University of Montana
ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers

Graduate School

1989

Analytic and commitment traditions in western Christianity and culture

Cheryle K. Herbig
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd
Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation
Herbig, Cheryle K., "Analytic and commitment traditions in western Christianity and culture" (1989). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 5577.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/5577

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

Mike and Maureen
MANSFIELD LIBRARY

Copying allowed as provided under provisions
of the Fair Use Section of the U.S.
COPYRIGHT LAW, 1976.
Any copying for commercial purposes
or financial gain may be undertaken only
with the author's written consent.

University of
Montana

ANALYTIC AND COMMITMENT TRADITIONS IN WESTERN CHRISTIANITY AND CULTURE

By

Cheryle K. Herbig

B.A., University of Montana, 1978

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Interdisciplinary Studies

University of Montana

1989

Approved by:

Chair, Board of Examiners

Dean, Graduate School

FEB 1 2 1990

Date

UMI Number: EP41041

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI
Dissertation Publishing

UMI EP41041
Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

3-21-90

Herbig, Cheryle K., M.I.S., December 1989

Analytic and Commitment Traditions in Modern Western Christianity and Culture (92 pp.)

Director: Paul Miller PM

The analytic and commitment therapeutic traditions and their effects upon church and culture in the modern west are the focus of this largely exegetical paper. This was an interdisciplinary study involving Psychology, Sociology and Religious Studies, specifically Philip Rieff's work on the psychology of Sigmund Freud, the sociology of Max Weber and the religious studies of Peter Berger.

Discussion of the ontological state of modernity and its impact upon the contemporary individual and community, comparisons of the historical and contemporary progression of the analytic therapeutic tradition and legal-rational authority, the historical and contemporary progression of the commitment therapeutic in community and charismatic authority, and the futures to which they give rise provided the material for the exegesis. The thesis was that the commitment therapeutic, embodied in western christianity with appropriate authority has the possibility of an inductive approach to itself and transformation of the emerging culture in the modern west, and that dialectical relationships between church and culture exist, are necessary and mutually empowering.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Preface	iv
I.	THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSON OF FAITH	1
II.	THE ANALYTIC TRADITION AND COMMUNITY	17
III.	THE COMMUNITY AND COMMITMENT THERAPY	28
IV.	LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY IN THE ANALYTIC COMMUNITY	41
V.	LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY IN COMMITMENT COMMUNITY	52
VI.	DIALECTICAL RELATIONSHIPS IN CHURCH AND CULTURE	64
	Appendix A	84
	Bibliography	88

PREFACE

When I originally petitioned the University of Montana Graduate School to consider my proposal of an interdisciplinary course of study concerning the individual and the community, my intention, under the direction of Dr. Lane McGaughy, was to pursue exegetical work in the writings of St. Paul, combined with the psychological work of Sigmund Freud and selected works in the sociology of religion. Experiences of teaching in the ghetto of Chicago, writing and teaching courses in Psychotheology and Death and Dying, developing inner city and suburban social justice projects in campus ministry and teaching music history to a group of holocaust survivors thrust me into a cultural milieu of struggle and hope embodied in the lives of the people I met, challenging my understanding of the role of religion and faith in modernity. Marriage and children further confirmed this expanded world view. Questions about legitimate authority in Christian community, symbol and cohesion in culture and the natue of the modern person emerged as more pressing than New Testament exegesis.

The first chapter discusses the possibility of a religious world view for the modern psychological person. Chapter II traces the presence of the analytic tradition in culture from Sigmund Freud foreward. Chapter III places

therapies of commitment in historical and religious contexts. Chapters IV and V discuss legitimate authority in analytic and commitment traditions. Chapter VI concludes with the thesis, and discusses dialectical relationships between church and culture in the modern West.

This project has given me the opportunity to clarify the issues and questions raised by my own experiences. I am very grateful for this opportunity, and have many people to thank.

I wish to thank Dr. Paul Miller who so graciously adopted this project as the chair of my committee. He is a wonderful example of what the intellectual can be both professionally and personally. His time, effort and correspondence have made this project possible.

I am also deeply indebted to Dr. Jan Wollersheim, the longest standing member of my committee, not only for remaining with this project over the span of time, but also for guidance in coursework and instruction in independent study which was crucial in the broadening of my perspective. A scholar and model for women students, Dr. Wollersheim's energy and integrity are remarkable.

Special thanks to Dr. Paul Dietrich who agreed to serve on my graduate committee from his scholarly perspective, particularly generous in light of this paper being far removed from his specialty, the Middle Ages. He also made the inital suggestion that Dr. Miller might appropriately

serve as chair. I am very grateful to Dr. Deitrich.

I also wish to thank former University of Montana professors Dr. Lane McGaughy and Dr. Richard Vandiver for their support throughout graduate school and service on my committee. I also thank fellow students and coworkers Bette Tomlinson, Tom Baker, Linda and Kim Gottschalk and Janet Bregar for challenging ideas and participating in conversation related to this topic, and to Theresa Bustos for proofreading. My thanks also to the Sorenson family, the Mudd family, and Dick Walton.

My special thanks to my husband, Dan, who typed and edited this thesis after long hours editing his own legal writing at work, and for his support and encouragment. Thanks also to Gabrielle and Mary Beth who gave up a part of Mom for a while so that this project could be completed. My gratitude to extended family members who have prized creativity and love of learning; to my parents, remembering that my Father gave up his own university studies, going to work in order to afford correction of my birth defect.

This paper is dedicated to Mr. Roy Lyman who first taught me theology in the key of C.

Cheryle K. Herbig, October 22, 1989

CHAPTER I

The Modern Psychological Person and Faith

How are religion, psychology, sociology and theology examining and contributing to patterns of emerging culture in belief and behavior, symbol and community for the future? What does it mean to be modern? Is there a new ideal type of community emerging from modernity? What are the possibilities for and consequences of the absence or presence of a religious world view in Modern Western civilization?

In 1969, Peter Berger wrote A Rumor of Angels,[1] combining sociology and theology to examine the contemporary western cultural erosion of a religious world view. It was an examination of the structures of secularism, and a comparison of secular and sacred world views. He determined that these were competing world views, deeply affecting religion and culture. The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation,[2] written ten years later again took up the question. This broader work continues to examine the struggle between religiosity and secularism in modern western society. There are many ideas and possibilities from this work impacting the modern psychological person of faith worth discussing,

and setting the framework for the larger question: What are the dialectical relationships in church and culture today?

A definition of terms distinguishing culture and society is appropriate. "Culture is another name for a design of motives directing the self outward, toward those communal purposes in which alone the self can be realized and satisfied."[3] This definition is especially applicable to Philip Rieff's concept of commitment community, discussed in chapter three of this paper.

> Every culture must establish itself as a system of moralizing demands, images that mark the trail of each man's memory; thus to distinguish right actions from wrong inner ordinances are set, by which men are guided in their conduct so as to assure a mutual security of contract. Culture is, indeed, the higher learning. But, this higher learning is not acquired at Universities; rather, it is assimilated continuously from the earliest infancy when human beings first begin to trust in those familiar responses others make to their overtures.[4]

This will be examined more fully in the discussion of the relationship between the analytic tradition and modern community.[5]

"Culture is the system of significances attached to behavior by which a society explains itself to itself."[6] Culture may also comment upon various institutions, structures, and give input to the development of symbol and community as they emerge in society. This considered, whether a society works out of a sacred or secular world view, or an aggregate world view, may impact culture from the most austere structures to the finest point about de-

termining quality of life for the individual. In a similar way, whether an individual's use of faith is for control of impulse and cultural power or remission of those controls is significant.

> Every culture has two main functions, 1) to organize the moral demands men make upon themselves into a system of symbols that make men intelligible and trustworthy to each other, thus rendering also the world intelligible and trustworthy; 2) to organize the expressive remissions by which men release themselves, in some degree, from the stain of conforming to the controlling symbolic, internalized variant readings of culture that constitute individual character. The process by which a culture changes at its profoundest level may be traced in the shifting balance of controls and releases which constitute a system of moral demands.[7]

Society, then, is a self-perpetuating totality of social relationships, bound by shared institutions and some common culture. It comes from the Latin word <u>societas</u>, meaning union, fellowship. Max Weber preferred the category of social community over society, as he did economic activity to economy, and discusses society in terms of social relationships, open and closed, communal and associative.[8] An open communal system, in Weber's terms, defines modern western society. It is communal because membership in society is not a rational choice, but part of "subjective feelings of the parties, whether affectual or traditional, that they belong together,"[9] and open because it "does not deny participation to anyone who wishes to join and is actually in a position to do so."[10]

Modernity impacts culture and society, and also

projects individuals into a radically different personal state than ever before in human history. To be modern is to assume control over aspects of life never before considered. Time, space, education, occupation, where to live, whom to marry--if at all, the number of one's children, gathering of resources, dividing activity into business and leisure, technology and science, even choosing one's God[11] have powerful impact upon moral, ideological and religious choices for the modern person. These choices, unthinkable in premodern society, now form the heretical imperative, according to Berger. Culture is now formed around the availability of these choices. Modernity is the "near inconceivable expansion of the area of human life open for choices."[12]

Equally challenging, and perhaps more pervasive is the accompanying world view that modernity is "the juxtaposition of this new world over the old worlds of traditional people--an unpredicted event in human history."[13] Being modern is expressing belief in the power of the inanimate. The most powerful force behind modernity is technology, according to Berger, which makes the movement from premodern fate to modern choice not only possible, but inevitable; the central thesis of his book.

Modernity in the west may not be chosen, because we are situated in history, and the fact of birth in this era constitutes a life in the midst of modernity. It is this

situation which places every individual life in the process of internalizing some of the qualities and dynamics of the modern state. The cognitive structures and psychohistorical development which result form modern consciousness.[14]

A modern psychological person (as in psychological man) is in the dialectical process, the inner self being guided by the forces of modernity and modern culture being reshaped by the movement towards autonomy of the individual. Contemporary technological consciousness is infused into all areas of life, including religion. Modern consciousness may be the situation, but the individual is not entirely confined within that situation. "Homo sapiens is a situated being but also...forever driven to transcend his situation."[15]

In this way, modern consciousness is only one form of consciousness, and like all others, historically it is in the constant process of transformation into the next culture.[16] In other words, modern consciousness is not the only truth. As in all forms of consciousness, it represents aggregates of internal and external forces within and without its dateline. It is the premodern world of fate broken perhaps forever by the modern possibility of plurality of choices which may irreparably rupture the connections between the two worlds. Cognitive dissonance is the new norm. It is here that the relationship between modern culture, the

modern individual and faith enters. In The Heretical Imperative, Peter Berger argues that modernity in the west has caused religion a unique two-fold crisis: secularism[17] and pluralization.[18] Pluralization, argues Berger, is the more powerful. Plurality undermines the authority of religious traditions, by expanding the plausibility structures by which the modern individual may explain one's existence, relationships and distinctions. Berger then concludes that this leaves modern western defenders of a religious world view three options: deduction, reduction, or induction.[19] Deduction is an attempt to "reaffirm the authority of the tradition in defiance of challenges to it,"[20] reduction is the compromise of "trying to secularize the tradition,"[21] and induction is the modern attempt to "try to uncover and retrieve the experiences embodied in the tradition."[22] Berger argues that the inductive approach is best applied to religious experience and tradition. It may be interesting to note that the reasoning behind the genesis of the Second Vatican Council in Rome was inductive, forever changing the modern face of Roman Catholicism.

One of the ways religious authority is undermined by plurality is the modern demise of tradition.[23] Using a ceremonial object for one purpose and no other, speaking or dancing in a ceremonial way for one celebration and not another, specific rites of initiation and passage open to a certain age, sex or social class, even ritual participation

itself mark traditional ground. What has been "experienced as necessary" over time comes to be "interpreted as necessary."[24] In modern society, what is necessary is subjective, and the objective reality is lost because the experience is no longer placed in the realm of the cosmos. Modernity also complicates and pluralizes the formation of experiences and institutions which lead to the formation and maintenance of tradition. Deciding whether to name or uphold a religious tradition in the modern world is to move from fate to decision. Each individual has multiple options choosing perspective and action, as well as choosing, at least to a small degree, a conscious world view. The process by which traditions became social institutions is also pluralized in modernity.[25] Consciousness, even modern consciousness, eventually requires some social support if it is to retain its viable view of reality. The plausibility structures of belief or unbelief, though subjective, are also the result of culture, even permitting the movement from one plausibility structure to another. This has far reaching consequences when considering the relationship between orthodoxy and heresy in the institutionalization of religious tradition. If it is true that orthodoxy is often former heresy, historically then, in modern culture orthodoxy by sheer force of plurality is heterodox. It is relevant to note that the word heresy comes from the Greek root meaning "to choose or form an opinion."[26] Part of

the recent "Conference on the Laity" in Rome was based upon the institutionally perceived problem of plurality in religious thought in the United States with regard to religious tradition and authority in Rome.

