CONTENTS   PAGE

IN THIS ISSUE: This issue is focused on MODERNITY and related
                   topics - inculturation, secularisation, social
transformation, world religions, traditional cultures.

        Inculturation is the dynamic relation between the Christian mes-
sage and culture or cultures; an insertion of the Christian life into
a culture; an ongoing process of reciprocal and critical interaction
and assimilation between them.   Today in our interdependent world,
modern technology and communications systems have spread throughout
the   world   thus deeply-affecting and transforming traditional
societies. Political, media and economic forces as well as urbaniza-
tion have reshaped values, life-styles and religious identity accross
national borders.

        This de facto diffusion of what is called modernity has affected
men   and   women everywhere regardless of their cultural roots.   Thus,
modernity represents a crucial challenge to a consistent evangeliza-
tion of today's world.   The values introduced by Modernity invite the
Church to rethink the Christian message and reshape its presentation
in order to reach the modern world from within its own positive mean-
ing and patterns. (Marcello Azevedo, S.J.).

SEDOS' Annual Seminar in March will focus on MODERNITY and its challenge to evangelization and inculturation.

All the articles in this issue of the Bulletin focus on various aspects of this theme. In the first article "Inculturation and Modernity", Peter Schineller, S.J. contends that the inculturation of Gospel values into the process of modernization is the most challenging and important place for inculturation to occur, more significant than Roman Catholic dialogue with other Christian Churches, with non-Christian religions and with traditional cultures.

In "Secularization and the Third World", Jean Bruls discusses the fundamental question: whether the fidelity of the Church to its mission of evangelization is better assured by the maintenance of its own institutions in the chiefly secular domains or by its loyal engagement in a secular program of human promotion, for which the state normally assumes responsibility?

What are the psychological characteristics of modern people who live in a world of plurality, of complexity, whose world is compartmentalized to the nth degree? Richard Knowles points out five characteristics and their impact on a faith commitment.

Marcello Azevedo, S.J, compares the structural elements of both modern and non-modern culture and cites contemporary examples of both types. In his second article, he discusses how biotechnologies have convinced modern humanity that it is master of its own destiny. Only an inculturated Church in dialogue with modernity might lead humanity to examine this naive assumption.

Wilfred Smith's contribution goes back to 1968. He examines the relationship between religions and culture and the "impact" of modernity on both.

Amata Miller, I.H.M, proposes strategies for involvement in social transformation.

(Pourquoi ce numéro consacré à la Modernité? L'inculturation est la rela tion dynamique entre le message chrétien et les cultures, l'insertion de la vie chrétienne dans une culture, un processus constant d'interactions mutuelles et critiqes et d'assimilation. De nos jours, dans notre monde interdépendant, les technologies modernes et les réseaux de communications se sont répandus jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre au point de toucher et de transformer profondément les sociétés traditionnelles. Les forces politiques, médiatiques et économiques et l'urbanisation ont transformé les valeurs, le style de vie et l'identité religieuse, par delà les frontiéres nationales.

Cette diffusion effective de ce que l'on appelle la Modernité a atteint les gens de partout quelles que soient leurs racines culturelles. La

modernité représente donc un défi décisif pour une évangélisation efficace du monde d'aujourd'hui. Les valeurs mises en lumiére par la modernité invitent l'Eglise à repenser le message chrétien et à reformuler sa présentation de facon à atteindre le monde moderne dans ses expressions et ses modèles les plus valables. (Marcello de Carvalho Azevedo, S.J.).

Le Séminaire annuel de SEDOS sera consacré à la modernité et à ses défis à l'evangélisation et à l'inculturation.

Tous les articles de de numéro du Bulletin concernent les divers aspects de ce théme. Dans le premier article "Inculturation et modernité", le P. Peter Schineller, S.J, affirme que l'inculturation des valeurs de la Bible dans le processus de la modernité est bien plus significative que le dialogue catholique romain avec les autres Eglises chrétiennes, avec les non-chrétiens et avec les cultures traditionnelles.

Dans "Sécularisation et Tiers-Monde", Jean Bruls examine le problème fondamental: la fidélité de l'Eglise à sa mission évangélisatrice est elle mieux garantie par le maintien de ses institutions propres dans les secteurs principalement séculiers que par un engagement loyal dans un projet séculier de promotion humaine, dont l'Etat assume normalement la responsablilité?

Quels sont les traits psychologiques distinctifs des gens d'aujourd'hui qui vivent dans un monde caractérisé par le pluralisme et la complexité, subdivisé à l'extrême? Richard Knowles, signale cinq traits caractéristiques et leur impact sur un engagement de foi.

Marcello Azevedo S.J, compare les éléments de base des cultures modernes et non-modernes, et relève des exemples contemporains des deux types. Dans un autre article, il examine comment les techniques de la biologie ont fait croire à l'humanité d'aujourd'hui qu'elle maîtrise sa propre destinée. Seule, une Eglise inculturée, en dialogue avec la modernité, peut aider l'humanité à réaliser la naïveté de cette hypothèse.

La contribution de Wilfred Smith, remonte à 1968. Il examine les relations entre les religions et les cultures et l'impact de la modernité sur elles.

Amata Miller, I.H.M, propose des actions coordonnées pour l'engagement dans les transformations sociales).

DOCUMENTATION

The complete text to all the articles in this issue of SEDOS Bulletin are available in SEDOS DOCUMENTATION CENTRE. We have also compiled a selection of articles on the theme of MODERNITY in a special dossier. This too is available for consultation in the CENTRE.

INCULTURATION AND MODERNITY

Peter Schineller, S.J.

This paper is written under the outline of 9 summary statements, moving from the more general considerations of inculturation, through more specific descriptions of the process and results of modernization, to the difficult task of bringing a theological and Christological perspective to bear on this phenomenon of modernization. It concludes with more specific strategies and emphasizes the indispensable role of the laity in the proces of inculturation with modernization.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS

1. The inculturation of Gospel values into the process of modernization is the most challenging and important place for inculturation to occur, more significant than Roman Catholic dialogue with other Christian Churches, with non-Christian religions, with traditional cultures and with atheism.

2. A key strategic concept in evaluating modernization is "ambiguity" whereby both positive and negative elements of modernization are attended to: this allows genuine dialogue and inculturation, and not an overly one-sided, or one-directional prophetic denunciation.

3. Aspects of the modern world that are intertwined with modernization, and which call for critical Christian, theological response include the growing gap of rich/poor, world hunger, technological society, nuclear power and weapons, transnational corporations, ecology and the limits to growth, and the changing role of women in modernized society.

4. God is not neutral, but involved and on the side of the weak and poor. Thus the theological response (God's word and viewpoint) to modernization, the viewpoint from which to evaluate it theologically, must be on how it affects the weak and the poor in both the long range and short range.

5. The Roman Catholic Church as an international body, can surface and speak for the concerns of all, especially the poor, in the evaluation of modernization.

6. Specific vices or forms of sin in a modernized society would include those of (1) failure to transcend one's limited perspective in both time and space, (2) passivity and complicity before complex systems, and (3) consumerism.

7. Specific virtues called for in light of inculturation with modernization would include (1) simplification of life style, (2) enlarging one's sympathies towards global awareness and responsibility, and (3) wisdom as the integrating understanding that leads to responsible action.

8. To succeed in the task of inculturating gospel values in modern

society, the Church itself must be modernized in its structures, style of operation, and language.

9. Only through the Christian laity can the gospel be inculturated in the modern world.

ELABORATION OF STATEMENTS 1, 8 AND 9

DIALOGUE WITH MODERNITY:

No.1. The inculturation of Gospel values into the process of

modernization is the most challenging and important place for inculturation to occur, more significant than Roman Catholic dialogue with other Christian Churches, with non-Christian religions, with traditional cultures and with atheism.

The usual image of inculturation is in the context of the missionary activity in a distant village, telling the Good News to those who may never have heard of Christianity. But as Father Arrupe reminds us, it must be a more encompassing concept, and each Jesuit is called to be an "agent of inculturation," where ever he is engaged in mission. My thesis is that in the present world situation, the dialogue with modernization must rate as most significant for the mission of the Church.

Qualitative and Quantitative Changes: Modernization thus points to the new world that is emerging, and describes the profound, qualitative and quantitative changes that have taken place in human society, changes affecting the political, economic, ecological and cultural spheres.

Precisely because modernization is a reality that must be approached from a variety of disciplines, (such as political science, sociology, psychology, philosophy, history, history of science) it is difficult to difine. In any case, it is a reality that encompasses differences between east and west, between capitalism and socialism. Hence it cannot be equated with westernization, even if that is the form it appears under for the most part. And while modernization is in its most advanced forms in the so called first world countries, the North rather than the South, it is a phenomenon which on the one hand affects all peoples and nations, and secondly, a phenomenon which seems to be an irreprehensible movement, something desirable by all peoples. Some thus speak of modernization as a systemic, global, progressive, and irreversible process.

A More Significant Dialogue: Finally, and most important for this section, I would argue that the dialogue of Christianity with modernization as a process and in its results - is a more significant dialogue than that with other religions with traditional cultures, and with atheism. Modernization is not simply one culture among others, but one that wishes to rule and dominate all cultures. Traditional religious and political values are shaken when modernization enters. In contrast to

religion (Christian and non-Christian) modernization is in no way a super-structure or ideology apart from human lives, but a force that more and more affects all human persons, physically as well as spiritually. It is a more inclusive concept than secularization, which is a subset of modernization, pointing to its challenge to traditional Christian and non-Christian religions. And while inculturation of Christian values with traditional cultures remains important, there is the clear danger that these traditional cultures will be swept up and torn apart by the all pervading forces of modernization. Even the traditional contrast of socialist and capitalist ideologies is relativised by modernization,as is demonstrated by the fact that all the major countries, USA, Russia, China, regardless of their political and economic ideologies are united in their common process of modernization (as attested to in cooperation between trans-national corporations, the international business and communications communities). Finally, the dialogue between theism and atheism becomes relativized as both believers and non-believers can and must join in the common human concern to assure that we do not destroy or ruin our earth, but hand it on to our children's children. The enemy of the Christian or theist is not so much the atheist, but the potential exploitive and evil forces and effects of modernization.

