

David T. Abalos
Seton Hall University

Transformative Commitment : A new Paradigm for the Study of the Religions

In an excellent review of *Beyond the Classics? Essays in the Scientific Study of Religion*,¹ Gordon Clanton made three points that I shall attempt to discuss in this article. First of all, he perceptively pointed out that the editors of the book were primarily concerned with exhausting the present paradigm by assuming that progress in the field consists of "gradual accumulation of empirical findings, the systematic study of hypotheses and the development of consensus with regard to a . . . shared theoretical perspective . . ." ² Secondly, the editors concentrate on the *sociology* of religion rather than on the sociology of *religion*.³ Finally, Clanton concludes that there has been a failure to move substantially beyond the classics.⁴

My thesis is that there is, in fact, an even more fruitful paradigm which will allow us to ask the kinds of questions that are more appropriate to the religious situation of today. It is time to reunite the tradition of sociology and of religious quest in mutual search again. Max Weber, Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx have done the necessary spade-work for us by charting the dialectical influence of religion and

1. Edited by Charles Y. Glock & Phillip E. Hammond, New York: Harper & Row, 1973; reviewed in *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, July, 1975, Vol. 4, No. 4.

2. *Op. cit.*, Clanton, p. 421.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 422.

4. *Ibid.*

society.⁵ We are now challenged to participate and create a new cultural context. After all, the great accomplishment of these three men was to point out the patterns that counted, the patterns that allowed us to see the determinants behind the flux. These men took religion and its impact seriously; whether they agreed with its influence or not, religion was recognized as a fact of human life. Of late, too much of our study of religion has been just that, the study of *religion*, i.e., the residue of the religious factor. Weber and Durkheim recognized the dynamic aspect of the religious and were able to trace its hardening in specific cultures. It was this residue that Marx and Freud primarily⁶ referred to in their critiques of religion. Ernst Troeltsch also noted the human tendency of original religious insight and creativity to be canonized, legalized, and routinized once the fervor of the original experience cooled.⁷ In this work we shall agree with Wilfred Cantwell Smith's distinction between religion as object or thing, as residue to be analyzed and the religious as adjective — as a quality of human life that has an autonomy of its own within the context of human life.⁸

The relevance of an alternative paradigm is determined by its capacity to confront questions that the prevailing paradigm is helpless

-
5. Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, translated from the French by Joseph W. Swain, N. Y., The Free Press, 1969; Max Weber, *The Religion of China: Confucianism & Taoism*, translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1951; *The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism & Buddhism*, translated by Hans H. Gerth, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1958; *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Talcott Parsons, London: Allen & Unwin, 1930; New York: Scribner, 1958; *The Sociology of Religion*, translated by Ephraim Fischhoff, Introduction by Talcott Parsons, Boston: Beacon Press, 1963; *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, translated and edited by Edward A. Shils & Henry A. Finch, with a foreword by Edward A. Shils, Glencoe, Ill. Free Press, 1949; Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *On Religion*, Introduction by Reinhold Niebuhr, New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
 6. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, translated by W. D. Robson-Scott, revised and newly edited by James Strachey, an Anchor Book, Garden City, N. Y., 1964.
 7. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, translated by Olive Wyon, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.
 8. *The Meaning and End of Religion: A New Approach to the Religious Traditions of Mankind*, New York: A Mentor Book, published by the New American Library, 1964.

to answer.⁹ Paradigms involve new hypotheses and theoretical imagination that allow us to see the phenomena afresh. It allows us to bring new combinations into being by leaving behind the old puzzles and riddles of normal science. But new paradigms owe a special gratitude to the dominant paradigm for it is within the background of the old that the new was made possible. So there is no attempt here to say that the theoretical approach of the last thirty years or so was wrong but that it is *now totally* inadequate. Similarly, Einstein did not presume to attack the Newtonian world-view because given Newton's perception of the world he was correct. For Einstein, who came increasingly to see a different world, Newton became in some respects irrelevant.¹⁰ Yet persons presenting an alternative paradigm do indeed consider it to be closer to the truth of reality.¹¹