Institutions also are pluralized, and plurality is institutionalized as a way of expanding the plausibility structures for belief.[27] Every traditional institution dependent upon social support in the past has been fragmented by modernity, its symbol system weakened by the cultural movement towards subjectivity, autonomy and conscious decision. There is a kind of built-in uncertainty to modern consciousness which is necessary for personal insight into multiple world views. One must reflect in order to decide.[28] Which competing world views will provide the structure for thought and action? "Biography is a sequence of choices,"[29] says Berger, as would mainstream cognitive therapists today. Epistemology asks, "What can I know?"[30] and the answers are no longer universal, provided by society, upheld by culture, leaving the reflective modern individual turning inward for answers toward self and subjective judgment.[31] The numbers and forms of modern psychologies, pseudo-psychologies, psychotherapies, therapeutic groups, religions, cults, and philosophies visible today indicate both the modern overintellectualization of everyday life as well as the new truth that a "socially defined universe can no longer be relied upon,"[32] which

then becomes another plausibility structure.

As the inner world becomes more subjective and complex, the outer world becomes less defined.[33] Modernity produces ambivalent people. Even children in our society come to know themselves alone and often isolated from traditional structures of support present in former structures. The femininization of poverty and rise in deviant and antisocial behavior among youth reflect the ambivalence of culture to define itself in this area. Jean Paul Sartre said we were all condemned to freedom in this century. Freedom and alienation seem to be the paradox of modernity;[34] they also represent an ancient theme in salvation history.

As the modern psychological person is very busy about organizing a workable world view in the cosmos, even the idea of relativity can be mass communicated, further pluralizing subjective meaning.[35] This necessitates continued restructuring of the modern individual's world view.

As morality and institutions of all kinds have been affected by modernity, so has modern human consciousness let go of the traditional hold of religion. As secularization is related to pluralism, modernity relativizes religion.[36] A religious world view, like other social structures, needs the social support of unity and social reliability to re-establish a hold in modern consciousness.

Modernity has changed the plausibility structures of

that social support, because, as Berger says, "modernity creates a new situation in which picking and choosing becomes an imperative."[37] To choose what and why one believes would have been heresy in premodern society, but is in fact the necessary question of modern life.

So, then, religious authority in culture--whether by natural law or traditional practice--gives way to a new idea of belief by consent. Belief by consensus was a part of the former traditional structure of religion in culture, but it is changed now, standing as it does with empiricisms in the new plausibility structures of modern belief.[38]

The modern individual then, by fact of birth in the west in this age, is faced with multiple choices including both the opportunity and necessity of making faith choices.[39] Destiny, in the religious sense, is no longer viewed as the path of life.

Max Weber speaks of the "religious virtuosi"[40] among believers for whom perhaps religious choice and religious thought is most self-authenticating, even in modernity. The mystic is the classic historical example, one whose first-hand experience with religious reality impacts so powerfully that the perceived truth of that experience is undeniable and unforgettable to that individual. These individuals may be able and willing to make personal and cosmological assumptions about the relationship of these primary experiences to other realms of life. Religious affirmation is

certainly possible here. The ordinary modern person searching for some movement towards religious affirmation, however, responds to a different internal dialogue. Still influenced by experiences which have become preserved in the tradition of religious culture, society, community and family, yet participating in the social mediation of those traditions, the modern psychological person will be selective and perhaps skeptical of the religious experiences and thoughts of others, and self.[41] The possibility of moving through the large number of accounts, perspectives and reflections available and apparent in our age, to a position of personal religious affirmation happens, but is often a difficult task.[42] Even a willingness to define sacred space and sacred time means dissecting reality for the modern seeker. Of all states of ordinary consciousness, being awake in everyday life is an easier reality to share with others than many other realities.[43] It also holds a place of honor among reliable perspectives available in the modern world, and has the strongest plausibility structure of all ordinary realities in this age of empiricism. There are, of course, departures from this waking reality. These may be biological, as in sleep, illness, grief or stress; they may be self-induced as in a hallucinogenic experience, or extended ritual participation.[44] These departures stand apart from ordinary reality, requiring the modern person to find somewhere else in the psyche to put them.

The question then becomes how the religious experience fits into all of one's experience.

Ultimately, religious experience and affirmation or rejection probably belong to the heart, not the mind, even in modernity. Perhaps the decision to explore religious experience is never entirely conscious. Faith is about one's own attitudes and beliefs about the location of the sacred, even in everyday reality.[45] The radical quality of religious experience, identified by Rudolph Otto and Miricea Eliade, insists upon making room in an already full modern world view for a cosmos which includes the possibility of a scared order and distinctions between the sacred and profane.[46] The resulting affirmations or rejections, emotional responses, identification with the sacred, and symbol structures are then available and subject to affirmation or denial by the community, as they have been for the individual.

The interesting thing about the modern encounter with the sacred is that though the primary experience of the sacred is still, as it was in premodern society, "other," there is something powerful about the way everyday reality and ordinary time are renewed and affirmed.[47] There is, of course, ambivalence in regard to this encounter, as there has been throughout biblical history. Cognitive and skeptical, yet attracted and curious, there is a bit of biological fight or flight in the assessment of the modern

religious encounter. We do not know which of our powers to trust. Appropriately, the Latin root of the word religion means "to be careful."

"The embodiment of human experience in traditions and institutions"[48] is universal and historical. It is an anthropological reality; not only for religion, this process makes social life possible.[49]

In considering how the modern individual may come to a point of religious affirmation, a brief examination of the continuing importance of ritual and symbol in religion and faith is appropriate. Ritual participation and the symbolic bind the individual to the community, and it is in these systems that renewal, reordering and identification happen on the deepest levels. Moving beyond cognitive structures into the intuitive creative dimensions of the psyche, ritual and symbol provide perhaps the deepest integrative opportunities in religious community. Ritual and symbol preserve and re-enact the embodiment of religious truth, regardless of historical considerations. As an example of this continuing interest and concern for integrating ritual and symbol into the overall life of a community, a large conference for religious professionals was held this past summer at Notre Dame University in Indiana. Its theme was "Ritual...The Connecting Point." Participants explored the realm of symbol and ritual as the link between a fragmented world of modern ordinary time and cohesive expression of

religious experience for themselves and their congregations.

Traditional pastoral concerns about building community and support systems for individuals take on new urgency in modernity. If the modern psychological person is to affirm christian faith in the midst of life today, it will require "the conviction that the core contents of the Christian message provide the fullest and most adequate interpretation of one's own experience of God, world and self."[50]

Notes

1. Peter L. Berger, A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural (New York: Doubleday, 1969)

2. Peter L. Berger, The Heretical Imperative; Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1979), hereafter cited as Heretical Imperative

3. Philip Rieff, The Triumph of the Therapeutic; Uses of Faith After Freud (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), hereafter cited as The Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 4

4. Ibid., pp. 11ff

5. See chapters II and IV of this paper

6. Rieff, The Triumph of the Therapeutic, pp. 68ff

7. Ibid., pp. 232ff

8. Max Weber, Economy and Society (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), vol. I, pp. 40ff

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., pp. 43ff

11. Berger, Heretical Imperative, pp. 2ff

12. Ibid., p. 3

13. Ibid., p. 2
14. Ibid., pp. 5ff
15. Ibid., p. 7
16. Ibid., pp. 7ff
17. Ibid., pp. 24ff
18. Ibid., pp. 14ff
19. Ibid., pp. 56ff
20. Ibid., p. xi
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., pp. 11ff
24. Ibid., p. 13
25. Ibid., pp. 16ff
26. Ibid., p. 120
27. Ibid., pp. 16ff
28. Ibid., pp. 120ff
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., p. 19
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., p. 20
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., pp. 21ff
35. Ibid., pp. 22ff
36. Ibid., pp. 24ff
37. Ibid., p. 25
28. Ibid., pp. 115ff

39. Ibid., pp. 28ff

40. Max Weber, Sociology of Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963) p. 162

41. Berger, Heretical Imperative pp. 33ff

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid., pp. 35ff

44. Ibid., pp. 36ff

45. Ibid., pp. 34ff

46. Miricea Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1959)

47. Berger, Heretical Imperative, pp. 39ff

48. Ibid., pp. 43ff

49. Ibid., p. 43. See also Berger & Luckman The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Doubleday, 1966)

50. Ibid., p. 165

CHAPTER II

The Analytic Tradition and Community

Attempting to treat the wounds of isolation we seek healing and even curative powers from within and beyond ourselves in both secular and religious community. Common language, symbol, art, myth and need for security have bound communities throughout history. Connection remains the impetus and the hope in our technological, impersonal, global but fragmented world. Existentialism in some degree is the modern state of being. Even the self-recognized existentialist will admit that we live in a therapeutic culture. In his book The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud,[1] Philip Rieff frames what he considers to be the religious question in modernity this way: How are we to be consoled for the misery of living?[2] Though history gives varied answers, if we are to examine modern western culture, at some point we are drawn to the important work of Sigmund Freud, his followers, and the resulting analytic tradition. Here is the genesis of modern western society as therapeutic culture.[3] Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) founded the psychoanalytic movement. An Austrian physician and neurologist, he was one of the cultural giants of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Freud did not ask the religious question, and never proclaimed a character ideal to answer or lead us beyond the question.[4] (This was not true of his students and followers.) Freud was analytic, not prophetic:[5] "What would be the use of the most correct use of social neurosis since no one possesses authority to impose such a therapy upon the group"? To change the dynamics of culture, the analytic attitude would have to become a moral demand, and thus it would cease to be analytic.[6]

This rejection of the religious question, as culture had handed it down to Freud, contributed to the symbolic impoverishment of our culture.[7] Though some of Freud's successors created a vision for a new or at least renewed culture, Freud argued that any further anguish over the chasm between meaning and meaningless must be abandoned. By the power of the analytic attitude, Freud tried to determine limits on the power of culture over the individual.[8] Culture was unimportant to Freud in the sense that it was unchangeable anyway. The power was in the analytic ability to change the individual's relationship to the invasion of culture. In this way, with culture viewed as a repressive moral demand system, one could become diplomatic in relationship to culture, at best. Maintaining the analytic attitude limits the power of culture, and becomes the effort of the ego.[9] This is not to say there is not conscience, but it is in the conflict between natural impulse and the

power of culture to impose authority over that impulse. Freudian maturity and membership in the adult community is determined by the rather consistent ability to keep the mediation going, and is bleak because there is nothing beyond the individual's power to maintain the mediation.[10] As is true with the historical institutionalization of any idea or system of ideas, psychoanalysis was adopted and changed beyond Freud, and "became a transferable art, and therefore a cultural force..."[11] part science and part art, contributing to individualism and isolation in our culture. It is ironic that the analytic attitude attempts to deal with the pain of individual loneliness produced by culture[12] at the same time requiring of that some individual radical introspection shattering belief in the power of any community to heal.

Freud's view of ego strength was as self-protection, and "life as a balancing act" with the "ego in constant danger of falling either into excessive instinctual release (psychopathy) or into excessive instinctual repressive (neurosis). It is crucial to remember that the ego has only so much energy to devote to its multiple tasks.[13]

The analytic relationship, in Weber's terms, is a closed associative system[14], and produces what Rieff terms the "negative community,"[15] created and used for individual purpose and increased autonomy in relationship to the negative influence of culture.

> A reorganization of those dialectical expression of Yes and No, the interplay of which constitutes culture, transforming motive into conduct, is occurring throughout the west.... It is to be expected that some instruments appropriate to our action will not survive the tension of fundamental reorganization. But, suppose the tension is driven deeper--so deep that all communications of ideals come under permanent and easy suspicion?[16]

The analytic attitude includes a negative view of authority, other than authority of self, reinforced by the negative community, even if that is only the community of analyst and patient. Maintained in modernity by new social norms of individual personal achievement, personally measured success and self reliance as plausibility structures, the modern psychological, and in Weber's terms, economic person prefers fewer obligations, in contrast to demands of former commitment communities. Perhaps Freud determined that the culturally cohesive authority to maintain social commitment was fading.[17] It seems more than coincidence that the analytic movement was born and is maintained only in modern relatively democratic societies.