THE CHURCH MUST MODERNIZE ITS STRUCTURES

No.8. To succeed in the task of inculturating gospel values in modern society, the Church herself must be modernized in her suctures, style of operation, and language.

Dialogue with Positive Aspects of Modernization: Most attention thus far has been on how the Church must understand and relate to the modern world. But a further step must be taken, namely, the modernization of the Church itself. If the Church is not to be a ghetto church, or reactionary, it must be not only in dialogue with, but in tune with the positive aspects of modernization. In a world that values democracy, the church cannot be authoritarian or strictly monarchical; some form of participation, shared leadership is demanded. In a pluralistic religious culture, or a secular culture where one values individual freedom highly, church authority must be a moral authority and never simply external. In a culture marked by a sense of relativity and historical consciousness, the church should recognize the historicity of its own institutions, and work at adapting them to the structure of the modern world. In an empirical-minded world, distrustful of abstractions, the church should translate its doctrines and beliefs and preaching into programs of action. In a culture where hope in the future becomes a univer-sal expectation, the church should collaborate in the effort of building a better society. In a culture in which values of justice and equality are prized, the church should look carefully at its criteria for leadership and ordination.

Urbanization: If we can speak of three revolutions in human history, namely the agricultural, the scientific/industrial, and finally the technetronic, then it is in dialogue with this latter age that the Church must form its message today. The point of insertion for gospel values can no longer be based upon a view of the human as living on farms or in villages, but must take into account urbanization and suburbanization. The

dreams, hopes and fears of modernized, technologized humanity become the point of contact with the gospel message of life. In this urbanized society, metaphors from nature have less impact and effectiveness.

Imagery and Metaphors Drawn from the Urban Reality: The concrete forms of the city, its skyscrapers and transit systems, its electric network of communication must be seen as providing imagery/metaphor for the word of God to come alive today. In cities where the physical building of the church is no longer the outstanding center, the visible point of unity for the culture as it once was for the village, the very function of religions shifts. Government, business, university personnel, doctors and lawyers are turned to for advice rather than the clergy. The priest is no longer the expert in this complex society. Religion in the technetronic age takes on a less direct and more mediated function in the fabric of society. Its message and gospel must be mediated through other institutions such as government, school, and business. This as we will see, can best, indeed can only be done through the laity.

THE LAITY INCULTURATE THE GOSPEL

No.9. Only through the Christian laity can the gospel be inculturated in the modern world.

Increase of Secular Power: A comparison of modern and pre-modern cultures would show that the Church had a much greater influence upon the currents of culture and society in the pre-modern period. The clergy, the bishop, for example exercised much authority and power over people's lives and destinies. The process of modernization, especially under the aspect of secularization, means precisely the loss of this Church power, with the corresponding increase of secular powers over lives. The world turns more by banks, governments, corporations, than by the Church.

Basic Principle of Inculturation: In other words, the non-cleric, the laity have more influence over lives than in the age where the Church was at the center. In light of the expertise needed simply to begin to understand this culture, the balance of responsibility must shift toward the Christian laity in this process of inculturating gospel values in society. Laity are already inserted, involved in positions of power and thus can and must bring Christian values to bear on seemingly secular decisions, but decisions which affect the lives of many. A basic principle of inculturation is at stake here, namely that the process involves competence, knowledge of the situation, dialogue with those in place and not a word coming from outside, over against the culture that has not first listened and tried to understand that culture.

The Gospel Touches the Transnational Corporation: In the light of this needed shift, the role of the clergy, religious minister shifts too, towards one of being a catalyst, empowerer of the laity, calling them together for their mission in the modern world rather than substituting clerically for what they can best, and must do. The example of the transnational corporation illustrates this point. Priests, bishops, theologians have little or no direct experience with the TNC - how they operate, what options are possible, what results are

achieved. But if the gospel values are to touch the TNC, this can only be done by one knowledgeable and in place, hence the Christian laity. If this process of incorporating the laity as the prime movers in the task of incul-turation in the modern world does not occur, the Church will only become more and more an irrelevant, ghetto Church, speaking a word that will not be listened to, a word that does not address the culture of modernity. The gap between gospel and life, church and world, will grow ever wider.

A New Vision of Church: With this, we return to the overall theme of inculturation, and the key of who does theology. The theology of inculturation of gospel values in the modernized world is too complex and important to be left to theologians. It must become the task of those involved more directly in the working, the creativity of the modern world. If we believe with Rahner, that grace is hidden in the depth of all reality, or with Pope Paul VI that the 'semina Verbi' are generously given, then theology must turn more and more to the laity to discover, un-cover the truth and call of God in the complexity of the modern world. This turn to the laity is obviously no magic solution, but rather points to the difficult task ahead, a task which involves a conversion to a new vision of Church, a new role of the minister as catalyst or facilitator in calling forth the talents and gifts of the laity for the process of inculturation in the modern world.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE MODERN PERSON

Richard T. Knowles, Ph.D.

I will focus on the psychological aspects of modern culture both because modern culture is more problematic for faith and because the world is moving rapidly to a modern mode of existence. As the transformation from a traditional to a modern way of life takes place, the psychological aspects become much more prominent. In fact, the psychological is the modern; wherever there is modernity, there is psychology; to understand things psychologically means already to have left behind the traditional understanding.

No.1. **A DIVIDED SELF**: What are the psychological characteristics of modern people who live in a world of plurality, of complexity, whose world is compartmentalized to the nth degree? How does a professional person function, a person whose expertise remains a specialized part of some supposed greater, but unknown, whole? Even in my own profession, there are over forty divisions of the American psychological Association, (clinical, experimental, environmental etc.), each speaking a different language and espousing a different ideology. The same is true even more for engineers, doctors, lawyers, and so on. What are the psychological aspects of the ordinary modern person who, on a subway or bus, cannot tell whether the person next to him/her is psychotic, a born-again Christian, a homosexual, a priest, a male or female or even whether they will speak the same language? Wouldn't the psychological aspects be different for a traditional person in an integrated culture who knows everybody either by name or by role?

Multiple Selves: Van den Berg takes the position that the psychology of the modern person includes not only the two souls of Goethe's Faust but the multiple souls or selves of modern day life. He rephrases the statement of Willian James (1891) in The principles of psychology: "Every person has as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he/she cares".

Traditional Faith Upbringing is One Option: What does it mean to have many different selves? Well, one of those selves is a religious or a faith self but it is compartmentalized and not usually integrated with the other selves. Traditional parents brought up their children in the one true reality, the only reality there was, the faith reality. Modern parents see the traditional faith upbringing as one option among many. This is a radical difference.

Hope is the Most Relevant Virtue: I suppose it is obvious that the life of faith is an integrated, undivided existence and that being divided means not to be in the faith experience. The hope is that a new integration, a reintegration, is on the way that will again make faith possible. For the modern person hope, rather than faith, seems to be the most relevant virtue. In any case, the first psychological

characteristic of modern life is the experience of being divided, of having many selves.   In   this   state   faith   is   either   nonexistent   or compartmentalized, shut off from the core of the person.

Remember Their Tradition: One way to make for the possibility of faith in
                            such a situation is to help people to remember their tradition, to help them to place their individual stories within the context of the larger cultural story.   This would mean teaching Ben to remember his tribe and the Californian to recover her own tradition. However, we can't be too optimistic about these efforts since they go against the tide of the experience of modernization.

No.2. SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS: A second psychological characteristic of the
                           modern person is self-consciousness.   In tradi- tional societies it is a compliment to say that a person plays the social role well, the role of father, mother, teacher etc.   There is a congruence between the role and the person; the person really expresses himself or her- self through the role.   The modern person would feel insulted to be accused of playing a role well.   For that person, being oneself means to be doing something private, something disconnected from the social roles.   In this position of self-consciousness there is a great concern for spontaneity. Of course, people who talk about being spontaneous are those who are not. Somehow spontaneity becomes a goal, a self-conscious goal, a very peculiar situation.

The Modern Ideal: A shift has taken place, from a concern with the object
                   of one's activity to a concern with how one is doing. The position of self-consciousness is really an impossible one: to stand apart from oneself observing oneself doing something. Of course, this means that the action will not be smooth or harmonious.   This habit or self- consciousness has grown in large measure from the principles of modern psychology.   The modern ideal is not that of the hero, heroine or saint but of the healthy animal the natural, healthy animal.   The focus again is on being natural or spontaneous and there is the illusion that one can will this, thereby creating the self-conscious condition.

Spontaneous Experience of Faith: Obviously, self-consciousness is not con-
                                  ducive to faith. To believe, one must be able to bypass the self toward the world.   If the concern remains with the self, one is not available for the other.   How can the self-conscious modern person move to spontaneous experience itself or more particularly, to the spontaneous experience of faith? What we do know is that self-consciousness is and experience of fear and that the fear must somehow be alleviated in order to move past it.   There must be a relaxation, a leisurely attitude, but how can this be possible in the modern context? We don't even know what we are afraid of or even that we are afraid.

No.3. THE DENIAL OF DEATH: And this brings us to the third psychological
                           characteristic of modern life: the denial of death and limitation and the accompanying attitude of aestheticism; we might sum up this modern attitude as anti-ascetic and pro-aesthetic.   It is said that religion or faith begins at the graveyard, at the point of trying to make sense out of the mystery of death.   Modern persons are not available for faith because they have so many ways of avoiding and denying it.