The alternative paradigm¹² by which we propose to study the religious situation is based on the following hypothesis: *only through an archetypal analysis of what it means to be human can we hope to reach the religious source of persons.* This paradigm holds that the religious is a fact of human experience, and that this religious dimension can be best understood by the archetypal incarnations found in human religious symbols and myth. It points to the quality of our relationship to the sacred. This paradigm is based on a theory of human relationships as archetypal patterns by which we relate ourselves to ourselves, to others, to the world and to God. These patterns or relationships of encounter are dialectical, that is, they involve a mutual interpenetration of self-other-world-God. In terms of method, this means that there can never be a value-free, detached analysis, resulting in quantitative studies, nor can participant observation be described as semi-detachment. Our method rather is based on the foundation of the religious transformation that takes place only in

9. See T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, second edition, 1970.

10. *Ibid.*

11. See also Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Beyond*, N. Y., Harper & Row, 1971.

12. This paradigm is based on a theory of human relationships as archetypal patterns by which persons relate to self, other, the world and God. It was developed by Prof. Manfred Halpern of the Politics Department at Princeton University.

persons.¹³ Thus a sociologist of the religious can recognize this paradigm only by participating in the transformation of self-other-world and God. Some may object that the social sciences cannot deal with such issues, that this is the realm of theology. But, as Clifford Geertz pointed out, God does not create religions, man does.¹⁴ Humankind creates responses to the experience of the holy. The study of the religious is not to be ignored or relegated to the domain of other disciplines. What we are seeking then is a paradigm that will allow us to scientifically analyze religious experience.¹⁵

Traditional social scientists merely report the residual categories of religion in an empirical, positivistic, behavioural manner. They never tell us anything about the revolutions in the religious realm. Consequently, as Kuhn points out, they miss the revolutions and see the new only in terms of the old. The new social scientist will seek to point out the inadequate structures inhibiting the growth of the religious and may even enter into a participation that will lead to the breaking of religious ties for the sake of creating alternative ones. This is a paradigmatic approach that enables us to develop a political and sociological theory that parallels the theological, religious and mythical witness that all of reality is subject to a process of creation, nourishment and destruction.¹⁶ From time immemorial, we have religious myths and symbols that tell us that the rhythm of the micro and macro cosmic is symbolized by a three-headed god-goddess: Brahma, the Creator; Vishnu, the Preserver; and Shiva, the Destroyer.¹⁷ The

-
13. Bernard Lonergan, S. J., "Theology in Its New Context," in *Theology of Renewal*, Volume I, edited by L. K. Shook, C. S. B., Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1968.
 14. Clifford Geertz, *Islam Observed*, New Haven, Conn., Harvard University Press, 1968.
 15. For another study that takes the religions seriously see Ninian Smart's *The Science of Religion and the Sociology of Knowledge*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1973.
 16. Helpert, *op. cit.*, unpublished manuscript, Chapter 20, "The Counter-Tradition of Transformation."
 17. See W. I. Thompson's book, *Passages About Earth*, Harper & Row, N. Y., Evanston, San Francisco, London, 1974, for an excellent application of this three-fold process.

alchemists also realized that base metals could be dissolved (solve) in order to be recreated (coagula) into gold.¹⁸ Similarly, the heart of the Christian Kerygma was the birth, death and resurrection of Jesus. The moon waxes and wanes, all of the cosmos follows this rhythm.¹⁹ According to this perspective, reality is of a piece – though with an infinite number of different expressions. The American Indian heritage was aware of this same cosmic unity. The Ogalala Sioux, for example, believed that wherever they pitched their tepee there was to be found the centre of their own being, the centre of the tribe, the universe and God simultaneously.²⁰ Apparently this was a common conviction: Being is synonymous with reality.²¹ God, the religious, the sacred, the source of all being, the undifferentiated source, the holy was always considered an integral part of life. But due to the reductionist and positivist trends especially since the 18th century, myth, symbol, the religious and mystery seem to have become a cause for embarrassment. The traditional social scientists, eager to quantify like their colleagues in the natural sciences, thus succeeded in separating us from our prime sources. Accordingly, when social scientists make a claim, they are speaking of merely a truncated reality. Yet three kinds of truth are able to be distinguished: the truth of propositions, the truth of reality, and the truth of persons. These three together constitute the truth of being.