Freud "imagined an ideal patient, one so strengthened that he could tolerate a return to nothing more compelling than an environment in which the ego could fight more capably for itself in the subtle and universal war of all against all."[18] For Freud, religion was another womb, from which the religious person must emerge shaken and alone, finally to admit that god is dead. In response, each person must become an expert on sustaining self, moving

quickly toward autonomy. Freud wrote," the moment a man questions the meaning and value of life he is sick, since objectively neither has any existence."[19] By rejecting a synthesized world view, the analytic person opposes the development of culture, and therefore rejects the notion of viable community.[20] It now becomes clear that reconciling positive commitment communities of any sort, including the religious with the analytic framework is very difficult. It does seem, however, that there is some fluidity between the two systems in that the introspection and scrupulous examination of conscience and motive required in the analytic life seem similar to some former requirements for religious contemplation and membership in that commitment community.

A new kind of realism is the modern requirement for the analytic, and it is here that truth,[21] not hope, can be found. As with culture, religion has two possible functions. One is control of ordinary existence, and the other is release from that control. If religion is controlling, then doctrine, dogma, structure and ecclesial office are important. In general, the older the commitment religious institution, the greater the degree of control because of the historical process of institutionalization. Faith, then, is relatively more systematic, limiting spontaneity and eventually becoming "anti-instinctual" because "doctrine is internalized."[22] As in all forms of psychological retraining, there are similarities between analysis and

religious experience.

"History supplies enough examples of that deliberate emptying of consciousness, which may be the essential characteristic of all systems of therapy."[23] All of these methods reflect therapeutic control. Communities which hold these beliefs historically have tended to be authoritarian, limiting the spontaneous expression of emotion. It is interesting that asceticism had its roots in ecstatic religious experience. "In Freud's conception, therapy is indeed a mechanism for establishing self-control." The cultural context is effected because Freudian therapy is "morally neutral. Faith, however, even one that accents the remission of control, is never neutral. The analytic attitude is an alternative to all religious ones."[24] One can clearly see the difficulty in the co-existence of the analytic attitude and positive community in modernity. Communities exist in part to perpetuate themselves, and so must balance controls and remissions. Culture also contains controls intended to structure boundaries within which the individual may function. The Freudian view holds human freedom in a dim context, seeking "not more happiness but less misery."[25]

> Psychological man is...a myth--but not more of a myth than other model men around whom we organize our own self-interpretations. He is the same self in a mad world, the integrating personality in the age of nuclear fission...his presence, fluttering in all of us, a response to the absent God.... Until we can control the shock of this recognition we shall not be able to assess the character of our own age correctly.[26]

Freudian residue in modern western culture is a response to the same dynamics which make the envisioning and recognition of the modern psychological person possible. Freud advocated abandoning the deep social questions of antiquity. In community, the analytic dynamic admits the complexity of modern life, but requires only balance in response. None of Freud's students, and few of his followers could resist the temptation to move back from the edge of the abyss. His noted student and rebel follower Carl Jung developed his system of archetypes, adapting the analytic attitude into a kind of universal community, even if on an unconscious level. Much more could be said about Jung, but for this paper Jung's support of the need of a religious outlook in maturity[27] and his ascertaining of the difference between meaning and meaningless as a factor in psychological well-being are most helpful. Jung deliberately, it seems, pushed beyond the limits stressed by Freud toward a reintegration of culture and community, though the object of Jungian therapy is still reconciliation with inner direction and inner authority. Freud's rejection of community, except for the analytic community of two was fueled by "his belief that there were no longer extant any communities wherein men could safely invest their troubled emotions in the hope of higher dividends."[28] The analytic is for individuals, psychological well-being is individual achievement, and the capacity to maintain that attitude

means having on hand more than one perspective for any situation, relationship or choice. Psychological maturity in this sense is cognitively demanding.

In the United States as technological and industrial capacities changed social structures, and authoritative structures began to crumble, there emerged questions about shared social commitments and the necessity of independent choice and self-expression. Analytic therapies are still dependent upon a Freudian framework, and modern culture has adapted that framework as well.

The Greek-influenced ideal of happiness was never fully integrated into either the christian or Jewish theory or theology for the formation of community. Freud found it unnecessary as well. Rieff states that:

> "...the political man of the Greeks, religious man of the Hebrews and Christians, and enlightened man of Eighteenth Century Europe (the original of that mythical present-day character, the "good European") has been superseded by a new model for the conduct of life. Psychological man is...more native to American culture than the puritan sources of that culture would indicate."[29]

Freud's rejection of some character ideals and cultural authority was easily assimilated into our culture because of what has been necessary in the very birth of the United States. Formed and shaped by these experiences of origin, we continue to be fertile ground for the analytic attitude. Rieff also points out that the ascetic ideal, once generated by commitment to community or ideology, has also become

therapeutic in modernity.[30] The analytic relationship models a detached, distanced therapist, from whom the patient is kept at bay to "maintain therapeutic effectiveness." In the process, "the patient must learn how to draw the veil properly around himself."[31] This is eventually extended to the social life of the patient, a therapeutically modeled minimalization of commitment to anything beyond one's own self and needs. Any commitment the individual does make becomes part of the therapeutic process. In Freudian terms, "the therapy of all therapies, the secret of all secrets, the interpretation of all interpretations is not to attach one self exclusively or too passionately to any one particular meaning or object."[32]

In this way, the inner life, examined, becomes the norm for social life just as in former communities of commitment, but with radically different expectations. Freedom is maintaining detachment. Emotions are not connected to any institution or community by which one might be yet bound. Life is certainly anti-symbolic in this model. Rieff states, "negative communities are those which, enabled to survive almost automatically by a self-sustaining technology, do not offer a type of collective salvation, and in which the therapeutic experience is not transformative but rather informative."[33]

Finally, then, there is the question of the possibility of any positive community, including christian community,

being formed and maintained in modern western culture. "The question is no longer as Dostoevski put it: 'Can civilized man believe?' Rather: Can unbelieving man be civilized?"[34]

Notes

1. Philip Rieff, The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), hereafter cited as Triumph of the Therapeutic

2. Ibid., p. 29

3. Ibid., pp. 27, 66ff, 71ff

4. Ibid., p. 29. See also, H. Gerth & C.Wright Mills, From Max Weber: Essays In Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946)

5. Ibid., p. 30

6. Ibid. See also Sigmund Freud, Civilization and its Discontents (London: Standard Edition, 1961) p. 144

7. Ibid., p. 48

8. Ibid., pp. 30ff

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., pp. 31ff

11. Ibid., p. 32

12. Ibid.

13. William C. Shepherd, Paradoxes About Ego in the Western Tradition (Unpublished Working Draft), p. 326

14. Max Weber, Economy and Society (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), vol. I, pp. 40ff, 43ff

15. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, pp. 32, 53ff, 73ff

16. Ibid., p. 4

17. Ibid., pp. 32ff

18. Ibid., p. 33

19. Ernst Freud, Ed., Letters of Sigmund Freud (New York: Basic Books, 1960), p. 436

20. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, pp. 34ff

21. Ibid., p. 137

22. Ibid., pp. 34ff

23. Ibid., p. 35

24. Ibid., p. 36

25. Ibid., p. 38

26. Ibid., pp. 39ff

27. Ibid., pp. 43ff

28. Ibid., p. 47

29. Ibid., p. 58

30. Ibid. pp. 60ff

31. Ibid., p. 59

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid., p. 73

34. Ibid., p. 4

CHAPTER III

The Community and Commitment Therapy

"Positive communities are characterized by their guarantee of some kind of salvation of self; and by salvation is meant an experience which transforms all personal relations by subordinating them to agreed communal purposes."[1] It is only here that therapies of commitment can be sustained. The ancient biblical idea contained in the book of Genesis, which is that to know is to name, is a precursor of the requirement for membership in positive community. Changing one's name, changing the name of another (as in Sari to Sarah, Abram to Abraham) was a sign that in knowing, and in relationship, the person was forever changed by the power of that encounter. Vestiges remain in the religious rites of conversion and confirmation as symbolic examples of the return to community necessary for the commitment therapeutic. Certainly, this may also happen in the secular world, as with devotion or service to nation-state or military goals. One is transformed by the power of one's commitment to the community and the ideals and plausibility structures which form, maintain, and renew that community.

It is very difficult for these positive communities to

survive in a culture expressly modern and technological, which relies upon informative rationalism as maintenance for its structures. Though it may be true that most western societies are no longer culturally positive,[2] it is still possible to find positive communities within the culturally negative societal framework. It is also possible to find many contemporary therapies suggesting a melding of the reality of modern intellectual rationalism (in this sense the analytic tradition) with commitment to community.[3] Already mentioned is the sustained therapy of Carl Jung, who advocated a universal community of archetypes, shared by a communal unconscious, therefore linking self to others even if on an unconscious level. Others have suggested doctrines of the search for true self. The difficulty is the danger, as found in Jung's therapy, of his "religious doctrine in which God is rendered completely interior"[4] and other processes which secularize the religious tradition and/or dilute the impact of the therapeutic.

The viable communities of commitment which do exist are changed in character by the cultural force of integrating the autonomous individualism of modernity into the plausibility structures for constructive reflection today. The goal of commitment therapies has always been to return the individual to former commitments to community, or to enable the individual to seek membership in a new community. Here, meaning beyond self may be found. In this reintegra-

tion, the social forces of modernity are modified, and a symbol system by which to live and believe reemerges as a contemporary possibility. Commitment therapies have always intended to go beyond the informative[5] to the transformation of the individual, opening new possibilities for finding meaning in life, even in the midst of an existential culture. Because there are ethical and often religious matters contained in the structures of commitment communities, there is a need for organization different from that of the analytic tradition. Like former commitment communities and therapies, modern commitment communities and therapies differ both in authority and doctrinal content. Almost all of the group psychotherapies and pseudo-psychotherapies practiced today are commitment therapy in some form. The many "twelve-step" programs are examples, trading group support for standing alone with addiction and promising that in the commitment to the community will be found strength and possible healing.

For many of these clients, the culturally compounding factor adding to the private forces of addiction is that many social support structures and institutions have failed in recent history as places to put one's trust without anything apparent to replace them. It is arguable that at least one generation of Americans find themselves in this bewildering and precarious position. For them, new models of commitment therapy may not only be possible, but life

sustaining.

Christian community, with other religious communities of commitment, have the possibility of adopting this role in providing opportunities for commitment for new reasons. The problem is in the subtle secularization of religion in the modern West and in the misinterpretation of the reemerging Kerygma of the church by the forces of routinization[6] and modernity. The possibility always exists for "any religious exercise [to be] justified only as being something men do for themselves, that is, for the enrichment of their own experience."[7] Individualizing religion for person objectives may be the impulse in modernity. It requires a large sophisticated yet intimate community to which the modern individual may commit to effectively challenge personal maturation and affirm plausibility structures for developing and sustaining a religious world view. These considerations apply to structures beyond christian community.

"Society as a whole needs patterns of community life which will help ordinary people to fulfill themselves in much the same sort of way that the psychiatrists help those specially troubled."[8] Surely churches could help fill that need in modern society if they would be willing to reexamine their roles and responsibilities in light of modernity.

Considerations of a culture's stability are

significant, particularly when hypothesizing the return of significant commitment communities and their symbol systems to the forefront of modernity, for it is as though modern culture mirrors the individual struggles commitment therapies seek to dispel:

> Culture, although it becomes for a man a 'second nature' remains something quite different from nature precisely because it is the product of man's own activity. Culture must be continually produced and reproduced by man. Its structures, therefore, are inherently precarious and predestined to change. The cultural imperative of stability and the inherent character of culture as unstable together posit the fundamental problem of man's world building activity.[9]

Thus, one of the pressing religious and cultural questions for modernity in commitment terms is how we are to be renewed and sustained in the modern world.

In both religion and culture, symbol and myth[10] play a crucial role. It is here that both truth and meaning can often be found.

> Traditional religious affirmation can now be regarded as 'symbols'--what they supposedly 'symbolize' usually turns out to be some realities presumed to exist in the depths of human consciousness. A conceptual liaison with psychologism and/or existentialism makes sense in this context.... If existentialist presuppositions can be posited as basic features of the human condition, religion can then be interpreted as 'symbolizing' the latter.[11]

For culture, symbol has the power to challenge and renew just as theology does in religious community. The continual development of myth and symbol in culture, like theology in religion, is a powerful dialectical force for renewal.

Legitimized by experience on a conscious level, myth and symbol reframe the plausibility structures for all of modern culture. The rational mind makes way for something additional, and often truthful, on another level. Ritual, then, has the power to reconnect the individual to the symbol around which the community may be reordered. Viewed this way, religion becomes not controlling but releasing by its capacity to allow individual determination of the depth of the bond mutually existing between the self and community.