The Denial of Limitations: Along with the denial of death, the final
limitation, there is a similar attitude toward
other limitations; that is, one should liberate oneself from whatever limits
one's possibilities. This is reminiscent of the earlier point about forget-
ting one's story or tradition since it limits one's current possibilities.
However, the attitude toward limits includes even more that that. In seek-
ing to rid oneself of all determinations, facticities or limitations, the
modern person actually undermines his or her possibilities. For, as Erik
Erikson puts it:

> Membership in a nation, in a class, or in a caste is one of
> those elements of an individual's identity which at the very mini-
> mum comprise what one is never not, as does membership in one of
> the two sexes or in a given race. What one is never not estab-
> lishes the life space within which one may hope to become uniquely
> and affirmatively what one is - and then transcend that uniqueness
> by way of a more inclusive humanity.

A Shift in Attitude: On the other side of these denials is the quest for a
sense of well-being. This is not the ordinary human
tendency to self-esteem; rather, it is a shift in attitude, a cultural
change. When suffering and death are issues that people confront, then
faith and hope become possible. When the highest goal is feeling good, as
Rieff describes the aim of a therapeutic outlook, then there has been a fun-
damental change. Rieff says:

> That a sense of well-being has become the end, rather than a
> striving after some superior communal end, announces a fundamental
> change of focus in the entire cast of our culture - toward a human
> condition about which there will be nothing further to say in the
> old style of despair and hope.

And I might add, nothing further to say in the old style of faith.

Pain and Suffering: Over-sensitivity to pain and suffering, the feeling
that they are out of place in a normal life, and, on
the other hand, the quest for more, clarifies further what is characteristic
of modern life.

The Person as Consumer: This model of modern life leads to what Alasdair
MacIntyre (1981) has called the rich Aesthete (the
consumer consumed by consuming), one of the three ideal characters of modern
society. The relationship such a person has to the world is that of a cus-
tomer in the supermarket, the person choosing this or that, even choosing
this or that faith. In this mode freedom is defined as having the greatest
number of options. Such a person may do a lot of choosing but he or she has
lost completely the sense of being chosen which faith requires.

Impossible to Speak of Faith: Again, to speak of integrating faith with a
culture that is post-faith creates enormous
problems. The modern consumer culture towards which the whole world seems
to be moving poses very different challenges for faith than a traditional
culture. When that culture denies death, sees suffering as a temporary loss
of function, and bases its decisions on what feels good, then it is impos

sible to speak of faith.   If we were talking about an individual, we would say that such a person could not be open to faith unless there occurred some major crisis in his or her life.   The same may be said of the culture, although we dare not wish for a crisis.

No.4. A TECHNICAL, MANIPULATIVE ATTITUDE: The fourth psychological aspect relevant to the integration of faith and culture is the technical, manipulative attitude of modern persons. The manipulative, technical position is one of mastery over things and people.   Perhaps a good example would be the attitude which prompted our predecessors to cut down the forests, tame the wilderness and, in general, to subject nature to technology.   This same attitude has been applied to winning friends, becoming self-actualized and even to becoming spiritual. What is obviously missing in the attitude is a receptivity to the world and others.   It fits in well with the aesthetic or consumer mode since it is geared to getting what one wants.

A Matter of Technique: This attitude is problematic for faith since it means being in control and reducing everything, including faith, to a matter of technique.   Faith is treated as any other commodity; the main question is not "What is it;" the main question is "How can I get it?" So, for the modern person, meditation is not a being in the presence of the other, is not even concerned with the other but is a technique for lowering blood pressure and for maintaining a sense of well-being. To meditate in this way is not to be meditating but to be in the technical attitude.   When anything is done in the technical attitude, whether writing a book, taking a walk or praying, one is not writing, walking or praying but is reducing those activities to one of mastery, efficiency and neutrality. Obviously, in the act of faith, one must be able to transcend technique and the technical attitude, an almost impossible task for the modern person.

No.5. INDIVIDUALISM: The last psychological aspect of modern life that I would offer is one that is very clear to people in more traditional cultures.   When they hear a modern person, especially a modern psychologist, talking about almost anything, they point out the individualism and the lack of any commitment to communal purpose.   They say that their experience is one of "us" whereas ours is one of "me." Rieff describes how this new attitude emerged with the triumph of the therapeutic or modern culture:

> Positive communities were, according to Freud, held together by guilt; they appear attractive only now, in distant retrospect, but the modern individual, faced with the necessity of merging his own life into communal effort, would have found them suffocating. Instead, modern individuals can only use the community as the necessary stage for their effort to enhance themselves if not always, or necessarily, to enrich themselves.

Modern Problems About Commitment: The individualist tendency is also problematic for faith since once again the person can't get past the self toward the other.   And it also brings along with it the modern problems about commitment.   To commit oneself means to move more to an attitude of "us" than to "me." Faith obviously requires

commitment; otherwise, being tentative, it remains something other than faith. But this is precisely where modern people have difficulty; they tend to avoid the risk of whole-hearted commitment.

SUMMARY

Traditional Culture: The traditional culture was one in which the person was more or less integrated into the social roles and the community. There was a straightforwardness about oneself, and a more direct, less complicated experience of the world and other people. There were ritual ways of dealing with death and suffering and it was supposed that life would entail sacrifice, that it would not be entirely easy. There was more or less a respect for nature and for the environment and a commitment to community values and tasks. Such a culture was conducive to faith and, in fact, could be called faith culture.

The Modern Way of Life: Then comes the move to a modern way of life and the loss of the traditional values. As the society becomes more complex, the persons find themselves divided and split off into many different selves. For the first time they experience an identity crisis and find themselves in a completely different world. As much as they might sentimentalize about their former way of life, they find themselves somewhat alienated and adopting the observer mode over the participant mode more and more frequently. They become preoccupied with obtaining the best and the latest consumer goods and the technology which will deliver them. Having outgrown the old taboos they become less identified with the community and take their places alongside the other modern people taking what they can get.

Conclusion: The picture that I have drawn here may seem oversimplified. Some may protest that there are cases where people move into modernity without losing their traditional values. I would suggest that such cases are the exception rather than the rule and that the consumer culture is so strong that eventually they also will probably succumb.

- end -

SECULARIZATION AND THE THIRD WORLD

Jean Bruls, S.A.M.

Secularization can be defined in a rather simple way as the tendency of the various aspects of human life (sciences, culture, politics, economy etc.) towards an increasingly greater autonomy in relation to religious motivations and institutions.

The phenomenon of secularization is important, it is sometimes said, but it is a phenomenon that is typically Western in its origin and its character. Even though it attracts the attention of young Western missionaries it can hardly hold the attention of experienced missiologists and missionaries. In Asia as well as in Africa, it is explained, we already have to deal with societies of a clearly sacral nature, which are not close to becoming secularized. We have the time to see an eventual change coming, and while waiting for it, it is in terms of the religious world that we must continue to carry on our activity now.

Already in the Process of Secularization: What must we think of it? I for my part believe that we must avoid transporting to other cultural contexts the problems presented by the Western world. But I also think that it is a dangerous illusion to believe that sacral, religious societies in Asia and Africa are not already profoundly disturbed, that they are not already clearly engaged in the process of secularization. And it seems important to me to become conscious of the fact that we ourselves, Christian missionaries, have been among the first and most efficacious agents of secularization of the Asian and African societies. For agricultural rites, we sought to substitute both the use of fertilizer and the rogation processions; to replace magical amulets, we offered medicines and medals; we did not suggest simply abandoning religious rituals, but replacing them by a Christian religious ritual; in an all-embracing way, we aimed not to secularize, but to Christianize a society which still remained a religious society.

It seems to me we could truly say that missionary activity had been of a religious nature, but nevertheless contained, in certain aspects, a secularizing trend. In brief, we oriented them towards a secularizing vision.

Human Promotion: In fact, in some particularly sacral societies, as in India or in most of the Moslem countries, it was along this secularizing line that mission was led to register its most dynamic activity: it sought to justify its presence through schools, hospitals, social works, free from proselytism and open to all without reference to religious affiliation; in the eyes of outside observers, it seemed thus to demonstrate that undertakings of human promotion could be perfectly valid without being comprised in the religious.

The Secular State: Further, when traditionally sacral type societies sought to transform themselves into modern states, and to do this, some political leaders wanted the socio-political structures, (to get away from the control of religion) and wanted the state to be secular, the Christian Church took their side. This was very clearly the case in India. It can doubtless be said that the Church only planned to assure for itself a climate of religious tolerance; but actually, it supported by its influence the ideal of a secular state, respectful, to be sure, of religious values, but autonomous with relation to them.

The Church Beside or Inside the National Society? Traditional mission presents itself worldwide as a religious affair: It strongly puts the accent on sacramentalization, it tries by preference not to question the sacral societies but to substitute a Christian religion for a non-Christian one. As has often been remarked in the course of the last few years, in the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th century Christian mission was still polarized by the ideal of Christianity. This ideal proves to be beyond reach and only finds a semblance of being achieved in a Christian society which is built beside the national society, with its own life, its institutions, its social relations, its means of expression. This small Christian society in certain cases runs the risk of retreating into a ghetto to defend its religious personality against the non-Christian environment; in other cases it can reveal a great dynamism of human promotion which will be appreciated by the non-Christian society but will also be regarded with a certain jealous distrust by reason of its close ties with what is perceived to be a powerful religious organization that is, in addition, of foreign origin.

National Development Plans: In a young state which seeks to affirm its personality and to assume all its responsibilities with regard to its citizens, this aspect as a "socio-religious body" of the Christian community becomes much more perceptible and more controvertible than under a regime of colonization or underdevelopment. We also see political leaders of these countries (even Christians) trying to integrate, willingly or possibly by force, the missionary institutions of education, care of the sick, social action, within the framework of the national development plans. These nationalizations are explained, from the point of view of the governments of these young states, by a very legitimate concern to assure the unity of the country and by the conviction that the objectives pursued by these institutions should be simply human, secular, and not religious objectives.