Subjectivity and inter-subjectivity are touchstones of reality to which we now turn. How do persons experience being/reality? By experiencing oneself first of all and by encouraging others to experience themselves, persons participate in reality. In the Muslim mystical tradition there is a fine proverb: To know yourself is to know *your*

18. For a discussion of alchemy as a sacred process of transformation symbolized in the work with metals, see Titus Burckhardt, *Alchemy*, Penguin Books, Baltimore, Maryland, 1971.

19. For the significance of the moon as a symbol of woman's mysteries as well as a symbol of transformation, see M. Esther Harding, *Woman's Mysteries Ancient and Modern*, Bantam Books, N. Y., 1973.

20. See *The Sacred Pipe*, ed. Joseph Epes Brown, Penguin Books, Baltimore, Maryland, 1971.

21. This is also Bernard Lonergan's conclusion in his own epistemological studies. See his article "Cognitional Structures" in *Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S. J.*, edited by Frederick E. Crowe, S. J., *Continuum*, Vol. II, No. 3, Fall, 1964.

god, not God or *the* god, but *your* god. Once an experience has made its impact, it is then necessary to search for the symbolic archetypal meaning of the event, what C. G. Jung referred to as the amplification of our present experiences, to search out its trans-personal significance.

Symbol and myth are central to understanding and interpreting all religious experiences. The source or the dark side of our consciousness, namely, the unconscious, was for Jung the centre of our mystery. It reveals itself to us through images inherent to myth, symbol and ritual. Symbols and myths are thus our bridge to the source which sustains us. The quality of our lives in every regard—psychologically, sociologically, religiously, politically—can be determined by the quality of the connection that links us to our source. We externalize, incarnate, or concretize the archetype (sacred source or god) to which we are related. If we simply repeat the incarnation for generations, then we break the dialectical relationship and allow the source to possess us, thus robbing us of the ability to create change or conflict. Thus, routinization of symbols robs symbols of their impact simply because they no longer link us to our source in a transformative manner. Accordingly, the original creation of Eucharist can become a legalistic banquet detailing the disposition of every crumb lest Jesus be damaged. This interpretation must be corrected in order to re-affirm the force of the archetype which consistently seeks a new incarnation as an expression of itself. For this reason, even in the midst of the most inquisitorial conditions there arose a countertradition, that is, the recognition and implementation of the fact that human beings could re-experience themselves, the universe and God by participating in gnosis, or knowledge of the process of transformation. Orthodoxy which seeks merely to preserve a tradition would never encourage such a re-experience as it might challenge the very social, political and religious structures which appear to conserve such orthodoxy.

American Social Science

The critique of American social scientists delivered some forty years ago is still a challenge. Karl Mannheim criticized American social science for "reforming or organizing society. Scientific interest centres on the dynamic forces determining the process of transformation of society."²² He went on to write on the need for a philosophical

22. "American Sociology" in *Sociology on Trial*, edited by Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1963.