"All symbol systems are therapeutic if they are compelling enough, and especially if they serve to introduce a character ideal.... In general, all cultures have a therapeutic function, insofar as they are systems of symbolic integration--whether these systems be called religious, philosophical, ideological, or by any other name."[12] This is reflected in the dynamics of religion and philosophy from the beginning of cultural development in the west. Integrative functions of the symbolic have always been expressed in culture, and have produced historical character ideals. It is the community which upheld them. Though in religious history the ascetic represented control, and the mystic ecstatic release, it is interesting to note that asceticism has been a Roman Catholic doctrinal requirement for some membership in commitment communities. Rieff notes that "Plato was the first to deliberately build his

symbol system upon the integrative function. His Republic is one attempt to link the health and stability of the person to his place in a right social order." [13]

It is, then, the community that is therapeutic. Full citizenship has often been cited in history as a requirement for maturity and well being. This ideal holds the core of commitment therapy, and has been reformulated throughout history. The emergent classical ideal was that "any individual can exercise his gifts and powers only by participating in the common life."[14] In the Middle Ages, for example, it was a commitment to church which led to the church-state power merging institutional authority with civil authority to limit the range of options in belief and behavior granted the individual.[15] In this way, the therapeutic ideal of the committed participant was maintained by citizenship.

"Culture is the system of significances attached to behavior by which a society explains itself to itself.[16] Cultures undergoing profound change find it difficult to articulate the rationale behind the social order.[17] In such a changing community, members or authority figures may attempt deductive, reductive, or inductive[18] work to re-establish the community order. Sometimes, the disorder is too great and the therapeutic commitment to community can no longer be made. Perhaps the ideals have decayed and the individual is no longer certain of salvation of any kind.

Philip Rieff holds that "in the destruction of all idealizations upon which traditional and classical communities were based, in theory and practice, is to be sought the origin of modernity."[19]

The analytic tradition would answer that the solution is to free the individual from the false psychological and emotional bonds to the community. Humanism is modern middle ground, with individual conscience lighting the path. If Peter Berger is right, and the inductive approach is best applied to religion in crisis, then the inductionists would say that there is still value in the commitment, though the structure needs to be reordered.

Communities still search for a way in which autonomous individuals may remain so yet maintain therapeutic commitments. The appropriate balance is the subject of religion, psychology and sociology today. In The Role of Religion in Psychology[20], Joseph Reid notes that the theistic and humanistic traditions of the two fields have encountered some difficulty in the modern age. Though the American Psychological Association opened a division for religion and there are several christian associations for psychology, the merging in actual therapeutic practice remains questionable to both disciplines. Part of the hesitation may be the undercurrent of the debate about the viability of any commitment therapy in the modern age. Religious therapists, if there are any, have a special task. Rather than attempting to proselytize or evangelize, the religious

therapist attempts to bring the individual to a synthesizing world view. It is not doctrine or dogma these commitment therapists find helpful, but the theological world view of the patient. The symbolic integration of spiritual, social, emotional, cognitive and physical factors may find support in commitment to a set of religious ideals as a way for the individual to reorient him- or herself.

All religions have a therapeutic function, whether controlling or releasing, but psychoanalysis in the Freudian tradition is implicitly anti-religious; therefore religious psychologists are not therapists in the analytic view. In light of commitment therapy, however, the right to choose one's perspective on well-being and choose one's connections is different. Even Jung suggested that a dominant symbolic must be operative to know self and thereby achieve mature well-being. Jung "had to sublimate psychoanalysis itself, altering it to the general cure of souls, without committing it to one or another historical religion but, rather, making it available in the service of all."[21]

In the nuclear age, we know that freedom and responsibility are linked. If the old culture dying is the ascetic culture, then perhaps the pendulum swinging toward the releasing modalities of our new age need to be examined in terms of motivation for developing morality and the possibility of understanding nature and culture in new ways. What sort of community is then worth our commitment, and

what, if anything, do we still need beyond our technology and ourselves?

Religion and religious communities still have some responsibility to culture. They must help to develop and maintain a modern symbolic which is to renew culture. The current symbolic poverty of the modern west may be helped by a "shift from evaluative to expressive symbolism."[22] Our former culture "internalized love and externalized hatred."[23] This form of negative community was manifest in Nazi Germany and Jonestown. This cannot be the vision of the future. "We are privileged to be participant observers of another great experiment by western humanity upon itself; an attempt to build upon the obsolescence of both love and hatred as organizing modes of personality."[24] What powerful possibilities for the formation of new modes of commitment therapy! It is now the motive for organizing that counts, both organizing one's personality and values and one's commitments. Perhaps it will be other than political or social motive which will determine any character ideal beyond this culture. Every doctrine of communal purpose will need to be scrutinized. In the commitment community of the future, as in a healthy family, the necessity of individual commitment will need to be balanced by the willingness of the group to support and serve individual development. Personal unfolding growth and renewal are enabled by the communal respect of the

autonomy of the participant to handle issues he or she is capable of handling without the intervention of the community or its authority. This more respectful relationship is very different from the invasion of some former commitment communities. Many issues such as family life, human sexuality, and obedience to authority could be re-examined in this vision of commitment community. It is perhaps only in being willing to adapt in this way that any commitment communities--or therapies--can be sustained in the future. Perhaps the language of faith is not dead, and religion will help a new type of therapist of commitment to emerge and be legitimized for the future. Power, among commitment groups may no longer be associated only with the cultural elite,[25] as in former systems. "New releasing insights deserve only a little less respect than the old controlling ones."[26] Distinctions between our modern inwardness and ancient faith must be cognitively reorganized. The therapeutic effort of commitment must move beyond the analytic tradition[27] becoming a moral voice "within a powerful and deeply compelling system of culture."[28] The challenge lies ahead for commitment therapies and communities to claim their roles as voices for the future.

Notes

1. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 73
2. Ibid., pp. 73ff

3. Eric Fromm, Carl Rogers, et al

4. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 97

5. Ibid., p.72

6. Max Weber, Economy and Society (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), pp. 246ff

7. John Wren-Lewis, "What Are Clergy For?" THE LISTENER vol. LXXI March 1964

8. Ibid., p. 252

9. Ibid., p. 6

10. See footnote 1, Chapter VI, this paper

11. Peter L. Berger, The Sacred Canopy (New York: Anchor Books, 1967), p. 167

12. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, pp. 66ff

13. Ibid., p. 67

14. Ibid., p. 68

15. Ibid., p. 68

16. Ibid., pp. 68ff

17. Ibid., p. 69

18. See Chapter I, this paper

19. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 69

20. Joseph Reid, Care Network (Colorado: Publishing House, 1989) July/August 1989

21. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 91

22. Ibid., p. 245

23. Ibid., p. 246

24. Ibid., p. 246

25. Ibid., pp. 246ff

26. Ibid., p. 261

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

Legitimate Authority in the Analytic Community

In the analytic based community and its vestiges present in modernity, legitimate authority arises out of rationalism. The idea of legitimate authority was presented by Max Weber in his Basic Concepts in Sociology[1] and applied specifically to religious community in his Sociology of Religion.[2] An outline of his discussion is as follows.

"Conduct, especially social conduct and more particularly a social relationship can be oriented on the part of the individuals to what constitutes their 'idea' of the existence of a legitimate authority. The possibility that such orientation actually occurs shall be called the 'validity' of the authority in question."[3] Weber argues that subjective recognition of legitimate authority may be due to compelling emotional response to that authority, "rational belief in the absolute validity of" that authority especially if there are "ultimate binding values of an ethical, aesthetic, or of any other kind" for the individual or the idea that "obedience to authority" provides a vehicle for some kind of salvation.[4] The first two of these possibilities apply to a discussion of the analytic tradition and community, the third to commitment community

because of the idea of salvation.

Authority is "conventional" if there is the general perception that disregarding that authority is disapproved of by the social group, and it becomes "Law" if that same social disapproval is represented by punishment, carried out by those "especially charged with the authority for that purpose."[5] Legitimate authority of this type comes to mind in western hierarchical and patriarchal groups. Control, as sanctioned by the group, is deemed essential to the well being of the community. There are more subtle version of these forms of control. Religious groups often use "friendly persuasion...as a form of gentle pressure on sinners [constituting conversion...providing it is carried out according to the rules and by a specially designated group. The same is true of the use of censure as a means of enforcing norms of moral conduct, and even more so of psychic pressure brought to bear as a means of church discipline."[6] One only needs to be reminded of the investigations and silencings in recent Roman Catholic policy.

From a sociological perspective, then, leadership is acknowledged authority in some form. A group which has established rules for the norms of appropriate behavior, particularly in the form of a charter or constitution with all rights and responsibilities prescribed therein, is a community bound by legal rational authority. Such a

community would have boundaries established for behaviors in all social circumstances, and sanctions against those who deviate from those norms. This type of community would also have a set of offices with duties prescribed to maintain those structures.[7] One who leads such a community by occupying one of the prescribed offices fulfills the responsibilities prescribed by the group and is mandated by the authority of this ideology. One's individual personality and charism--or lack of it--is irrelevant in the sense that this leader does not determine policy. Charismatic authority,[8] on the other hand, has everything to do with one's personality traits and individual abilities since the entire organization operates around a compelling individual. Many church sects, and most economic institutions are a blend of charismatic and legal-rational authority. Historically, the movement tends to be from the charismatic to the legal rational. In point, our society has moved steadily from charismatic to legal-rational organization. Some would say that the entire modern western society is about the process of perfecting legal rationalism as the new norm. This parallels the autonomous existential lives of the modern psychological person, and the historical development of the analytic attitude in democratic societies. Negative communities, found in the analytic tradition, can continue to exist and be supported because of their authority system.

> A system of authority which is guaranteed by external sanctions may also become internalized. . . .The sociologist regards a standard as ethical if men attribute to it a special kind of value which they claim to be ethically good, just as any conduct regarded as beautiful can be measured by aesthetic standards. Ethically normative ideas of this kind can have a powerful influence on conduct even though they may lack any external guarantees.[9]

This lack of any external guarantees may even include a lack of any guarantee of salvation. "Belief in legality"[10] is the contemporary affirmation of legitimacy in modernity. This has replaced earlier affirmations such as indentification of charisma, natural law or pantheistic world views. The sweep in the west toward legality is personal, communal, cultural and societal.

In the analytical community as it exists in modernity, the therapeutic goals are administered by therapists, as in the analytic community of two, or a small group, or near therapists; those who take upon themselves a therapeutic administratorship, but lack full membership in the analytic community of therapists. (Certain types of ministers, counselors, administrators, writers, teachers.) The analytic model draws the individual into the study of self with a detachment from community which will later be model for social interaction as well. Authority in the christian version of this dynamic comes from the belief that "Jesus himself was the first therapeutic."[11] The kerygma of the church is personalized in this way but the effort of that personalization is for individual therapeutic purposes in

contrast to the earlier commitment to communal purpose of salvation. Therapeutic religion is something of a contrast of terms in the analytic sense, and therapeutic christian authority in the analytic tradition requires the secularization of the tradition to legitimize the mission of the leader to a point where the analytic model takes precedence over the external salvational goals of the community. This renders the church therapeutic, negative, and incapable of standing as a powerful prophetic voice in culture. It is in this area and in this way that some modern christian communities have abdicated their catalytic roles in modern culture. As long as the therapeutic is modeled as an ideal type, negative communities will continue to be formed with little hope of commitment beyond self. Philip Rieff speaks of the rise of the therapeutic this way:

> The leisured, or non-working, classes are the main resource from which the therapeutic, as a character type is drawn. Emancipated from an ethic of hard work, Americans have also grown morally less self-demanding. They have been released from the old system of self-demands by a convergence of doctrines that do not resort to new restrictions but rather propose jointly the superiority of all that money can buy, technology can make, and science can conceive.[12]

Churches, then, and church authority must compete with culture, leisure, autonomy and affluence on their own levels. It is from this aggregate of pressures that some contemporary religious groups doctrinally link personal wealth and success to God's providence in return for membership in the community of the spiritual and cultural

elite, and also that civil religion is born. Civil religions is also psychologically rooted in the analytic tradition, though its members often do not recognize their participation in this negative community.

The person holding religious authority then, must balance modernity and all its trappings with christianity 'apiruic roots. Clearly there is little middle ground, and modern western christian community often yields to the pressures of autonomous psychological individualism, nation-state policies and symbols. Legal-rational authority and charismatic personality are often blended in the leadership, benefiting the demands of modernity and maintenance needs of community. Rieff argues that "the gospel is self fulfillment,"[13] and the authority to do so comes from within. Sacrament, myth, symbol and ritual become therapeutic tools, and the presider need no longer be especially spiritual, certainly not mystical or even an exemplary person. Rather, one must be unwilling to preach against self above all, and to refrain from suggesting old therapies of commitment and asceticism into prerequisites for spiritual well being. Contemporary character ideals demand separation between former caretakers of christian commitment systems, and that particular religious world view which they upheld as truth.

It is no surprise, then, that not only are christian communities in difficulty, but christian authority as well.