The Means of influence In a Society: Faced with these governmental pretentions, two reactions are possible for the Church: obstinate defense of its right to procure its own institutions or, on the contrary, ceding to the state these institutions of ecclesiastical origin. In the first case, it would harden its position as a "religious body," the perfect society, as the canonists would say, which keeps its distance from civil society. In the second case, it would recognize the capacity of a state that had come of age to assume the responsibility for the education and well-being of its citizens; to put it another way, it accepts the secularization of a whole series of means of influence which until now had also been to some extent, means of religious influence.

It would be easy to mention numerous examples of this process in Asian and African countries in the last few years, with different reactions of the local Churches. The most complete example of integration is perhaps that of Tanzania where the missions, Catholic and Protestant, have accepted full integration of their schools and hospitals in the national program.

The Fundamental Question: Is not this the fundamental question: Whether the fidelity of the Church to its mission of evangelization is better assured by the maintenance of its own institutions in the chiefly secular domains or by its loyal engagement in a secular program of human promotion, for which the state normally assumes responsibility? One immediately realizes all the consequences that the response to this question could involve in the conception of missionary activities, where education and medical care have absorbed such a considerable part of the means, the religious personnel and resources of every kind; consequences also in the choice of means to assure the Christian formation of youth.

The Nationalization of Social Services: But does the Church actually have the choice in the perspective of secularization? If it is true that the process is world-wide and irreversible, the Church in defending its own institutions, will scarcely raise more than a delaying fight, which in the end risks having no other result than making the Church ever more marginal. Believing that it is defending its mission, the Church would then be dangerously compromised. Whatever the local circumstances might be, causing slight variations in the solutions adopted, the tendency to nationalization of school and medical resources obliges the Church to take a position on a fundamental point of secularization: Do we recognize that civil society is of age and capable of assuming responsibility for the evolution of humankind? Instead of substituting ourselves or juxtaposing ourselves to this civil society in its educative and social mission, can we accept simply assisting it therein?

We have posed this question in connection with a particular fact, that of the nationalization of education and of medical services, because concretely it is often on this fact that the missionary Church must first take a position. But now we have to extend the debate.

The Church Appears as a Political-Social Force: All humanity is engaged in building a better world and henceforth, disposing of the necessary means to that end will less and less require the initiatives of human promotion which the Church had taken and which it had directed. To the extent that the Church appears as a political-social force with a religious motivation, it will be increasingly contested by the movement of secularization. And this is perhaps particularly true in the countries of the Third World: In relation to the general situation and the number of its members the missionary Church often appears there to be disproportionately powerful, while enthusiasm towards nation-building makes the public authorities all the more desirous of controling the spheres of influence themselves.

A Serving Church: In this context, Christian mission seems then to be asked to renounce many of the means of activity which not long

ago comprised its strength. In the present world, it could no longer be dynamically present to people except to the extent that it fully embraces the general movement of human development, to the point of allowing itself to be absorbed in it in some way. The Council perceived in the history of the world the very design of God, and in speaking of a serving Church rejected all position of power in order to place itself at the service of the ideals pursued by humanity, both Christian and non-Christian, believing and umbelieving.

Mission and Laity: Modern mission has rested almost exclusively on the religious congregations and missionary institutes; after Vatican II it rests first of all on the local Church, but this runs the great risk of referring above all to clerical teams. In the perspective of secularization, the idea seems to assert itself that the mission of the Church must be more and more an affair of the entire People of God.

Mission having become largely the responsibility of the People of God, it necessarily takes on forms different from those we have recently known. It will be exercised mainly by the witness given by the Christian - by the local people and secondarily by the ones coming from abroad - by their very engagement in the service of society's human project, by their professional, family, social and political life.

The Church and Development: It seems to be important to mention in passing a planning error which might crop up; in helping development, the important thing is not that the hierarchical Church direct the undertakings of development, for that would only transpose what it had formerly done in its educational and other institutions; the important thing is that it orient Christian lay persons towards their own human responsibilities and urge them to assume these responsibilities correctly in cooperation with all.

Avoid Getting Lost in Secularization: Here we meet a danger of which we must be clearly aware. Feeling and wishing to be concerned, together with other non-Christians, for the project of human promotion, the Christian risks being absorbed to the point of no longer finding any valid reason for belonging to the Church. Animation and deepening of the faith are necessary for the Christian not only to avoid getting lost in secularization, but because our engagement will be most constructive, most advantageous to others precisely if we bring them something they do not have. This something is the illumination which the Christian faith throws on humankind and its destiny: It is the model which the Christian finds in Jesus Christ. It is not sufficient that Christianity be the personal support of each individual Christian nor of the small group formed by Christians in society. It must be a light offered to all to help them better orient the human design.

A World on the Way to Secularization: Gaudium et Spes indicates for us how the inalienable mission of the People of God must be oriented in a world on the way to secularization.

"The People of God believes that it is led by the Spirit of the Lord, Who fills the earth. Motivated by this faith, it labors to decipher authentic signs of God's presence and purpose in the

happenings, needs and desires in which this People has a part
along with other peoples of our age. For faith throws a new light
on everything, manifests God's design for our total vocation, and
thus directs the mind to solutions which are fully human."

Ref. World Mission Vol.21, No.3, Fall 1970.

- end -

A SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL VISION

"The church rightly stresses that the proper mission of the laity is
toward the temporal order. However, it is our experience that lay people in-
creasingly resist that kind of division in their lives. They wish to see
their lives holistically, as one", Bishop Joseph Devine of Motherwell,
Scotland, told the Synod of Bishops Oct. 8. "What entitles us to expect that
a greater number of lay people will become more active in their special mis-
sion to the temporal order if they remain passive in their participation in
the internal life of the church?" Devine asked. He suggested that the synod
would need "to give special attention to the partnership between the clergy
and the laity in the life of the church". The spirit of the Second Vatican
Council "has not sufficiently affected the fundamental attitudes of many of
the clergy and the great majority of the laity", Devine said. "A major cause
of this", he said, "is a lack of a common vision concerning the church and
her mission in the world". He said it is through the actual experience of
the church as a "communio" that lay people "will become more mature in their
ecclesial vocation and more effective in exercising their special vocation
in the secular order.

Ref. Origins, Nov. 1987, Vol. 17; No. 1.

MODERN AND NON-MODERN SOCIETIES

Marcello de Carvalho Azevedo, SJ.

The world in which we live today presents characteristics markedly defferent from those of the world from which arose the largest number of our religious institutes. To better understand these structural elements of modern-contemporary culture, it is good to recall the characteristics of non-modern culture. These two cultural forms are not necessarily linked to any chronological-historical period. Furthermore, they can co-exist within the same socio-geographic situation.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NON-MODERN CULTURE

Organic Unity: Non-modern culture is characterized by an organic unity, and an almost systematic integration of all that is socio-cultural. Thus, the political, economic, normative, technical-instrumental dimension, the dimensions of affinity and property, those of leisure and of religions are linked in an interdependent way. Not infrequently, the religious dimension acts as a catalyst and an unifying factor for the rest giving them clarity and legitimization. (This is the way it is, for example, in the Iran of Ayotollah Khomeini, and also with the tribes or micro-societies of Africa, in Oceania and among some of the indigenous peoples of Latin America. It is also true, in great measure, of christianity in medieval times).

Subordination of The Individual to The Group: From this there follows that the whole and the persons within the group are seen as a whole. Individuals understand one another in terms of the group and in relation to it; they live in conformity with the situation and with the role assigned them by the group. The latter exercises a function of guardianship regarding the options and decisions of individuals. Such tutelage comes from the natural subordination of the individual to everything related to the group. (This is verified, for example, in the situation wherein originated the caste system in India, in apartheid in South Africa, in the categories of "slave and free persons", in societies of various kinds throughout history, in the open or veiled discrimination against women, Blacks, Indians or the poor in various societies today).

Established Order: The organic unity and subordination of the individual shape and manifest the order of the society with regard to hierarchies and levels. The stability and the permanence of this order are conditions considered indispensable for the continuity and functioning of society. This society, pre-established as a given, always feels itself threatened by change, by individual choice, by a disturbance of the organic unity. (Whence comes the need to explain and to justify the reasonableness of this order by creating structures of plausibility which permit the members of the group to assimilate and to take on the patterns of their life, to maintain them, to defend them, to be motivated to transmit them to the

generations to come).

Homogeneity and Continuity: The viability of the permanence of an order set
                               up thus presupposes a relative homogeneity and
continuity in the culture.   By culture, here, I mean the whole ensemble of
meanings and of understandings, of values and of ways of being and of doing,
of symbolic and social expressions, which give consistency to the identity
and to the cultural "ethos", and which condition and also explain the
choices   and   the   life of the group and members that belong to it.   (This
explains, for example, the strict protection of the members of the group
against disturbing influences.   From whence come censorship and restriction
of information, as is the case in almost the whole of the communist bloc
today; control over the educative process at the level of the family and
school, and over means of communications, especially, television).