foundation that yearns "for the knowledge of real things, that makes for increased constructive power. Philosophical training allowed persons to recognize connections between things, for a development of the comprehensive view of the social process as a whole, instead of mere isolated treatment of sporadic facts which cannot be mastered in a division of jobs."²³ It is this ability to make connections that C. W. Mills called the sociological imagination: "To be aware of the idea of social structure and to use it with sensibility is to be capable of tracing such linkages among a great variety of milieux. To be able to do that is to possess the sociological imagination."²⁴ However, Mills should not have rejected the argument of the depth psychologists such as Jung and Freud. He vigorously rejected Ernest Jones' statement that man is his own worst enemy and that evil lurks within the hearts of men. Mills saw this as a fudging of the issue; our destructiveness was to be found in the forces of a more complex social structure.²⁵ Certainly the problem lies in both areas. Let us reiterate—the process through which individuals experience personal transformation is also the very same archetypal process on a social and political level. Nevertheless Mills and Mannheim agree that we need a perspective which does not obscure the need for total systemic transformation. An epistemological commitment underlies their perceptions. They realized that social scientists could not merely report the world; the issue rather was to *inform* it in a qualitatively new way. It is a sociology and politics of engagement which does not allow a methodology that separates the knower from the known. Human knowing is relational and dynamic: it seeks to penetrate and to be penetrated. Our cognitional activities refuse to be satisfied by the partial since "from the partial knowledge we have reached it sends us back to fuller experiencing."²⁶ For Marx, human knowledge arose from the transformation of the world through work. In other words, we come to know ourselves, indeed to create ourselves in the very process of incarnating humanity in the world. Thus a social science that focuses on adjustment, stability, conformity,

23. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

24. C. W. Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, London, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 1971, pp. 10-13.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Lonergan, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-229.

reform and reality as given ²⁷ cuts us off from our sources, that is the transcendent element in human life that challenges us to destroy the inadequate for the purpose of creating again.

Social scientists do themselves a grave injustice and create distortions by refusing to take the religious factor as part and parcel of their concern. Heisenberg has taught us that the scientific community returned to philosophical and religious issues when the prevalent scientific view was in its death throes. Niels Bohr underwent what was in fact a religious experience that provided him with the courage and renewed creativity to plumb the depths of the atomic mystery. He first of all had to re-experience the reality of mystery in himself.²⁸ There is a further distortion and loss that affects the scientist, the door of inquiry. If a scientist merely mirrors the world, he can never participate in his own or the world's transformation. He is caught in a one-dimensional world. We have ample evidence that scientists have discovered parallel phenomena in nature by creatively playing, that is imagining and seeing new possibilities.²⁹ The implications of this are enormous: It gives a significance to the scientist which is of ultimate importance. He does not repeat nature or other phenomena; he actually creates himself and the world to be in a new manner. He participates in giving directions to forces within and outside himself.

What really landed him in trouble was that he saw the concrete archetypically. He saw the motions he saw as necessary relationships. The pope objected that Galileo was necessitating god, so that god ceased to be all-powerful. . . . God himself thus becomes subject to the laws of creativity through which he expresses creativity. The science which grows out of this position . . . is an inquiry which liberates, energizes and gives significance to the scientist.³⁰

27. This is essentially the complaint of Alvin Gouldner in his book, *The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology*, Basic Books, N. Y., 1970.

28. Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, T. S. Kuhn, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

29. W. I. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

30. Halpern, *op. cit.*, "Transformation and the Source of the Fundamentally New," pp 23-24.

Our purpose then is to use mythical, religious and symbolic language to free ourselves and others from the paradigms of fixed faith in theology, sociology and the other sciences. Fixed faith, in whatever area of human knowledge, ends with a sterile objectivity that does not permit a renewal through subjective experience. Paradoxically, the goal is to reach an objective subjectivity. Ironically, agnostic scientists often conclude by being devoured by the very religious orthodoxy, at which they scoff. They act as if reality is fixed or, if it is dynamic, it is predictable and cumulative. For such scientists it is sufficient to gather more and more knowledge by, with and in computers to solve puzzles of nature and human society. We can at best co-operate with nature (God) and nature's laws (God's eternal, immutable laws). Nature is fixed and God is fixed in a set course.