Rieff puts it this way:

> Christian...professionals have lost their spiritual preceptorships. Any functional equivalents to the old internal interdicts, whatever they may be, struggling to stabilize themselves and as yet without institutional conveyances, take on meaning insofar as they prove capable of providing a trained prudence to the therapeutic, anxious to increase his psychological capital without incurring dangerous risks.[14]

Modern legal-rational authoritarianism in christian community demands that value judgments be made only in reference to the particular community. In this sense, culture and church stand apart as christian perceptions are held true only within the plausibility structures of historical christianity.

> If yesterday's analytic thrust is to become part of tomorrow's cultural super-ego, it must take on an institutional form, defend itself not only as true but also as good and dig into personality as a demand system.... Like the old cultural super-ego, the negative communities of the next culture, so far as we can discern them in this respect, rarely utter hosannas; therapeutics, not yet settled in their mode, speak to each other mainly in harsh tones. Our spiritual preceptors practice their unkindness upon each other.[15]

Not only is church unable to be a powerful critic of culture in modern times, church also sometimes struggles in self-evaluation.[16] The tension in struggling authority is felt from within and without the christian communities own structures. "Certainly, Freud hoped that the psychoanalyst would be the one to have some legitimate claim to spiritual perception. Yet Freud himself was reluctant to tamper radically with the cultural super-ego. As we have seen, his

orthodox successors have become even more strictly client-centered."[17] Who, then, will take up the sceptor? Will the modern psychological person as an ideal type be capable of sustaining religion in modernity? It is a complicated set of probabilities. Rieff comments on religion and the future this way:

> At least those rationalists who, with Freud, returned to a therapeutic examination of the committed consciousness that held their fathers, admit that their own scientific instruments derive from therapies of commitment. As rationalists, obsessed with the idea of examining the refuse of moribund and corrupt religiosities, our epigonal Freuds are really engaged in fighting one mode of internality with another. Because psychoanalysis is a secular paradigm of religious self-knowledge, it aims at abolishing itself. The logic of abolition is in the psychoanalytic effort itself, and in the next, culture. As the ideal type of psychological man of this post religious century is struggling to make his deepest and more subjective processes clearer as neurosis, rather than as gods, as his ancestors had done. Later, probably, the therapeutic will have externalized his emotional life successfully, and psychology will then cease to be a post-religious discipline; rather, it will probably supply the language of cultural controls by which the new man will organize his social relations and self-perceptions.[18]

It seems probable that the legal rational system of mandating and maintaining authority will continue to be assimilated into all but the most distant observers rejectors of culture (i.e., the Amish, Hutterites, and other special sects) in modern christian community life in the west. As church often mirrors trends in society, we might look for institutional authority to continue to be upheld in christianity, even though there are many for whom it has

very little personal meaning. The charism, universals and moral systems of demands once firmly in place have been replaced by a subjective particular self-proclaimed perspective from which to preach. The renewing function of theology and its traditional accompanying mouthpiece of presider/authority may no longer have the capacity to renew. Authority so institutional as ours loses its dynamic force as a catalyst for cultural change, and becomes instead support for the status quo in society. Institutions are upheld, not the communities they were created to serve, and institutional control serves the controls of society, even as they crumble in a psychohistorical era of social remissions. The result is individuals who experience commitment to sacrament, ritual or community on a personal level, but to whom the large authority structure may mean very little, if at all anything. Of these members, new scismatic communities are formed, often on a local level. The underground church is the American Catholic example. It remains to be seen whether these communities will undergo the routinization of charisma and development of authority similar to the communities they left.

It is interesting to note the recent mega-merger of the Lutheran Church of America, the American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches into the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, involving 5,288,048 members. (The more conservative Missouri Synod

remains unmerged.) Reflecting societal trends, the merger process included "debates over quota, the possibility of adding an intermediate layer of bureaucracy to the national structure, and ownership of property."[19] Quotas were debated in terms of ratio of lay representatives to clergy with decision-making power, as well as ratios of minorities to dominant Lutheran populations, and male and female members constituting new decision-making bodies. Nine Regions were added and now operate between the National Church Council and 65 Synods, each Region with a bishop. "Designed as centers for mission, there is continued debate as to their effectiveness and necessity."[20] Ownership of property dealt with issues of who owns what when a congregation is disbanded or merged. "The three dominant arguments favoring the merger were 1) a unified Lutheran Voice in America, 2) more centralized use of resources, and 3) cost effectiveness."[21]

One can see the societal trends toward corporate merger, legal-rational authority, and vestiges of the analytic attitude at work here, and in many similar though smaller church situations. The question is, are these trends compatible with the kerygma of the church, or are they forces secularizing religion?

Notes

1. Max Weber, Basic Concepts in Sociology (New York: Citadel Press, 1968), cited hereafter as Basic Concepts

2. Max Weber, Sociology of Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), cited hereafter as Sociology of Religion

3. Weber, Basic Concepts, p. 71

4. Ibid., p. 75

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p. 77

7. Max Weber, Economy and Society (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), cited hereafter as Economy and Society, pp. 217ff

8. Ibid., pp. 241ff

9. Max Weber, Basic Concepts in Sociology (New York: Citadel Press, 1968), p. 78

10. Ibid., p. 82

11. Rieff, The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), hereafter cited as Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 251

12. Ibid., p. 253

13. Ibid., p. 252

14. Ibid., pp. 255ff

15. Ibid., pp. 258ff

16. See Appendix I

17. Rieff, Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 249

18. Ibid., p. 200

19. Interview with Pastor John D. Sorenson, former ALC now ELCA Pastor, Bethel Lutheran Church, Colorado Springs, Colorado, September, 1989

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

CHAPTER V

Legitimate Authority in Commitment Community

Legitimate authority in commitment community is very different from the legal-rational authority of analytic community. While the forces of modernity are at work in commitment community, as they are at work in analytic community, the commitment community resists the legal-rational role of authority, most typically producing instead a set of circumstances requiring charismatic leadership to support and maintain its structures, particularly in christian community. Certainly there are blends of authority: legal-rational, traditional, and charismatic, but the unique commitments to abstract ideals present in these positive communities accentuate the need for charisma in its leader.

As previously stated, there are social theories and historical examples which hold that it is the community that cures. Examples of the curative community may be found, for example, throughout the history of Greek philosophy. The Middle Ages was also a significant historical era, a time when the therapeutic and moral expectations of religion were institutionalized in the form of a church civilization. Authority figures were necessary when there were

disagreements about means, not ends, as the community integrated its salvational, moral, and even therapeutic goals into doctrines such as natural law.[1] During this period clerics exercised the therapeutic function by performing rite, ritual, and participating in the integration of symbol into the community by whatever means were sanctioned by the community in order to bring the individual into the realm of appropriate belief and action held positive by the community.

It is interesting to note that a classical understanding of the function of the therapist is to "commit the patient to the symbol system of the community, as best he can and by whatever techniques are sanctioned."[2] The point is that behind the authority figure in these commitment communities stands the community as a symbolic support for the authority of the beliefs, actions and decisions spoken or ritualized by the leader. Positive communities offer salvation as the reward for individual commitment. If it is true that "faiths develop first as primary modes of release from earlier uses of faith, then develop their own control functions,"[3] then the person of authority in that faith community, as a therapeutic type, will balance the tension between remissions and control emergent in that community represented. Positive communities in earlier stages of formation would integrate releasing functions into the therapeutic effort. This has

historical foundation as the ecstatic may have been the first therapeutic type.[4] The ascetic then, would represent communities which develop structures leaning toward therapeutic systems of control.

The person holding authority in commitment communities has needed to possess the characteristics of the charismatic. "Ritual participation is an extreme form of commitment therapy"[5] and the presider for that ritual in a positive community is to embody the personal life worth living as defined by community standards, in its extreme, the very deity itself. "All extraordinary needs, i.e., those which transcend the sphere of everyday economic routines, have always been satisfied in an entirely heterogeneous manner: on a charismatic basis."[6] Max Weber's statement certainly applies to the abstract ideal of salvation promised by christian commitment community: "The authority exercised by those individuals who experience charisma directly, over all others in society who experience it only in radiated form, we will call charismatic authority."[7]

Rudolph Sohm took up the historical and biblical idea of charism from the letters of St. Paul and wrote of the evolution of primitive christianity to the Roman Catholic Church. Max Weber took it up again, moving Sohm's application of charism to institution over to personality. According to Weber, the charismatic personality may be

manifest in sacred and secular authority figures. The charismatic is an expansive, compelling personality, sometimes exhibiting an exemplary inner state. The charismatic person is interested in the transformative more than the informative. Charismatic persons "seek to break the structures of routine actions and to replace them with structures of inspirational actions which are "infused" with those qualities or states of mind generated by immediate and intensive contact with the "ultimate"--with the powers which guide and determine human life."[8] Charismatic authority does not yield to and is not maintained by the forces of modernity as other types of authority previously mentioned because the legitimation of this authority and the accompanying world view come from the realm of the sacred, not the ordinary. The concepts of sacred and profane, as discussed by Rudolph Otto[9] and Miricea Eliade[10] speak of sacred space, sacred time, and the realm of the sacred as distinguished from the realm of the profane. These distinctions are helpful in understanding the role of charismatic leadership because the plausibility structures of communities guided by charismatic authority stand apart from the norms of modern western society, and partially from legal rational considerations. Though these communities exist in the culture of modern society, there is something "revolutionary"[11] about their presence, especially in modernity. Weber puts it this way:

> The mere fact of recognizing the personal mission of a charismatic master establishes his power. Whether it is more active or passive, this recognition derives from the surrender of the faithful to the extraordinary and unheard-of, to what is alien to all regulation and tradition and therefore is viewed as divine--surrender which arises from distress or enthusiasm. Because of this mode of legitimation, genuine charismatic domination knows no abstract laws and regulations and no formal adjudication. Its "objective" law flows from the highly personal experience of divine grace and god-like heroic strength and rejects all external order solely for the sake of glorifying genuine prophetic and heroic ethos. Hence, in a revolutionary and sovereign manner, charismatic domination transforms all values and breaks all traditional and rational norms: "It has been written..., but I say unto you....[12]

Modernity is about autonomy, technology, power, linear progress, predictability, and legal-rationalism. By its very nature, charismatic authority disrupts the viability of this world view. This is not only true in modernity. Historically, monasteries and universities have been sources of institutional control of charismatics.[13] As Peter Berger[14] points out, one of the compelling advantages of a culture distinguishing between the sacred and the profane is to allow the secular order to continue uninterrupted while encounters with the sacred are related to specific predictable times and places. This need is exaggerated in modernity.

As for the commitment community responding to and supporting charismatic authority, there are several considerations:

> Those in whom the charismatic propensity is strongest, out of intelligence, moral sensi-

> bility, metaphysical inclination, etc.--will be the promulgators of the new vision of a better order; those in whom the charismatic propensities, although not strong enough to permit charismatic originality, are strong enough to respond to such a vision when concretely embodied and mediated in a charismatic person, are the most likely followers.[15]

This description may be also aptly applied to scismatic groups who leave a larger religious group because they are in need of a different authority structure, but hold fast to the abstract ideals and salvational goals of their former community. It is interesting to note that in those groups, proclamation from sacred text, preaching and other presidential duties are often shared among the new founders, perhaps in an attempt to determine the charisma within the group as well as to symbolically reject the authority structure recently abandoned.

There are some difficulties unique to charismatic leadership which compound the difficulties of plausibility and maintenance structures of positive commitment communities in the modern west. Max Weber isolated the problems of charismatic succession and routinization of charisma. Both are complicated by the pluralizing and releasing forces of modernity. Weber argues that when a charismatic leader must be replaced, there is a "call for dispersion of charisma"[16] from the original charismatic person through a series of institutionalizing steps which disperse and diminish the compelling force of the charisma. As the succession moves further down the road of history

from its original inceptor, the more institutionalized and routine the charisma becomes, eventually rendering the charism, the charismatic authority and the community relatively ineffective, and prey for the forces of modernity. In this way, charismatic authority is pressed by the same norms of the movement toward legal rationalism paralleled in society. Max Weber states this powerfully, saying that "[i]ndeed, in its pure form charismatic authority may be said to exist in natu nascendi. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized or a combination of both."[17] He outlines the possibilities in succession process as follows:

> A) The search for a new charismatic leader on the basis of criteria of the qualities which will fit him for the position of authority. B) Revelation manifested in oracles, lots, divine judgments, or other techniques of selection. In this case the legitimacy of the new leader is dependent on the legitimacy of the technique of his selection. This involves a form of legalization. C) Designation on the part of the original charismatic leader of his own successor and his recognition on the part of the followers. D) Designation of a successor by the charismatically qualified administrative staff and his recognition by the community. E) The conception that charisma is a quality transmitted by heredity; thus, that it is participated in by the kinsmen of its bearer, particularly by his closet relatives. F) The concept that charisma may be transmitted by ritual means from one bearer to another or may be created in a new person. The concept was originally magical. It involves dissociation of charisma from a particular individual, making it an objective, transferable entity. In particular, it may become the charisma of office. In this case the belief in legitimacy is no longer directed to the individual, but to the acquired qualities and to the effectiveness of the ritual acts.[18]

The third and fifth possibilities listed above have the most probable application to modern religious commitment community; the third would be applicable in succession of bishops and other higher ecclesial offices; and the last in rites of passage, especially confirmation, holy orders, and other consecrations for religious purposes. This is an effective way of saying symbolically that one is brought forth from the midst of the community to be and set apart, usually in a traditional setting.