A Static or Cyclical Concept of History: Another characteristic of non-
                                           modern culture-and the last I want
to mention is a static or even cyclic concept of history. Cyclic such as is
found in certain civilizations that rely on a cosmic vision of history and
of life and that emphasize the elements that condition and determine human
beings.   Static in so far as the dominant retrospective stress in the ap-
proach to history tends to conceive history, above all, as repetitive or as
very slow moving. This view of history, which idealizes and favors the past
thus makes recourse to history as an instrument for guaranteeing the estab-
lished order and/or the criterion for controlling change,   It places no im-
portance whatsoever on the conduct of human beings in the present and ex-
cludes suppositions regarding the future. There results from this a percep-
tion of history and a manner of living it as something imposed on humanity
and extrinsic to it, and which carries a connotation of inexorable
domination. (Thus, for example, can be explained much of the inflexible and
deterministic infrastructure of so many cultures, the resignation of entire
peoples before God or their submission before other human beings.   The
refusal to accept initiatives that are directed towards shaping or trans-
forming the world or the group itself are also a result of this.   A typical
example of this is the ideologies of national security in Latin America and
the control of a slow and gradual return to a rightful situation by means of
a process based on the arbitrary criteria of those who hold the power).

ELEMENTS CHARACTERISTIC OF MODERN-CONTEMPORANEITY AS CULTURE

From the end of the Medieval Era, modern culture began to bevelop
slowly and it defined and asserted itself always more and more through the
scientific, industrial, technological and communications revolutions.

Distinct Economic, Political and Religious Systems: Throughout this entire
                                                      process, the separation
of the various sectors of the socio-cultural whether economic,
political, normative or religious, etc was set up and each one evolved on
its own.   Distinct systems thus arose with different epistomologies and
methodologies, vocabularies, rationalizations and "discourses", specific
codes and symbols, rupturing the all encompassing cultural and organic unity
of the non-modern. This gave rise to the fragmented and pluralistic charac-
teristic of modern culture; the autonomy of persons and of societal institu

tions relative to religious components. Even if modern culture did not repudiate nor eliminate the sacred and its value, it took away its legitimatizing authority and its basis of intelligibility. This is called secularization. The formation and evolution of modern culture is, in itself, a whole process of the secularization of human beings and of social institutions which is practically irreversible. (From this there follows autonomy of research and of scientific investigation, with their consequences, a radical modification of normative and legislative systems and the separation of Church and State).

Individuals Find Their Meaning Within Themselves: Within this cultural structure, individuals find their meaning within themselves and not from with the group. The root of action, decision and of law resides within individuals themselves. In a certain way. humanity is reproduced in each person. On the individual level, there is a progressive rejection of the patronizing decisions of the group and a going from the given to the chosen as regards fundamental options of life such as social conditions, education, vocation and profession, social mobility, political or syndicalist positions, etc.

Order Can No Longer Be Imposed: On the one hand and the primacy of the individual on the other, rupture from within the pre-established and stable order of the non-modern cultural world. From this there follows, as inherent to modern culture, the characteristics of competition, conflict, critique, instability, efficiency, the impulse to transform and the mark of the temporary. The order then, can no longer be set or imposed. It will be built on the possible resolution of conflicts, on consensus or compromise requiring flexibility and carrying with it the almost sure promise or certainty of instability. (Thus, we have the whole legislative process of the modern State, internal relations among the classes of society - parties, trade unions, managers and patrons, employers and workers or functionaries; the relations of capital to labor; thus, also, the search for peace through international negotiations).

Erosion of the Pretension of Security and of Permanence: The temporary character of roles and functions or the temporary aspect of persons in the periodic changes within hierarchies, the self-propelling character of a technology intimately linked to science, in a process of mutual feedback, explain change as an element intimately associated with the modern process. Moreover, the fragmentation of the cultural world is reflected in the multiplicity and diversity of understandings and meanings, of values and of ways of being and of living, of social and symbolic expressions. This plurality reduces, confuses and compromises identity. It relativizes certitudes; it renders critique and discernment imperative, and hermeneutics and interpretation indispensable. As a consequence there is an instinctive erosion of the non-modern pretension of security and of permanence. (From this derive the insistence on maximun information and the aversion for exaggerated secrecy; the ordinariness of discussion and participation, the necessity of evaluations, revisions, re-examination, critique and self-criticism. From this come caution in affirming and denying, resistence to dogmatism; repugnance or vigilance when confronted with authoritarian positions; the difficulty of accepting unchangeable norms, confusion or fear regarding permanent commitments, regarding the perpetual within the temporal. From this spring an understanding regarding the different formation of consciences,

the spirit of dialogue and ecumenical perspectives).

Linear and Dynamic Concept of History: Finally, there is, in addition to
all this, a concept of history which
is linear and dynamic and, consequently, neither cyclic nor static. History
which is developing and always advancing is teleological and irreversible.
The judaic tradition and the christian synthesis present us with a world
which has a beginning in time and which journeys historically in time
towards the "eschaton". Here, God and human beings are the actors. Tradi-
tion and modern trends or concepts of history, especially Marxist, are in
some way, the tributaries of the judeo-christian inspiration of a history
which goes forward and does not repeat itself. But in a goodly number of
such modern concepts, although they may be in contradiction to one another,
the ideal is limited to the immanent and to the intra-terrestrial and cir-
cumscribe human beings within their own limits emphasizing, nevertheless,
forcefully, their role as builders and protagonists of history. (From this
there flows a whole new perception of the meaning of time, of possible
growth, of the need for organization and of planning, of productivity and
efficiency. From this comes the importance of time and its economic value.
This changes the behavior of individuals both as persons and as groups. It
affects the gratuitous, contemplative and intellectual dimensions of life.
From this, there results a special attentiveness to initiative and
creativity, to the powers that shape history and the importance given to
praxis.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN CULTURE

As a human reality, christianity, in its institutional form in the
Church, was structured and organized in non-modern terms, especially begin-
ning with the IVth century. Nevertheless, christianity and the Church, as
bearers of the christian message, are, surprisingly, at the root of the for-
mation and inspiration of modern culture and of many of its more valuable
intuitions. The concepts of liberty, equality, fraternity, justice, peace,
universality, participation and of so many other things that characterize
the programs and aims of modern societies and cultures, have in the Gospel,
a major potential and basic force, a more radical demand for consistency
than could be obtained from any idea imagined or actually attained by
humanity today.

Divergence in the Evalution of Church and World: The reinforcement of the
non-modern paradigm of in-
stitutionalization very much characterizes the work of the Council of Trent.
The latter exerted a great importance on the future development of the life
of the Church. More specifically, during the course of the last four cen-
turies there has been an ever widening divergence in the process of the
evolution of the Church and of the world. Mutual relations have encountered
serious difficulties, rendering more and more inadiquate the forms of evan-
gelization of the modern contemporary world.

Gaudium et Spes: During the recent pre and post Vatican II years, there has
been a certain coming together of the Church and the
world. "Gaudium et Spes" explicitly, but also many other conciliar and post
conciliar papal documents express insights on christian evangelical prin-
ciples already suggested by the world and modern culture. Such are, for

example, ecumenism, religious liberty, the role of the laity, more active participation in the decision making process, etc.

Critical Authority Vis-A-Vis Modern Culture: However, this coming together of the Church and the world cannot be done with eyes shut and in a submissive way on the part of the Church. On the contrary, the Church has the conditions necessary for taking a position or critical authority vis-a-vis modern culture and its consequences for the world itself, without rejecting it altogether or beforehand, and without projecting, in any absolute way, a pessimistic view of this same world. The Church has done this principally in reference to major impacts of modernity on human beings such as: structural injustice, institutionalized violence, the arms race, conventional or nuclear and the ethical erosion which reduces human beings to things and consequently treats them as such biologically, technologically and economically.

The challenge of the Church is to live in the modern world, to take a critical position vis-a-vis this world and to advance patiently and freely, from within it and with it, by starting with what is good, human and divine in it, as in all other cultures; this is the only means of evangelizing it, building it, re-directing it and transforming it.

Formation for Religious Life: Formation for religious life today does not consist in reproducing materially the forms and the behavior which were successful in the past. Neither is it a matter of taking a negative or pessimistic, defensive or aggressive position which would make us concretely reject altogether the world that exists at this moment, nor is it a matter of keeping ourselves aloof from it by a sectarian or hostile point of view. Finally, formation does not mean to define criteria and formulas of action and of communications and to immobilize them in the present, in a search for security and a guarantee for our life and mission.

Authentic Interior Liberty: To form for religious life today is to develop within the person during the course of formation an authentic interior liberty. In this way, religious life will take its place without fear in the world in which it exists and which it wishes to evangelize. This liberty, enlightened and nourished by faith will make for a right conscience, critical in the analysis and evaluation of reality. Liberty becomes the condition and the means of discernment before an unpredictable world which is in constant process of change: a world which continually demands the making of new choices, decisions and the taking of positions adequate for its in-depth evangelization, starting from its real socio-cultural reality.

Ref. Excerpt from,
Formation: Religious Life in Contemporary Culture.
U.I.S.G. Special Issue. No. 69. pp. 17-24
Piazza Ponte, S. Angelo, 28; 00186, Rome.

- end -

MISSIONARY INSTITUTES AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

Amata Miller, I.H.M.

There are several different action roles necessary for social transformation. Some will be engaged in one and some in another; the power of community and of our group of communities is that among us we can be everywhere. And if we can make the vision of a transformed world intentional among us as we act we can be a powerful force for change.

James Robertson in his powerful little book, "The Sane Alternative" outlines six different action roles for social change.

- Some of us will be most actively engaged in building the new value system through preaching, teaching, writing, music, art.

- Some of us will be creating alternative structures. All of us cannot be innovators but these creative persons need back-up support from those who can organize support, help find resources, spread the word.

- Most of us will be transforming existing institutions from within. Developing new ways of governing, of rewarding achievement, of resolving conflicts and widening the circle of those who have experienced non-hierarchical, non-violent, non-materialistic ways of conducting organizations, we can multiply the forces for change and gradually change oppressive structures. Robert Theobald, that great futurist, says "To get revolutionary change, be evolutionary".

