. Each in their own way sought a solid foundation for their respective discipline. Yet the treatment of doubt within each thinker was remarkably different.

Today it is philosophically and theologically fashionable to critique the Cartesian reliance on the cogito, especially in light of the negative consequences this has had for our understanding of the status of the body. The dualism that places mind over body has not been healthy for society or theology. In turn, the Cartesian emphasis on the cogito has been connected with the production of other disconcerting dualisms, such as the hierarchical ordering of male over female. However, in the legitimate rush to exorcise theology from an over-dependence on the mind, or cogitation, the important role of doubt within the Cartesian cogito has been neglected. It can be argued that religion and theology have also found themselves divided between Baconian and Cartesian approaches to certainty and doubt. Both are strategies for dealing with doubt, but while both saw doubt as something to be overcome, Descartes also intuitively felt that doubt is uniquely important in developing deeper understanding.

Both Descartes and Bacon assumed that it was ultimately possible to escape doubt by providing solid rational foundations for knowledge. Yet in their different approaches, each created a different route for subsequent scientists and philosophers. As has recently been comprehensively argued, while science has continued to thrive using the empirical foundation developed by Bacon, subsequent philosophy has never been able to agree that Descartes’s solid foundations were any bit as firm as he believed.³ While the history of science is the history of building on the sturdy empirical foundations of Bacon, the subsequent history of philosophy is the story of a continuing questioning and doubting of whether reason alone can ever provide a firm foundation.

The desire to evade doubt was common to both Descartes and Bacon. But Descartes also recognized that doubt played an important role in constituting the subject. It was not simply something to be avoided, it was also a mechanism for helping discover the true foundation of thought. By contrast, doubt for Bacon was merely something to be avoided. At the same time, while Descartes assumed that belief in God was essential to the foundations of his rational system, Bacon’s system had no need

3. Gregory, *The Unintended Reformation*, 115–28.

of God. And so while Bacon's system was able to thrive without God, Descartes's system was undermined both by its inability to totally exclude doubt, and also, in time, by the apparent idiosyncrasy of a rational system that incorporated monotheistic belief. Neither Bacon nor Descartes could ever rid themselves of doubt, and as Giorgio Agamben has written scientific method may well have encouraged doubt for Descartes:

The view through Galileo's telescope produced not certainty and faith in experience but Descartes's doubt, and his famous hypothesis of a demon whose only occupation is to deceive our senses.⁴

Doubts about God and doubts about whether reason could really provide certainty undid Descartes. Yet trust in the verifiable and empirical reality of the external world ensured Bacon's views would remain abidingly influential. While Descartes continues to have a reputation as an arch-rationalist, his thought was never completely able to avoid something theology has always struggled with: the question of uncertainty.

While doubts are important to theology, there are many examples of Christian practice that appear to leave no room for doubt. Christianity has a far from perfect record in accommodating doubters, and for large sections of the faithful doubt appears to be anathema. This chapter examines why doubt presents such difficulties. It will consider the problems raised by uncertainty, and why this creates challenges both for theology and also for some of its ardent critics. The division between certainty and uncertainty, what for simplicity's sake we will telescope as a division between the Baconian and Cartesian, cannot simply be mapped onto the difference between religious and secular thought. Instead, it will become clear how even quite different religious and secular discourses come to resemble one another in the way that they prioritize either certainty or uncertainty. While religious faith can be strengthened when it is recast as a practice of radical uncertainty, too often it has instead been presented as providing ultimate assurance. If, as Descartes thought, doubt is the origin of wisdom, this chapter will explore what happens to theology when doubt is suppressed and only certainty remains.⁵

4. Agamben, *Infancy and History*, 20.

5. Although Descartes never used the words "doubt is the origin of wisdom" the persistent misattribution of this phrase to him is powerful testimony to the centrality that doubt plays in his thought.

4 Faithful Doubt

Bacon, like modern science, allows us to articulate and interpret the world in a more certain kind of way. However, in seeking certainty, this approach has to exclude anything that cannot be verified empirically. God clearly cannot be verified through sense experience, and so God can never be the subject of scientific study for Bacon. By contrast, Descartes was willing to broaden the remit of philosophy to incorporate matters of non-sense experience, like the divine. The tragedy of Descartes is that in seeking to discover a universal framework for reason, he ends up creating a rational system that ultimately has just as negative an effect on divinity and doubt as Bacon. Bacon's exclusion of both divinity and doubt in the construction of his system was successful, and the subsequent history of science bears this out. By contrast, Descartes's attempt to provide certain reasons for God at the same time as affirming the revelatory potential of doubt were not as long-lasting. One legacy of this is seen in the comparative strengths of the scientific and theological communities in academia and public life. Most intellectuals assume that somehow science and philosophy cannot coexist with belief in God. Equally, most Western societies today assume that philosophical or religious beliefs are inherently private matters open to doubt. Neither of these positions would have made sense to either Bacon or Descartes. The rest of this chapter will investigate how it is that the drift toward certainty continues to displace God. Along the way it will also become apparent how doubt is of more utility to religion and theology than has previously been recognized.

The Logic of Certainty

Religious fundamentalism and militant atheism have a number of compelling similarities.⁶ Each brooks no opposition, and both are powerfully certain of the rightness of their cause. Despite their very different responses to the question of God, both firmly believe they have a monopoly on truth. Given that many atheists start out as Christian, this is not itself

6. Using the word *fundamentalism* is provocative: it is certainly not a term of endearment. However, it is hard to find a better term to describe those who seek (and profess to find) absolute certainty in their religious tradition. For the purposes of this work, I will take it as self-evident that a (religious or non-religious) fundamentalist is someone who prizes certainty above all. In contrast to fundamentalism we will speak of flexibilism, flexibility, or those who are (religiously or non-religiously) flexible. *Flexibilism* does not appear to be a word, but I think it is eloquently self-explanatory, pertaining to those who seek flexibility over inflexibility. (Of course, fundamentalists could be designated inflexibilists, but this seems a superfluous neologism.)