There is also the consideration of the place and value of charisma in modern society at large. As each person seeks to become an authority on self in the modern west, developing personal power is expected in the corporate structure. There is charisma present in every strata of society, and in fact charisma has become the modern prerequisite to success, though now separated from its origin in and connection to the sacred. This "normal form"[19] of charisma has become part of the ordinary. It also "provides the chief criterion for granting deference in the system of stratification and pervades the main themes of the cultural inheritance and practice in everyday society. thus, normal charisma is an active and effective phenomenon, essential to the maintenance of the routine order of society."[20] Max Weber named patriarchalism and bureaucracy as structures maintaining continuity in ordinary affairs in society. These stand over against "all extraordinary needs,

i.e., those which transcend the sphere of everyday economic routines, have always been satisfied in an entirely heterogeneous manner on a charismatic basis.... Charisma is self-determined and sets its own limits."[21] The charismatic leader not only receives mandate from the cohesive ideology of the community, but is dependent upon recognition of the inherent charism for the authority to be effective and sustained. The idea of that leader being set apart emerges again in historical developments such as celibacy as a requirement for ordination or ecclesial office, prohibitions from holding civil office, and vows of poverty and obedience. Max Weber comments this way: "Charisma rejects as undignified all methodical rational acquisition, in fact, all rational economic conduct. This accounts also for its radical difference from the patriarchal structure, which rests upon an orderly household...those who have a share...in the charisma must inevitably turn away from the world."[22]

The other problem with charismatic authority is the need for continued recognition and assent of the leader. Max Weber notes that "[c]harismatic authority is naturally unstable."[23] The person holding charismatic authority must prove again and again a worthiness to lead. The well-being of the individual and the community are linked to the power of the charismatic leader to provide that well-being. In this way, the responsibility of survival is mutual--the

community upholds belief in the power of the charismatic leader to lead and the leader mediates health back to the community. All this fails quickly if for whatever reason, rational or irrational, success is not forthcoming for the community.

What then, of the future of charismatically led christian communities in modernity? The answer may lie in the revolutionary nature of charisma previously discussed. As Philip Rieff notes:

> In culture, too a revolution may be taken to represent the overthrow of an established order, a substitution of some new ruling symbolism of personal sacrifice for old. Social change is heralded, or accompanied, by ideological or cultural movements that are themselves training schools for some new therapy of commitment.... A truly unique revolution would be one that would not generate any compelling therapies of commitment. In our urban technological culture, it seems both archaic and dispensable already to organize men into compassionate communities by what Freud called "erotic illusion." Instead, the therapeutic is more adapted to organization into administrative units, with what use to be called "indifferentism," or, more recently "nihilism" as the general rubric describing social emotion. Not trained in a symbolic of obedience--indeed, entertaining the category merely as a convenience--western man could be free at last from an authority depending upon his sense of sin. Even now, sin is all but incomprehensible to him in-as-much as the moral demand system no longer generates powerful inclinations toward obedience or faith, nor feelings of quiet when those inclinations are overridden by others for which sin is an ancient name.[24]

Commitment community and charismatic authority have not breathed their last. The other possibility is that the revolutionary nature of charismatic leadership and christian

commitment community are unpredictable in another way. If modern christianity is able to be its own critic without continually silencing prophetic voices from within itself, it may have a role in shaping the future of culture, whatever that culture may be. That role would be centered around some of its historical situations as in any institution, but drawn by a transcendent reality and hope of human existence achieving full potentiality by developing an inclusive world view and refusing to allow culture the final step of accepting relativity and meaninglessness with no possibility of another dimension for the future. This would certainly require a dialectical relationship in church and culture.

Notes

1. Philip Rieff, The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud, (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), hereafter cited as Triumph of the Therapeutic, p. 67ff

2. Ibid., p. 68

3. Ibid., pp. 72ff

4. Ibid., p. 72

5. Ibid.

6. Max Weber, Economy and Society (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968), p. 1111

7. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1968), hereafter cited as Encyclopedia, vol. II, p. 386

8. Ibid., p. 387

9. Rudolph Otto, The Idea of the Holy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978)

10. Miricea Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of the Holy (New York; Harcourt, Brace & World, 1959)

11. Ibid.

12. Weber, Economy and Society, p. 1115

13. Encyclopedia, vol. II, p. 338

14. Peter Berger, The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1979), hereafter cited as Heretical Imperative, p. 46

15. Encyclopedia, vol II, p. 389

16. Ibid.

17. Weber, Economy and Society, p. 246

18. Ibid., pp. 246-49

19. Encyclopedia, vol. II, p. 390

20. Ibid.

21. Weber, Economy and Society, p. 1111

22. Ibid., p. 1113

23. Ibid., p. 1114

24. Rieff, Heretical Imperative, pp. 244-45

CHAPTER VI

Dialectical Relationships in Church and Culture

Some of the most important questions for the future are about autonomy, commitment and culture. What will the next culture look like? Where will it draw its boundaries and set its vision? Will the new ideal type, as Philip Rieff suggests, be the therapeutic? What hope is the for a post-modern religious world view? What is the balance between private autonomy and social commitment? What will be the relationship between church and culture? In concluding this paper and responding to the questions remaining, there nine major considerations which need to be explored, the last of these containing the thesis of this work. They are as follows:

1) Modernity is not permanent, but is in the process of transformation as has been every culture preceding it. Further, modernity is multi-dimensional.

2) The forces of modernity may be a source of purification both of culture and christian commitment community; an opportunity foe genesis, not destruction.

3) Institutional structures and motivations toward organizations of modern communities, including christian commitment communities, require re-examination,

due in part to cultural infusion by the analytic tradition.

4) Christianity has a responsibility to challenge culture just as culture has historically challenged christianity. The future of this challenge lies in the area of reintegration of moral questions; first into its own structures and then into culture.

5) Elements of self-expressive curiosity, historical transcendence of situation and continued social activities of maintaining and recreating world views hypothesize homo sapiens as a poor candidate to remain strictly legal-rational in the analytic tradition.

6) No one world view is ever complete, and many world views are homogeneous. Modernity is an aggregate of many forces; one of the hidden blessings of the modern situation possibly being the autonomous power of the individual to develop or choose an aggregate of world views including the possibility of a religious world view.

7) Questions of meaning and of morality are forced by biological considerations and historical biography. Unmitigated existentialism is difficult to bear over a lifetime, even in a culture which denies the reality of limitations to human power and ultimately death.

8) The social sciences may have missed something in that there is little work done on what the compelling experience is for those who do choose christian community and the accompanying religious world view and the possi-

bility that charismatic leadership is often misunderstood in modernity.

9) Commitment communities, particularly christian commitment communities with appropriate leaders, self understood as carriers of the myth[1] embodying the truth of the kerygma of the church, have a role in the formation and transformation of the next culture.[2]

The multidimensional aspects of modern culture are complex in tensions between remissions and controls, the struggle for individual autonomy and responsibilities remaining beyond the self, the generation of new symbol structures in media and art, clarified and articulated even if adversarial relationships between nature and culture. All these provide themes around which the individual, communities and culture may organize for the future. In the process of transforming ourselves into the next culture, we bring some historical considerations such as social successes and failures in policy and practice, eras of war and peace. We bring new considerations as well, questions as to how modern society will adapt the growing urgency of our own environmental needs may be supported by formerly dominant native religious world views about the relationship of environment and social community. Examples of two world wars, regional wars, the holocaust, and the use of terrorism as an agent for social change all in this century require modern consciousness, policy and leadership, both

civil and religious, to consider ancient religious themes of war and peace in the contemporary situation, balancing freedom and responsibility in light of nuclear possibilities. In addition, AIDS and the predicted shift in demographics toward a large population of the elderly as well as social considerations of poverty, addiction and violence require the reconsideration of the theodicy question in modern times. What we are to become, especially in the democratic west, depends partly on which voices are heard. No one perspective holds the answer, but modernity requires a new balanced aggregate of perspectives. Church and culture are dependent upon each other in constructive reflection for the future on these issues and others, bound by the inexorable pressures of modernity.

Christianity in the west may need the challenge of modernity to grow beyond it's traditional boundaries and perspectives, to accept more fully it's own ongoing revelation and along with culture to be transformed. Reassessing authority and commitment are serious issues in many churches as they are in the emerging culture. Modernity has already been through some of the process of reassessment and though conclusions need not be the same, studying modernity and culture could serve as a useful tool for religion. In this way religion would have the possibility of an inductive approach to itself and culture, purifying form and preparing for the future. Peter Berger

sums up the inductive advantage this way:

> Implied in this option is a deliberate empirical attitude, a weighing and assessing frame of mind --not necessarily cool and dispassionate, but unwilling to impose closure on the quest for religious truth by invoking any authority whatever--not the authority of this or that Deus Dixit, but also not the authority of modern thought or consciousness."[3]

We might suppose that the forces of modernity previously discussed will continue to shake down communities and therapies of commitment and replace or blend charismatic authority with legal rational authority. We might further suppose that, as Philip Rieff suggests, the therapeutic is the new ideal type. It follows that the next culture might be more remissive, existential, and rational; it might continue to have the analytic tradition in its roots. Even if all this is to become reality in the modern west, there is still much to be learned. Perhaps previously orthodox reductionist theories of culture, commitment, community and religion need to be challenged in light of the analytic tradition. For example, some institutionalized co-dependent religious behaviors such as committing oneself to community so that one may be taken care of could stand to be re-examined and perhaps be found questionable. One possibility is that cognitive therapies could speak to this issue, encouraging individuals to claim their own therapeutic processes, creating a new future for commitment. Some major structural reordering may need to follow, but it is possible that therapies of commitment could be purified and made

viable again. Similarly, by recognizing plurality modern culture could benefit from the "admission of church as humane lobbyist"[4] into its political arena. Lane McGaughy has argued that "the American political system itself rests on symbolism drawn largely from the Judeo-Christian tradition"[5] resulting in closer connections between church and state than are often realized, and giving rise to civil religion. He further argues for a distinguishing between civil religion and religious dogmatic tradition, and recognition of the study of religion as a source of illumination of the American political tradition.[6] The future needs these dialectical relationships, purifying and transforming both church and culture.

Perhaps nothing is more pressing than the need to address moral questions, both corporate and private, in the social order. This is made difficult by the plurality of modernity and the lack of a cohesive commitment authority. Which questions to ask, how and to whom to ask them, and what plausibility structures frame their answers remain to be determined. Remissions and controls, commitment and autonomy are at issue. Because it is necessary to reflect and dialogue in order to choose, there is the necessity of ongoing evaluation and creation of symbol, including language. Language is always human symbol, socially and historically located. Language used to symbolize moral debate is especially powerful because it is reinterpreted on

so many levels. It is also possible to voice one's world view in the use of language even if that has not been directly called for in the moral debate.

Just as culture needs methods of theoretical reflection and analysis of its moral issues as they emerge, religion requires a similar dialogue for renewal. This has been traditionally the role of theology in the church. When a religious tradition is without theology it is without the possibility of renewal. Ancient structures with no modern voice form situations like religion in Iran with enormous moral, political and social problems. Caretakers of culture might take note that the need for renewal in culture in the political, social, symbolic, and moral arenas is no less urgent. Religion could help raise these moral questions by providing a perspective from which they could be debated and studied, thus contributing ideals for renewal from its own structures.