- Some of us will do the strategizing for how to get from here to there. Those who do need the rest of us in organizations which bring that "constituency of conscience" of which Bryan Hehir speaks so frequently into action whenever and wherever there is an affront to human dignity. So our individual and corporate memberships in Bread for the World. PAX CHRISTI, Network, infact are a critical part of acting together for change.

- All of us must take part in choosing lifestyles consistent with a just world order. By itself our individual and community choices for simplicity will not bring a more just world, but without a change in our lifestyles there is no room for the needs of the poor in the world's distribution of goods and services. And unless we begin now to live more simply and to help others to come freely to such choices there will not be space in our national policies for the needs of others because there will be no constituency for them.

- All of us must, finally, find our place standing in opposition

<u>to all that goes in the wrong direction</u>.   In a time when the
status quo has been named sinful as it has been in the pastoral
letter, there is no such thing as being neutral.   To be silent is
to be on the side of the evil.,   Thus, in whatever way is ap-
ropriate for us as individuals and as communities, we must speak
out.

Within this set of action roles each of us and all of us can find a
place for effective participation in the process of social transformation if
we do what we do with a new intentionality born out of the newly sharpened
vision of a just society.

Ref. Some Implications of the Pastoral Letter,
     <u>ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR ALL</u>, for Congregations of Women Religious in
     the U.S.A. presented at LCWR National Assembly, August 26, 1987.
     (Full text available at SEDOS or request).

- end -

TRADITIONAL RELIGIONS AND MODERN CULTURE

Wilfred Smith.

(This excerpt is from an essay first delivered on September 9, 1965, in Claremont, California, to a plenary session of the eleventh congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, the international professional organization in this comparative field. The agenda for that program, as is evident from Smith's opening paragraphs, was tradition/modernity; and Smith's discussion of the title assigned him is characteristic of his concern to pin down what's in a name, to note the unstated assumptions which may underlie terminology casually taken for granted).

To define at all accurately what it is that we are being asked to discuss, is in some way to decide (whether consciously or otherwise) what kind of thing is actually going on religiously in the contemporary world. At issue is the general question as to what is the task of the historian of religion in studying the particular period of human history that is currently in process.

Let us look, then at the titles proposed. "Traditional Religions and Modern Culture". "Traditional Religion under Modern Culture". Still another wording is "Traditional Religion under the impact of cultural modernization". This last crystallizes a common variant view, which deserves more critical scrutiny than it normally gets. In my study of the Islamic and of the Indian scenes I have had occasion to challenge this view: namely, that modernity is somehow an entity that from the outside delivers a blow of which Islam or Hinduism is the victim. It is worth considering some implications of, and some alternatives to, such a view.

THE IMPACT OF MODERNITY

The impact theory has been widely held usually without argument, perhaps especially by Western administrators, by political scientists, and by economic-aid men. It thinks in terms of a religion as something more or less given, a compact entity inherited from the past in a particular form, and thinks of modernization also as something given, if not in a fixed form at least as a process with a more or less fixed direction, usually imposed or at least illustrated by the recent West.

Within this polarity, this view envisages the latter, modern culture, which is dynamic, as actively raining blows on the former, the religion, which is thus at least the recipient, if not simply the victim, of external pressure.

Now we can all think of particular facts, both in our own personal lives and in contemporary Afro-Asia, that would seem to justify such an interpretation, so that the impact metaphor as a first approximation is not silly. Yet I find it inadequate, and in some ways wrong.

(1) For one thing, thinking of the impact of one thing upon another seems altogether too externalist. Is it not in danger of distorting by minimizing the interiorization of modernity in the religious life of all communities? - an interiorization such that whatever effect there may be takes place not only from the outside but from within. Other metaphors, accordingly, would be needed to supplement this: one might think, for instance, in terms of percolation, or of digestion, or of an artesian well, or of a contagious disease.

(2) The impact metaphor also seems to suffer from a serious underestimate of the dynamic, fluid quality of the so-called traditional religious systems. They, too, are in flux; they have their own evolution, which today is in full swing. If one is going to think in dichotomies at all, the proper picture is more nearly the confluence of two rivers than the impact of one rushing river on a rock (or mud) citadel.

We need to inquire into what is going on, not to assume a priori any one particular analysis of contemporary religious developments. Hence my contention that it could be profitable to consider these titles themselves in the light of the actual situation, and not vice versa. Particularly in a study of a major civilization other than one's own, and most of all, of the religious life of the men and women of that civilization, one must learn not to set out seeking answers to questions that one has formulated previously. One must learn, rather - slowly, perceptively, painfully, creatively - to ask new questions, to discern new categories, to sense new visions.

The anthropologists themselves have begun to recognize that there is a dynamic within, and not merely upon, present-day religious life in the Orient. The economic historians and economic planners have swung around to seeing that religion is not simply a dead weight intrusive interference from the past in an otherwise straightforward secular advance, but is potentially a contributor to development, perhaps even of some illusive sine qua non - a quality that they do not understand but that they ask us to elucidate for them.

RELIGION AND CULTURE A WESTERN CONCEPT

Alongside the "impact" and "under" titles, there was the more non-committal one "Traditional Religion and Modern Culture". This would seem, at first, comprehensive enough. "Why so fastidious"? you may ask. "Why all this fuss about phrasing? We wish to know what is happening to man's religious life in its various forms in our rapidly innovating modern world. However one may choose one's wording, surely we all know in general what is under discussion". I am unable to aggreè that of course we all know what is being discussed, under this heading. My hope is that by considering the inadequacy of its formulations to the current scene we can arrive at a truer apprehension of this latter, the actual goal of our endeavours.

In fact, I feel that one of the most important requirements of our study is a recognition that we do not quite know what it is that we are observing - so that our first task is to struggle to find out. Creativity is required here.

The relations between religious life and the rest of culture are to be understood in terms of complex interaction and mutual involvement, rather than of a one-way impact. They are relations between religious life "and the rest of culture", and not between it "and culture" simpliciter. The point is important. The latter dichotomy is Western: our civilization derives its religious tradition from Palestine, its culture from Greece and Rome. It not only conceptualizes, but institutionalizes, the two separately. And it has reified the one but not the other.

"Traditional religion and modern culture" is, accordingly, a Western concept. And to some extent also it is a Western phenomenon. Of the other civilizations of the world, China has had a formally comparable duality, with its acceptance and elaboration of a Buddhist movement from India, but the duality is not one of religion versus culture. Neither is Japan's. India on the other hand, and the Islamic world (except in Indonesia) have had a formally more coherent complex. In contrast with the West, therefore, for Asia - at least for the Islamic and Indian worlds, (and I would advocate a use of the term "religious" such that this would hold also for the rest of Asia and for Africa) - for the non-Western world, the religious traditions are the only traditions there are.

(Put differently: "Hinduism" is a modern Western concept which formulates in Western-cultural terms what can more accurately or only be characterized as Hindu culture, perhaps better as Indian culture).

In making such generalizations I have in mind such facts as that the first use of the word Islami in Arabic was to designate those Arabic poets who lived subsequent to Muhammad's mission, including Christian poets, and that as late as the nineteenth century, Muslims in India called themselves "Hindu" because they lived in India as Indians. I also have in mind such a situation as the santri traditions of Indonesia, which are partly Muslim and partly Hindu; and I would contend that the situation in Java is more aptly understood and more authentically apprehended under my sweeping over-simplification that all the cultural traditions of Asia are religious traditions, than they can be under the standard Western over-simplification that dichotomizes such a situation, into two sets of elements,"religious" and "cultural".

All cultural Traditions are Religious Traditions: I admit, that "all the cultural traditions that Asia has are religious traditions" is an over simplification. Yet I put it forth quite seriously, admitting cheerfully that of course it needs to be refined, yet insisting nonetheless that first it needs to be understood. What I am really suggesting is that a Western student who starts from it is far less likely to make mistakes than is one who starts from a religion-versus-culture duality. In fact, he will quite possibly make no mistakes at all; since the exceptions,of which there are many, will be relatively easy to ferret out, if they do not strike him at once, whereas the exceptions to the dichotomizing prejedgment are exceedingly subtle and have escaped many quite erudite scholars.

Of course, another way of saying exactly the same thing is that in non-

Western societies there is no such thing as religion: there is only culture.
This is what the sociologist Werner Cohn has said - and while I do not
sugest that one whould necessarily agree with him, I do suggest that it is
of the utmost importance that one understand him. To see Asians as not
having a religion, only a culture, can be richly illuminating. What one has
to grasp, in that case, is the way in which the culture has transcendent
overtones.

The Elites and Western Concepts: The really serious complication, of
                                  course, is that the important Westernizing
élite of Afro-Asia has adopted Western conceptual orientations, to the point
where it itself affirms our dichotomy; so that some English-speaking Muslims
and Hindus themselves think of traditional religion and modern culture,
thereby both confusing Western observers and cutting themselves off in in-
teresting ways from the rest of their own societies, as well as confusing
themselves. These élites are indeed important; and this innovation of
theirs is not merely a conceptual one. It too is both religious and
cultural, for good or ill.

The history of Pakistan since 1947 illuminates this point richly. The
great matter here is that, for political-socio-economic-internationalist
reasons, the reification of religion is an historical process, which though
very recent in Asia is yet powerful. I have proposed the curious sounding
thesis that Hinduism emerged in the late nineteenth century, and is still in
process of coming into being. In the case of Islam I have documented con-
ceptual reification; in the Hindu case it is sociological as well. At the
moment let me simply make my point this way: that the emergence of Hinduism
and Islam as "traditional religions" is itself a symptom of modern culture.