First, however, religion would have to take a hard look at its own structures. Policy and rubric based upon the same injustices found in dominant culture are of little hope as a source of renewal. An example of the placing of moral question in the cultural and religious arena was the work of the Moral Majority. It is interesting to note that in an era of cultural remission, the vestiges of the Moral Majority (which may have been neither) argue for censorship and restriction of the parameters of belief, symbol, art,

reflection, dialog and action. This effort, and others like it must not be misunderstood as an inductive approach to either religion or culture. Equally disturbing and incongruous is the current institutional pressuring and even silencing of some theologians to assert a deductive or reductive evaluation of both religion and culture. These efforts delay the processing and synthesizing of valuable information and perspective--personal, corporate, interdisciplinary and cross-cultural--retarding efforts to develop meaningful dialog between church and culture. The famous theologian Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P., now silenced by the Roman Catholic Magesterium in the tradition of Galileo, once noted that "authentic orthodoxy is seldom to be found in those who simply repeat literally what has already been said...."[7] One wonders if he knew intuitively how prophetic the words he chose to introduce the book God the Future of Man[8] would become. He chose from the writing of Martin Heidegger:

> The situation could hardly be more grotesque--my philosophical attempts are proclaimed as the destruction of metaphysics and yet, at the same time, with the help of these attempts, ways of thought and ideas are followed which have been derived from--I do not say which are indebted to--that alleged destruction."[9]

In this area, the forces of modernity and the aggregate of world views and authority structures now possible could mediate the power of institutional control without devaluing all authority, historical organization, symbol and

development of doctrine. The kerygma of the church and its possibilities for impact upon culture as a moral voice may thus be refined, re-evaluated and empowered rather than destroyed, ironically the fate the silencing magesterium fears. Debates over censorship in church reflect the struggle to balance remissions and controls in culture. In the emerging culture, moral questions cannot be avoided. A strong multifaceted symbolic will help give expression to these moral questions, possible answers, and continued reflection. Church could be of help in this area, as a model and voice of commitment in culture. The very idea of commitment beyond self runs counter to the analytic tradition, yet, as Philip Rieff says, "[c]ompassionate communities, as distinct from welfare states, exist only where there is a rich symbolic life, shared, and demanding of the self a hard line limiting the range of desires."[10] There are difficult choices ahead.

Human beings have always been symbol makers, and modern people are no exception. The roles of media, art, drama, music, literature and other symbol systems tell us something about who we are; they are informative but they speak to realms beyond rational information. They transform us by expanding our mindsets. Ritual, ritual participation, worship and religious symbol share in this power. Whether the meaning is specific to a particular social group or intended to reach beyond any sect, symbol transforms

culture. There are some things, i.e., alienation, suffering, love, birth and death, and deity which elude rational human description. Some of the deepest issues for any community or culture can only be expressed symbolically. For example, the traveling Viet Nam war memorial wall is more than an informative list of names of war victims. It is also a reminder of social failure to move beyond violence, a sign of commitment, sign of connection, reminder of loss and sorrow, as well as historical biography for many. Regardless of political standing, one cannot help but be moved by the sight of the wall and those who come to see it. It represents an era of human history, enormous suffering, death and destruction; by its presence it seems to ask for cultural clarification of a world view. Can this be the model for the future? Another example was the fund-raising dinner in Omaha, Nebraska held to build the National Holocaust Memorial in Washington, D.C. At the end of the dinner, the liberators of each death camp marched into the room, holding their colors, and those who had been liberated struggled to stand. At the end of the procession, the room was filled with survivors and liberators standing...with not a word uttered. The candles reflected in mirrors on each table seemed the only source of light in the memory of such darkness. Each candle represented 100,000 lives extinguished in the holocaust. Elie Wiesel and others remind us that to remember is to survive.

Questions of meaning and meaninglessness are part of morality, social history and biography. The emerging culture will need to develop symbol systems compelling enough to move people to remember, to integrate moral issues into personal choice and to move beyond helplessness in confronting moral issues. This will require an effort beyond legal-rational rhetoric.

Forming a world view is not always conscious. Cognitive definition of self and others, associations conscious and unconscious, environment, experiences, myth, social history and symbol structure all give rise to plausibility structures in which a world view is formed. The possibility of integrating religious components into a world view is favorable in modernity for many reasons. The therapeutic process which happens with age is an integration of personality. It points toward a natural tendency toward growth and integration, and this process of moving toward wholeness is explicit in the psychotherapies of Eric Fromm, Carl Rogers and others.

The analytic tradition, legal-rationalism and modernity have shown us that we are not bound by fate but are in the process of cultural exchange. Because the entire world is now accessible and influenced by media, becoming the global village, we are no longer destined to live out of one prescribed world view. In the biological and therapeutic process, questions of quality of life and meaning emerge;

the possibility of commitment beyond self emerges; the possibility of power beyond the psyche, technology and science emerges. Questions of who am I? Where do I belong in the universe? What are my powers and what is beyond me? continue to haunt the modern person, echoing ancient but ever-present religious themes. These questions make the possibility of choosing to integrate a religious world view into the modern psyche viable, as there have always been questions escaping our powers to answer.

Coming to terms with aging and ultimately death both individually and culturally may be a psychological improbability in modernity. Elisabeth Kubler-Ross[11] argues that it is unlikely for the psyche to fully conceive of its own death, resulting in the personal and cultural denial of death. She states her case this way: "Since in our unconscious mind we are all immortal, it is almost inconceivable for us to acknowledge that we too have to face death."[12] When human limitations and death are finally confronted, as they are in each life, deep personal questions are aroused, many of which deal with the finiteness of one's own life. Because the psyche cannot fully accept this proposition, yet recognizes that death is a fact for others, cognitive dissonance results. A culture worshipping youth, health, acquisition of material goods and power results. Even with those social supports for the denial of death, there is a nagging discomfort as one

approaches middle age. Much has been written about mid-life crisis, yet very little has been resolved. All our power, technology, science and denial of death fails us in the end. Here, too, religion can be a source of support for culture in recognizing the tensions and offering a perspective on human limitation and death. Churches can offer alternatives to helplessness and hopelessness in these ultimate issues by providing opportunities of commitment by which the individual may transcend self and ultimately model that same possibility for culture.

As the secularizing forces of modernity tend to discount religion, some theorists have labeled religion as meaningless to anyone beyond members of religious community. At most, religion is viewed as support for individuals in crisis. Perhaps the social sciences have overlooked the study of what membership in these commitment communities means to those members, and how that meaning is infused into culture. If such study were to be done, studying worship activity, ritual, ritual preparation and participation including symbol might provide a vision of the plausibility structures for their beliefs. Questions about the sources of this power could be separate from the significance of its symbolic and systems of meaning. The result could be the recognition of the validity of the model of the christian commitment community where the authority rests in the vision of the community upheld by a charismatic leader, built by

mutual individual support and interaction. This is exactly where the analytic model fails and culture has been without vision. Perhaps the next culture can integrate these ideas of mutual support for common ideals, recognition of the need of interaction to validate world views and symbol systems. Authority, especially civil authority, would do well to examine the possibility of mutuality with community vision and transformative ideals upheld charismatically in addition to the legal-rational needs of modernity. Charismatic authority may be misunderstood in modernity. Skeptical of the intuitive and irrational, charismatic authority is often accused of being a cult of personality. This is especially true in religious leadership which is established and traditional. Culturally, charism appeals to the modern person, at least in appearance, but we rely upon rationalism in debate and policy. Perhaps the next culture can call forth a self-evaluating (analytic) yet compelling (charismatic) personality as a model. A new blend of these characteristics could serve modern culture and commitment community, balancing remissions and controls in new ways. This model could support integration of the analytic and charismatic into the cultural human formation process expanding social roles and producing a more human society. Rosemary Haughton offers this perspective:

> The idea of the formation of man is the process of using all the influences of culture--family affection, humane education and political and social structures, and all the scientific know-

> how available--to help people understand themselves and each other and the world they share, to adjust themselves to both without either undue aggressiveness or frightened conformity, and so to be done through a well-ordained community setting in which mutual responsibility and the care of the weak are taken for granted.[13]

Finally, commitment communities, particularly christian commitment communities with appropriate leaders, which are self-understood as carriers of the myth embodying the truth of the kerygma of the church have roles in the formation and transformation of the next culture. The analytic vision cannot go beyond self, or at least beyond a collection of selves, thus offers little hope in its pure form for the formation of social community. Negative communities cannot transcend self, let alone get to the pressing moral and ethical questions of our time. A broader vision is required if there is to be enough cohesion to sustain the cultures of the future. A cohesive humane social order will require dialog, imagination, prophetic vision, an energized and committed extraordinary leadership to transform a strong symbolic and develop models for renewal and transformation. Culture will need to risk the possibility and the understanding that change does not mean instability or chaos, but is a productive agent giving rise to new futures. All these characteristics are modeled in some form in christian commitment community and charismatic leadership. The future calls for personal presumptions and positions to be re-examined in light of larger perspectives. All this

could point to a different composite of those contributing to legitimation of authority in the future. In his book Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Postmodern Theology, Harvard professor Harvey Cox says:

> The resources for postmodern theology will come about not from the center, but from the bottom and from the edge. They will come from those sectors of the modern social edifices that for various reasons--usually to do with class or color or gender--have been consigned to its lower stories and excluded from the chance to help formulate its religious vision. They will come from those parts of the world geopoliticians classify as the "periphery," regions also largely left out of participation in the centers of modern theological discourse which are located in the Western political and cultural milieu.[15]

A similar statement could be made about the emerging culture. It remains to be seen how disenfranchised social groups will make their voices heard. Shifts in social, ethnic and economic composition as well as the aging of the overall population are signs that resources for the creation of the next culture will be different. Religion offers the model of the prophet and prophetic community in interpreting and integrating new voices into culture which will be heard from--some for the first time in the industrialized west. Prophesy in religion has always been transformative and transformation describes well the massive structural, maintenance, authority and community models available to the next culture. Who do we hope to become? That is a question religious and civil leaders hope to symbolize for culture and community. Here it is possible to consider the

religious study of hermeneutics and to apply what

> ...Protestant philosophers such as P. Ricoeur and H.G. Gadamer and Protestant theologians such as Paul Tillich and K. Lowith have called the "hermeneutical circle." All understanding takes place in a circular movement--the answer is to some extent determined by the question, which is in turn confirmed, extended or corrected by the answer. A new question then grows out of this understanding, so that the hermeneutical circle continues to develop in a never ending spiral.[16]

Culture, too, needs this cohesive method of connecting historical experience to modern plausibility structures in creating its norms for the future.

What, then, is the future for charismatic authority in the christian commitment community and in culture? Should the minister become a therapist for the community? Though it is true that the complexity of modern life demands introspective self-analytic reflection from the minister, the primary role should not be therapeutic. Of course, geographical considerations sometimes make therapeutic work unavoidable, as in rural ministry, but in most settings the religious task is one of empowering commitment. This paper argues for leaving therapy in the analytic sense to the professional therapists and transformation by commitment beyond self to the minister. This presumes that the minister has owned his or her own therapeutic process fully and understands the powers of intuitive and cognitive processes in self and congregation. When speaking to the qualities a minister needs, Richard McBrien[17] lists "basic human wholeness, theological virtues of faith, hope and

charity, moral virtues of prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude, a positive sense of church, communications skills, sound theological competence and vision, as well as social, political and cultural awareness."[18] In discussing the psychologically effective minister, Michael Cavanaugh cites the necessities of "a healthy sense of self, self-knowledge, self-esteem, self-actualization, and self-fulfillment" in his book, The Effective Minister.[19]

There is a familiar analytic ring to these latter categories. Perhaps that is the way church and culture will be transformed--in dialectical relationships reflecting historical and psychological, symbolic and imaginative, analytic and commitment thought, and models synthesized into the next culture. Perhaps already contained in this culture are the interdisciplinary pieces to new methods needed to examine and transform church and culture, revitalize commitment therapies, re-examine charismatic, traditional and legal-rational authority, transcend autonomy, and further evaluate the balance between remissions and controls necessary to produce a humane social community. The analytic understanding of the effect the social community upon the individual and therapeutic understanding of effect of the commitment community upon the individual both provide valuable insights into what will produce the new ideal type. Psychology, sociology and religion along with other disciplines have the ability to respond in part to the

development of new methodologies needed in the 21st Century to sustain social community and produce a cohesive symbolic powerful enough to be compelling in assuring commitment beyond self in the face of modernity. These are areas remaining to be synthesized in the crucial dialectical relationship of church and culture in the future.

Notes

1. By "myth" is meant "any real...story, recurring theme, or character type that appeals to the consciousness of a people by embodying its cultural ideals or by giving expression to deep commonly felt emotions." The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (New York: Haughton Mifflin Company, 1973) p. 869

2. These considerations are meant to apply to contextualist (predominantly mainline) commitment communities and not meant to apply to fundamentalist religious sects, as they utilize a separate set of authority and maintenance structures requiring a different method for analysis.