The existence of a religious phonomenon deriving from the past, and ex-
isting in the present as something distinct from and to some extent in con-
flict with what I have called the rest of culture, is a modern-cultural
phonomenon. The historian of religion can study its recent rise, and can
analyse the radical innovation in the religious history of the communities
concerned that it is in process of constituting. Curiously, this modern
cultural phenomenon of something called "traditional religions" turns out to
be not only not traditional, but also not religious, except in quite
limited ways. Insofar as there actually has come to be a dichotomy between
religion and culture, this particular phenomenon is on the cultural side of
that dichotomy, not on the religious side.

TRADITIONAL RELIGION A FALLACY?

This brings us, then, to the other of the two main concepts in our
title. If the concept "modern culture" is misleading because it suggests a
culture from which religious matters are somehow distinct, the phrase
"traditional religion" is misleading for a whole series of reasons. In the
Meaning and End of Religion I have set forth the reasons that lead me to be
dissatisfied with the concept "a religion" and its plural. To think of it as
"traditional" reduplicates the fallacy.

For any person whose faith is vivid, even whose faith is at all alive,
there are two qualities of that faith (of "his/her religion", if you insist)

that stand out, so far as questions of temporality are concerned: first, that it is timeless; second, that it is present. If religion is anything at all, it is something that links the present moment to eternity. Not to understand this is to have no feel for religious life at all. In the Hindu case, the lack of concern with historical development that has prevailed until quite modern times, is notorious. The outlook of Muslims, in contrast, has been historical - but not historicist. The difference is of the utmost consequence.

Islam: One cannot read the documents of century after century of Islamic religious history with any sensitivity and imagination, without recognizing that they indicate primarily a contemporary reality to those involved. Until at least the late nineteenth century, the Islam of Muslims was a living truth, something that existed primarily in their own day and in their own lives, even though they knew and were quite interested in, the fact that earlier generations had known it also in theirs; - since Muhammad, and in a sense since Adam. The law that devout Muslim's practised was a living reality, was a system of commands that God was enjoining on them, was addressing to them, right then and there, where they stood. That the content of the commands. was X rather than Y, they might learn historically; but the force of the command was contemporary, was fresh each morning as they got out of bed.

You will note that I speak of the law that they "practised". They did not obey the law; that is a modern aberration. They practised the law; it was God that they obeyed. The difference is subtle, but profound; and it ramifies. They did not strive to construct an Islamic society; they strove to obey God, and what we (and perhaps they) call an Islamic society resulted.

Jews: The same is of course true for Jews, equally historical, equally un-historicist. The covenant was a living covenant of God with every generation of Jews, including one's own. It had had, no doubt, a past event as an historical reference point, but one lived in that covenant as a con

temporary reality. In both cases it was the present reality of faith that gave meaning to history, rather than vice versa.

Buddhists: The same truth in the Buddhist case led to the Mahayana glorification of the transcendent, and therefore contemporary, Buddha; and even among Theravadins it was the permanent, timeless, and altogether contemporary dhamma and all that it signified and could lead to, that sustained the faithful. The historical Buddha was important any given morning because he or she had made known once in the past that timeless truth whose relevance and charm and power were at work that particular morning. Their significance in the past derived from a living truth of today, rather than the other way around.

Hindus: In every community the living contemporary faith of the adherents has been the cause and not merely the result of the "religion's" history. Ultimately, Hindus do not believe a doctrine because it is part of Hinduism; rather, it is part of what we have come to call Hinduism, because they believe it.

The Force of Religious Decisions: Let no one imagine that the question of

what is happening to Islam in Pakistan is anything other than the question
of what is happening to people in Pakistan. And even this does not mean
only, what is happening to Pakistanis in Pakistan: it is, rather, what is
happening to women and men in Pakistan. Let no one imagine that the ques-
tion of the cow in India is anything less that the question of how we are to
understand ourselves and our place in the universe. The Buddhist's involve-
ment in politics in Vietnam is a political question but also a question of
our relation to eternity - yours and mine as well as his. Every time a per-
son anywhere makes a religious decision, at stake is the final destiny and
meaning of the human race. If we do not see this, and connot make our public
see it, then whatever else we may be, we are not historians of religion.

Radical Modifications: The religious conditions of Asia (like that of the
West itself) is without any question in process of
being radically modified in the twentieth century, largely as a result of
the spread throughout the world of a dynamic movement originating in the
West by which men and women are transforming mundane life. What I am con-
tending is that this radical modification is much too complex and dynamic,
much too profound and tumultuous, to be described in Western and simplicist
terms as the interplay of two factors, one religious (and traditional
religious at that). one cultural (and modern culture, at that). Rather, the
whole religious (and indeed cultural) history of people is entering a
seriously new phase; so that if we want to understand it we must study it,
and not study something elso: namely, traditional religion.

Is the current development of man's religiousness being worked out in-
side the mosques? in the temples? in the churches? I somewhat doubt it; or
at least, I suspect not only there. I would advise, let us say a Japanese
scholar who might wish to study the present-day evolution of 'homo
religiosus' in America, not to confine his investigations totally to the
formally institutionalized Church, even though Christians especially in
recent centuries have formally institutionalized their religious life more
than perhaps is true of any other society on earth, either at present or
throughout the past. Yet one obvious development on this continent, worth
keeping an eye on, is the emergence of religion departments in arts
faculties, and the possibility that intellectual creativity may be shifting
from the seminaries to them, the possibility that it may be there that alone
will be answered the questions that even the Church itself is asking. Yet
this, I say, is a fairly obvious point; there are many much more covert and
subtle. Simmilarly, I would advise any Western scholar who sets out to
study modern religious process in the Islamic world, not to imagine that
he/she either knows or can find out what Islam formally or essentially is
before they start, so that their task is to survey the current scene and
simply to report on what is happening to that Islam in the tumult of today's
whirlwind. Similarly for something that his conceived as "Hinduism", some
traditional form.

The Heart of the Matter: The Islam that is significant today lies as it al-
ways has lain, in the heart of Muslims, and not
necessarily in the inherited forms. The "Hinduism" that is our task to
describe is that spirit astir among Hindus whose formulation lies in the
future, not in the past. Our concern today is with those things that will
become traditions tomorrow, or the day after; quite possibly, long after we

are dead. Traditions now extant are the deposit of earlier faith. At best, they can be the efficient cause of the faith of people today. Yet if there is one quality characteristic of our modern age, it is the possibility of dislocation between faith and inherited formulation. An investigation concerned only with formulation, not with faith, will all too probably miss the heart of the matter.

Illustrative of this kind of point is Dag Hammarskjöld's <u>Markings</u>. Until this book appeared, a formalistic student of contemporary religious life in the West would hardly have known that this gentleman represented an important part of what they ought to be studying. Suppose that the United Nations Secretary General had had the kind of concern and vision and question that apparently he did have, yet had not written these memoirs or, he having written them, they had not been published. Does any one of us seriously imagine that there are not counterparts to Hammarskjöld in the modern Muslim or Hindu or Buddhist or African worlds, whose reflections have not and never will appear in published form?

Ref. Abridged from PROCEEDINGS of the XIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions. Vol. 1; LEIDEN: E.J. Brill, 1968.

- end -

MODERNITY AND TECHNOLOGY

Marcello de Carvalho Azevedo, S.J.

I want to emphasize only two important aspects of the impact of technology on our humanity because they are both particularly meaningful for our understanding of the challenges put to inculturation. The <u>first</u> one is the close interconnection between the external instrumental nature of technology in a given culture and the shaping of individual and social consciousness in the same culture. The <u>second</u> one is the contemporary, new level of creative technology which involves the human being as an object of the technological process: the biotechnologies.

<u>Technology and Consciousness</u>: We cannot emphasize enough the striking interrelationship between insideness and outsideness in human operations. Improved technology leads to both the internal improvement of the person and to the increased and constantly new transformations of the world. Early man using a limited and precarious technology was also very restrained in his capacity to deal with his environment. The contemporary person, stimulated again and again by the highly developed technology resulting from new mental processes, is equally able to recover and to change entire hostile habitats as well as to destroy a sound environment. The growing awareness of the relevance of ecology has become a central concern of our world today and gives the measure of what technology means. Thus, the more a person transforms the external environment, the more he/she is affected in his/her internal consciousness and vice-versa.

<u>The Process of Human Knowledge</u>: Different technologies generate different attitudes and influence the specific development of individuals and groups. The fundamental reason for this is that technology in a direct or indirect way affects the very process of human knowledge itself. In no other field is this so evident as it is in the technological improvement of human communication. From oral tradition to writing, printing and more recently to the electronic devices which make communication instant - information storage and retrieval systems easily available all over the world - the human person has not only changed instruments but has radically transformed the process of knowledge itself.

<u>The Transfer of Technology</u>: Some people tend to relate this phenomenon to educated populations and producers of technology only. In their opinion, therefore, this problem would be of no interest for underdeveloped countries and for their churches as well. We should not be concerned about it when dealing with the great majority of world population, those millions of undernourished, illiterate human beings in the Third World. This is not true. By various means, the indirect transposition of technologically-rooted mental categories leads to technologically-shaped thinking on the part of people who are not directly in contact with the production of technology. This transposition became a commonplace and unavoidable phenomenon in primitive societies as well as in archaic and modern ones. However, the more a given society becomes involved in the

process of modernization, the more it accelerates such a transfer of contemporary technology. Moreover, while the processes and institutions of education, communication and administration are not directly linked to technological production, they are nevertheless effective carriers of technological symbol-systems and consequently of new meanings and values. On the other hand, since the processes and institutions immediately involved in the production or transformation of technology are the sources of those symbols and patterns, they are decisive in the cultural impact of technology

Transforms Fundamental Relationships: Modernization has always been a gradually growing process. It implies, however, an intellectual, technological and social revolution in any one of its stages. It transforms three of a person's most fundamental relationships - to time, to nature and to another human being. Technology is like a hinge between two other dimensions, the intellectual and the social, in this global, transforming process. When we speak of technology therefore we are not referring simply to something "out there"; this massive technological development is, rather, a profound transformation of individual and social consciousness. It is here that technology can humanize or de-humanize. It is here that technology becomes the crossroads of the hopes and anxieties of the contemporary world. It is also here that the Church can support a hopeless, antagonistic view of technology or integrate itself in the effort of humankind to look for a responsible way to deal with technology. This is a central choice for both the world and the Church.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

Let us mention three aspects of current concern which are variously linked to the technological challenge and are crucial for the inculturation of the christian message and related church policies.