3. Peter L. Berger, The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1979), hereafter cited as The Heretical Imperative, p. 58

4. McGaughy, Lane C., The Church as Humane Lobbyist in the American Context of Pluralism and Voluntarism University of Montana (Unpublished Working Draft)

5. Ibid., p. 4

6. Ibid., p. 89

7. Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P., God the Future of Man (New York: Sheen and Ward, 1968), hereafter cited as God the Future p. 19

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p. 2, quoting Martin Heidegger, Zur Seinsfrage Frankfort a.M. (1956) p. 36

10. Rieff, The Heretical Imperative, p. 245

11. Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, On Death and Dying (New York: McMillan, 1969)

12. Ibid., p. 37

13. Rosemary Haughton, The Transformation of Man: A Study of Conversion and Community (Springfield: Templegate, 1967), p. 7

14. Harvey Cox, Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Postmodern Theology (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984)

15. Ibid., p. 21

16. Schillebeeckx, God the Future, pp. 7-8

17. Richard P. McBrien, Ministry: A Theological Pastoral Handbook (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988)

18. Ibid., pp. 51-74

19. Michael E. Cavanaugh, The Effective Minister: Psychological and Social Considerations (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), pp. 2-17

APPENDIX A

The following is the letter by Latin American priests sent to John Paul II on the occasion of his visit to Brazil in 1980, as found in Schillebeeckx, Edward. Ministry, Crossroad Publishing Company, 1981, pp. 130-34:

To John Paul II, Bishop of Rome, who gives direction to the unity and neighborly love of all churches:

Holy Father, we, priests of different churches in Latin America, address you on the occasion of your journey to this continent.

On this occasion you will be visiting Brazil. This is the country where the church makes an extremely important contribution to the future of the Catholic Church in Latin America and the rest of the world. It is a church which is born in the power of the Spirit and from the womb of the Lord's poor. From this church, which can be found throughout the continent, we want to express our faith and make a contribution to your visit.

Everyone knows this history of Latin America. But not everyone has had the same experiences. Some have been the conquerors and others the conquered. We want to begin to tell you our experiences and those of the people, because their voice is never able to be heard.

The first colonists found the original inhabitants of this land 'primitive' and 'uncared for'. That was sufficient justification for one of the most blatant cases of genocide in human history. The indigenous population was decimated and oppressed in the name of Jesus Christ. His cross, the symbol of redemption, took the form of the sword of the conqueror which was blessed by all but the good pastors of their church. This dishonoring of the gospel and the involvement of the church with the colonists and their system have been a source of serious ambiguities in the faith which still persist even now.

We believe that the time has come for the Catholic Church to confess its sins. It should acknowledge that it too was involved in Spanish and Poruguese colonization. We think that it must engage in self-criticism, which is without doubt healthy, especially for itself.

Three centuries after the independence of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies came the new 'colonists', the European interests. They let the world know that this was a divided continent. On the basis of this attitude it was split up into 'countries', despite the dream among some of its sons of 'one great fatherland'. This division served the interests of others, but certainly not that of the people, who were increasingly oppressed and were constantly kept divided.

After the First World Was, as a result of the new

international power structures, the political focal point was shifted to the northern continent. The United States of American announced the plans which it had for Latin America; for them we are and remain forever an 'undeveloped' country within the capitalist system. As a result they again had a pretext for colonizing us. What was presented as brotherly help is in fact the plundering of our natural riches. And of course this cannot be without consequences. In contrast to what may be thought in other parts of the world, in Latin America the conflicts are not played out between church and state. Here we have the conflicting interests of an exploited mass on the one had and the state, out for its own advantage, on the other. The conflict is thus on the level of the oppressed people versus the ruling minority.

Part of this confrontation is also an arms race which is simply a cover for instruments of oppression, which are constantly refined; it also contributes to greater need among the exploited majority.

In Brazil you will meet a people which is subject to the most terrible material need and cultural poverty. You are aware of the exceptionally high death rate among children, the illiteracy and the premature deaths through endemic illness which ravage our peoples. We simply want you to ask, as our people ask, how this is possible in one of the richest countries in the world.

Our people can easily find the key to an answer in the mechanisms manipulated by the great powers, and the imperialistic politics which are supported by the Trilateral Commission.

They have no moral scruples, because their only 'morality' is economic self-interest. So they never have sleepless nights, either because of a genocide carried out in a highly subtle way or because of the 'manipulation' by privileged groups on our continent.

For this reason, too, there is no hesitation over helping military dictators into the saddle in the southern part of the continent, who indulge in bloody oppression. This is done under the pretext of there being a 'power vacuum' and for 'the national security', which only serves their own interests.

The people loathe the fact that their murderers appeal to their own Christianity and use it as a justification for mass murders. The loathe the fact that many bishops and even nuncios are not without responsibility here, if only through their own passivity.

At some time every people comes to the end of its patience, and that end has now come for the people of Latin America. Thus the people of Nicaragua have said 'Enough' to their dictatorial government. The people of El Salvador and Guatemala are looking for the means of securing their freedom.

This historical process in which our continent is now involved is known throughout the world, but each person sees it in his or her own way.

We, the servants of Christ, incarnate in the story of the 'poor of Yahweh', are certain that he is also alive on our continent and eats bread with the hungry and thirsts for righteousness on behalf of those of our people who live in prisons and suffer torture and death in the fields. He is also present in the thousands of men, women and children who suffer from malnutrition.

Therefore we stand for true liberation and fight alongside the people in the name of Jesus Christ.

Millions of brothers have gone before us in the same fight. Like them, we too are aware of the risks that we run and of the responsibility that we are taking upon ourselves. What Christ could not have suffered we are willing to suffer for him, for his body, the church, and as a proclamation of his resurrection. The proof of that lies with those who, in total surrender, have paid for this with their own lives.

Along with non-believing <u>companeros</u>, bishops too have fallen in the fight; and many sisters and priest, and thousands of Christians.

For us, the recent murder of Archbishop Romero in San Salvador is a symbol of this struggle and a witness which makes us tread in the footsteps of the good shepherd Jesus Christ, who gave his life for his sheep.

The death of Monsignor Romero follows the death of six priests in El Salvador in recent years. In Argentina in 1976, Bishop Enrique Angelelli de la Rioja paid for his 'choice for the poor' by his death, as did thirteen priests in that country. In Chile, three priests stand on the long list of those murdered by the military dictatorship which has been in power since 1973. In 1976 alone, two priests in Brazil paid for their witness with their lives. In Mexico, a country which is known on the continent for its respect for 'democratic freedoms', between 1976 and now three priests have been murdered. In Guatemala and Bolivia two priests have been killed in short succession, in each country, by the so-called established power.

To these 'extreme' testimonies of love we must also add those who for love have been exiled, imprisoned or tortured. At this moment dozens of priests in Latin American are in this kind of situation.

Illuminated by the example of this 'greatest love' of those who 'offered their life for their friends', and starting from the experiences of our oppressed and murdered brothers who keep demanding justice, we stress that our participation in this process is a biblical command and that we must therefore continue it.

On the other hand, those who represent opposed interests can see this model and this experience as a 'political'

attitude in the bad sense of the word, or as being unworthy of the priestly ministry.

After Medellin, in Puebla the priests have again declared that they choose the side of the poor in this continent.

The poor of Latin American are not poor as the result of one kind of natural 'fortune' or another which has condemned them to perpetual need. On the contrary. As we have already seen, as producers, as farmers and workers, they are owners of an enormous potential of material wealth and cultural possibilities. Thus they are not asking any alms from the rich, but for a return of what has been stolen.

Thus, one cannot call the cause of this situation 'humanitarian' or 'social'. It is a political cause, because there must be a radical transformation of structures which will put an end to the privileges of a small minority which maintains itself through great political and economic power.

Consequently we think that to 'choose for the poor' in Latin America is a political choice. That is the way in which it is understood by many Christians, and despite all the risks, we are prepared to keep our promise to the end.

With your visit to Brazil you will be coming for the second time to a continent at war. On the one hand is the exploited and oppressed class which is constantly becoming more aware and is demanding rights which have been trampled on for so long. On the other hand are the privileged minority and the multi-nationals who harden their position and counter any attempt at the liberation of the people with fire and sword.

There must be an end to vagueness and neutral attitudes.

As servants of the same church of Jesus Christ, we hope that your visit means a renewal of the promise which the episcopate made at Medellin and Puebla; a clear and definite choice for the poor of Latin America.

We want to end with the words of our Bishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero: 'The cry of this people for liberation is a cry which goes up to God and which nothing and no one can keep back.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Ernest. The Denial of Death, New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Bellah, Robert N. et. al. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.

Berger, Peter L. The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation, New York: Doubleday, 1980.

_____. A Rumor of Angels, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

_____. The Sacred Canopy, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Berger, Peter L. & Neuhaus, Richard John, ed., Against the World For the World: The Hartford Appeal and the Future of American Religion, New York: Seabury Press, 1976.

Berger, Peter L. & Kellner, Hansfried. Sociology Reinterpreted: An Essay on Method and Vocation, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1981.

Brown, Raymond E., S.S. "The Dilemma of the Magisterium vs. The Theologians - Debunking Some Fictions", Chicago Studies, Baltimore: Theological Studies, Inc., Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer 1978).

Cavanaugh, Michael E. The Effective Minister: Psychological and Social Considerations, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

Cox, Harvey. Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Postmodern Theology, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984.

_____. The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Douglas, Jack D., ed., The Relevance of Sociology, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Dudley, Carl S., ed., Building Effective Ministry: Theory and Practice in the Local Church, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, 2nd ed. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1976.

Eliade, Miricea. Myth and Reality, New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

_____. Rites and Symbols of Initiation: The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth, New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

_____. The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1959.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1989 Yearbook, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1989.

Freud, Ernst, ed. Letters of Sigmund Freud, New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and its Discontents, London: Standard Edition, 1961.

_____. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, New York: Pocket Books, 1973.

_____. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1959.

Gerth, H.H. & Mills, C. Wright., eds., From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Haughey, John C., ed., The Faith That Does Justice: Examining the Christian Sources for Social Change, New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Haughton, Rosemary. The Transformation of Man: A Study of Conversion and Community, Springfield: Templegate Press, 1967.

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York: Macmillan/Free Press, 1973.

Jung, Carl. Psychology and Religion, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

_____. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961.

Kubler-Ross, Elisabeth. On Death and Dying, New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Kung, Hans. Signposts for the Future: Contemporary Issues Facing the Church, New york: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1978.

Lauzun, Gerard. Sigmund Freud: The Man and His Theories, Greenwich; Faucet Publications, Inc., 1965.

Levy, Marion J. Modernization: Latecomers and Survivors, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.

Lozano, John M. Discipleship, Chicago: Claret Center for Resources in Spirituality, 1980.

Luckmann, Thomas. The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society, New York: Macmillan, 1967.

McBrien, Richard P. Ministry: A Theological, Pastoral Handbook, San Francisco; Harper & Row, 1987.

McGaughy, Lane C. "The Church as Humane Lobbyist in the American Context of Pluralism and Voluntarism," University of Montana, Unpublished Working Draft.

Metz, Johannes B. Theology of the World, New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Mitchell, Leonel L. The Meaning of Ritual, New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Monden, Louis, S.J., Sin, Liberty and Law, Kansas City: Sheed Andrews & McMeel, 1965.

Nelson, John W. Your God Is Alive and Well and Appearing in Popular Culture, Philadelphia; Westminster Press, 1976.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christ and Culture, New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

_____. The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry, New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

Novak, Michael. Freedom With Justice: Catholic Social Thought and Liberal Institutions, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.

Otto, Rudolph. The Idea of the Holy, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

_____. Mysticism East and West: A Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism, Illinois: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1987.

Rahner, Karl. Theology for Renewal, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964.

Reid, Joseph. "The Role of Religion in Psychotherapy", Care Network, Colorado: The Publishing House, 1989. Vol. II, July/August 1989.

Rieff, Philip., ed., On Intellectuals: Theoretical Studies, Case Studies, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Rieff, Philip. The Triumph of the Therapeutic: Uses of Faith After Freud, New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Ruether, Rosemary. Liberation Theology: Human Hope Confronts Christian History and American Power, New York: Paulist Press, 1972.

Schillebeeckx, Edward O.P. God the Future of Man, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1968.

_____. Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ, New York: Crossroads, 1981.

Shaughnessy, James D. The Roots of Ritual, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1973.

Shepherd, William C. "Paradoxes About Ego in the Western Tradition," University of Montana, Unpublished Working Draft.

Stern, Mark E. & Marino, Bert G., eds. Psychotheology, Paramus: Paulist Press, 1970.

Tillich, Paul. What Is Religion?, New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Watts, Alan W. Myth and Ritual in Christianity, Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Weber, Max. Basic Concepts in Sociology, 5th ed., New York: Citadel Press, 1968.

_____. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, New York: Bedminster Press, 1968. 3 Vols.

_____. The Sociology of Religion, 4th ed., Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Wren-Lewis, John. "What Are Clergy For?", The Listener, Vol. LXXI, March 1964.

Zaretsky, Irving I. & Leone, Mark P., eds., Religious Movements in Contemporary America, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974.