Communications: The first is the problem of language as understood in the broader sense of communication. Most of the training of priests and religious, men and women, has been dominated by literary, philosophical and theological categories. This normally results in a peculiar throght-pattern and a rather specific language which characterizes our preaching, our catechesis and the adult religious education of the laity. The analysis of ecclesiastical documents at almost any level discloses how limited their potential is for genuine communication. Moreover, since the authors are unfamiliar with the mental categories of technologically influenced people, their language may also lead to a functionalist shaping of individual and social consciousness. Religion becomes a separate domain of personal and social life with well-defined operative duties. We fall far short of proposing our message in a way that "animates, directs and unifies the culture"

Educational Institutions: The second point is the nature and place of church institutions, especially of education, within the context of modern education which is essentially modeled and based on scientific thought and method. What is their real contribution to inculturation? How need they be reshaped in our day in order to become effective instruments of dialogue between the christian message and the

cultural-scientific environment?   How should we envision their relationship
with other institutions of education and with public and private policy
decisions?

Ecclesiastical Decision-Making Process: The third aspect is the ecclesiasti-
                                           cal decision-making process itself.
Increasingly the church has had to face difficult and complex situations in
both the developed and developing countries.   There is among christians in
general a sense of how unprepared the Church is to deal with the highly
developed technological network of integrated and frequently manipulated in-
formation which constantly feeds the world centers of decision-making as
well as broad sectors of public opinion.

THE BIOTECHNOLOGIES

     There is another dimension of technology which I would like to intro-
duce now.   Since the end of World War II, both science and technology have
experienced a significant change in direction, the radical significance of
which has not yet been grasped by civic and church leaders, as Brungs stated.
"The life sciences", he says, "have moved away from an observational
posture, through an intense and extremely rapid analytic phase, to a syn-
thetic capability, synthetic in the sense of the capacity to build things.
As a result, we have entered into a new technological revolution with im-
plications for humanity too vast even to be imagined at present.   We have
entered into deliberate and systematic technological intervention into the
human.   We face the greatest technological and spiritual challenges we have
ever known: the growing capacity technologically to master ourselves.   For
the first time in human history we face a technological challenge that must
be met primarily in terms of human ends,   not merely in terms of
instrumentality".

The Church and the World: When the Church decided to face up to modernity
                             in Vatican II, its position on technology con-
templated the older, technological processes, the products and procedures of
the agricultural and industrial revolutions. These processes, as I have al-
ready pointed out, lead to external modifications of the environment, they
improve human efficiency and they affect individual and social
consciousness.   Stressing the former aspects and paying less attention to
the latter, GAUDIUM ET SPES praised science and technology, in a relatively
uncritical way. This statement, which nevertheless is very relevant for the
new relationship between Church and world in its historical-theological
perspective - as is the whole of Gaudium et Spes - was, however, "already
obsolete when it was written" (Brungs).

Application at the Human Level: The philosophical inspiration of science
                                   and technology during the industrial
revolution developed a mathematical outlook on nature. It is a world view
which looks on all things, humans included, as essentially quantifiable. For
almost two centuries, the scientific-technological experimental method con
centrated research in the infa-human area.   It was the adoption of the
method of physics and mathematics by the life sciences in a very recent past

that accelerated their rapid growth toward technological and industrial ap-
plication at the human level. At the time of Vatican II, DNA and the con
traceptive pill were already in existence but only for about ten years. Al-
though Pius XII stated the position of the Church on the research starting
them, the Church as a whole had neither enough information about the
biotechnologies involved nor an accurate perception of their unpredictable
scope. Since then development of biogenetic engineering has been extremely
accelerated.

Biotechnologies and the Third World: Systematically and methodologically,
biotechnologies work toward controlling
and planning the human situation at the psychosomatic level of the in-
dividual and of all humanity. They look to change in humans, the results of
which will be passed on to future generations Here again some people think
this is a problem confined to developed countries. The Churches in the
Third World, they feel, should not waste their time and be distracted from
their current concerns by dealing with biotechnologies. This is not true.
It would be an illusion to think that it is still possible to separate the
fates of populations in today's interdependent world. The contraceptive
pill has been developed in a laboratory of a "center" country but its large-
scale industrial impact has been on millions of human beings who live in the
"periphery" countries and become the objects of nationwide programs of birth
control. One of the most challenging confrontations of our time and in the
near future will take place within this whole area of biomedicine and
biotechnology. Three of the most important aspects of this whole problem
center on personal identity and value, personal freedom and responsibility
as well as on physical - expecially sexual - integrity. "The world to be
evangelized" - Brungs concludes - "includes, among other things, this kind
of science and technology. The sweep of contemporary discovery and the
aspects of nature which they disclose are not yet a part of the Church's
understanding".

Scientific Discovery and Theological Research Linked: With biotechnologies
the Church faces once
again a challenge which is comparable to some others it has faced in modern
times, as I described them in the section on the Church's historical
evolution. If we are not to miss another crucial watershed, scientific dis-
covery will have to be closely followed by, and organically integrated into
our theological research and reflection.

This demands thinking of inculturation in relationship to modernity not
just as a matter of practical pastoral planning or social relations. This
demands a far greater theological understanding of creation than we have
now. This also demands of the Church not its traditional defensive posture
but a basic attitude of both critical and positive openness to unfolding
scientific processes. This necessarily has to be an interdisciplinary task
that urges the theological community to work together with other members of
the Church, particularly with the scientific community, on the meaning and
extent of these discoveries.

This attitude of corresponsibility and mutual trust would replace a
sheerly negative position of condemnation; it would arouse concern about how

to put such a high degree of knowledge and of technology at the service of humankind; it would protect human populations from the consequences of misuse of the most brilliant scientific discoveries of our times. This is not a simple task; it certainly is a crucial challenge to a consistent evangelization of today's world; it touches the cultural structures of modern times, the underlying set of meanings, values and patterns of its social practice and symbolic level.

The Meaning of Human Life: We have to go directly to the heart of problems such as the very meaning of human life in the light of these new sciences and technologies. We should rethink the problem of technological potential as it is related to the booming industrial and capital interests connected with it. "Because of its extraordinary potential, gene splicing... seems to be the technology of the 1980s, just as plastics were in the 1940s, transistors in the 1950s, computers in the 1960s, and microcomputers in the 1970s. Biotechnology is one of the biggest industrial opportunities of the late 20th century" (Time, March 9, 1981, p.51). This simple list of prevailing technologies in the last few decades enlightens the significance of the 80's for the Church.

A Naive Assumption: Theology may help modern humanity in discovering and realizing the limits of immanence and the unavoidable necessity of transcendence. In other words, an inculturated Church may lead modern humanity to overcome the modern dogma par excellence, namely, that humanity is the master of its own destiny. This naive assumption of the industrial revolution has become meaningless for the frightened humankind of the technetronic revolution. Inculturation seems to be the only way for the Church to engage in a dialogue with modernity throughout the world.

The goal in the inculturation process is not to secularize theology but to enable it to introduce the transcendent God to the secular mind of humanity. That is only possible if theological reflection refrains from the attempt to sacralize the whole of human life and recognizes that humanity can provide itself with many answers which were formerly sought from religion. Ironically, secularization may then become a way of purification of religion and faith.

Ref. INCULTURATION AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY;
Marcello de Carvalho Azevedo, S.J, Working Papers on Living Faith and Cultures, Gregorian University, 1982, pp. 30-52

- end -

COMING EVENTS.

I. INTER FAITH DIALOGUE:

A THREE SESSION STUDY

SESSION I

PLACE: SVD Generalate: Via Dei Veibiti, 1.

TIME: Thursday, February, 25; 16.00 hrs to 18.30 hrs.

FACILITATOR: Micheal Amaladoss, S.J.

Participants should prepare Chapter I, II and III of the STUDY GUIDE: MY NEIGHBOUR'S FAITH - AND MINE: Theological Discoveries through Inter-Faith Dialogue. Available at SEDOS Secretariat (Lire 5000).

(Session II will be held on March 24, and Session III on April 28, 1988).

II. EVANGELIZATION:

THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY

PLACE: Villa Cavalletti, Grottaferatta

TIME: Tuesday, March 15, 18.00 hrs. to Saturday March, 19, 13.00 hrs.

REGISTRATION: Tuesday, March 15, 15.00 hrs. - 17.30 hrs.

RESOURCE   DESMOND O'DONNELL, O.M.I; L'ABBE A. NGINDU MUSHETE;
PERSONS: MARCELLO de CARVALHO AZEVEDO, S.J.

FACILITATOR: CAROL SCHMITZ, SSND.

NEWS

LAY MISSIONARY SOCIETIES: MEMBERSHIP OF SEDOS: The SEDOS Executive Committee asked a small committee of members whose institutes have considerable involvement with lay mission groups to make a preliminary study of this proposal, which came originally from the Villa Cavalletti 1987 Seminar on LAITY IN MISSION. Members of the Committee are, Joe O'Neill, MM; Wolfgang Weiss, SAC; Joseph Uhl, MCCJ; Dirk Rapol, CICM; Helene O"Sullivan, MM; Bill Jenkinson, CSSP. The Committee met twice and consulted informally a sampling of SEDOS members. Their interim report is being sent to the Executive Committee which will contact all SEDOS members about the progress of the study.