Archetypal Analysis

"We know the fix of stereotypes not the movement of archetypes."³¹

Everything has two faces, its own face and the face of God.³²

Some forty years ago Arthur O. Lovejoy delivered his famous lectures, *The Great Chain of Being*,³³ in which he sought to demonstrate the unity of all things. The book was widely proclaimed for its analysis of the nature of human life, history and culture. Lovejoy's study correctly points out that it was the Church that sanctified a frozen, permanent, fixed chain of being. Everything flowered from on high and was incarnated once for all. The course of human history was fixed and irrevocable. The eternal ideas manifested themselves as a continuity of an ever evolving, perfecting sameness. Yet Lovejoy never understood the *Aurea Catena* as consisting of links of transformation. Dialectical process teaches that there are three stages of being or reality: creation, nourishment and destruction. To incarnate once for all is to deny that anything fundamentally new can emerge. Myths and symbols of transformation, if they have not been reduced

31. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

32. An old Muslim proverb as quoted in Helpern, *ibid.*, p. 10.

33. *The Great Chain of Being, A Study of the History of an Idea*, the William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University, 1933, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1950.

to impotent fetisihisms, allow us to bridge the movement back to the experience out of which our gods and religions were created. Through the image and emotion elicited by myth and symbol, we contact the other side of the established institutions of a society, the archetypal. Now archetypes are the necessary forms in which concrete relationships manifest themselves. We enact and experience an archetype through its concrete manifestation; we contact it through symbols in dreams, visions and fantasies on the personal level and in myths and religion on the societal level. Although the archetype may be universal, it is imperative that we as individuals constellate archetypes in a personal, concrete manner.³⁴ We are constantly enacting archetypes. Archetypes have their origin from an undifferentiated source, or the God beyond god. They represent the collective inheritance of humanity rooted in the source of sources. The source of all, therefore, manifests itself through archetypes. Every concrete expression, creation or incarnation in the world is thus the externalization of the transpersonal archetype that is an expression of the nameless source. We have thus a trinity: the source from which we all derive, our connection to the source (archetypal), and the concrete. When a person or persons incarnate themselves, history, culture and society, they differentiate and express the godhead in their midst. Now the nature of being and reality is process: we *and* the source co-operate in creating, nourishing and destroying in order to build again. When a political ideology, a scientific paradigm, a marriage, a religion, or a sociological theory stresses stability, normalcy, continuity, equilibrium, growth indices or puzzle-solving, it breaks the dialectical process and seeks to establish and nourish an orthodox face of the holy. The exclusive choice of one archetype or archetypal expression cuts us off from our source and allows us to be possessed by only that one god. Any form of possession is demonic. This is the essence of idolatry. There are many gods in our personal, social and historical drama. In order to create and re-experience self, other and history, we must first break the security through enchantment. To simply repeat self, other and history is to stereotype the world as a particular god's final revelation. This

34. For a good treatment of archetypes see the *Collected Works of Carl Gustave Jung*, editors: Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler, William McGuire, translated by R. F. C. Hull, Bollingen Series XX, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, especially Volume IX, Part 1, 1970, and for a good introduction to Jung see Calvin S. Hall and V. J. Nordby, *A Primer of Jungian Psychology*, Mentor Books, N. Y., 1973.

is a disservice to all involved, and especially to God. We have rejected the orthodox chain of fixed creation primarily because it posits a pre-established plan of future evolution. But human freedom is of ultimate significance for the following reason: if God is indeed the undifferentiated source, there is no concreteness in the source. Furthermore, the undifferentiated necessary existent possesses no differentiated consciousness. Human beings because of their consciousness are necessary to the source to continue the pouring forth of the divine creation into the world.³⁵ Therefore, it can be said that if humankind needs the source as its sun, then the source is in its turn dependent upon human persons for the completion of God. This gives us a more relational and dynamic insight into revelation. Revelation has been defined as God's entry into man's making of man.³⁶ But our paradigm allows us to restore the full implication of a theory of transformation, that is that revelation is mutual in that it is also humankind's entry into God's making of God. Whenever this archetypal process of transformation is re-experienced it constitutes a destruction of the fixed revelation, an acknowledgment that we no longer know what we thought was permanent, so that we can participate in the formation of the new energies emerging from the undifferentiated source. This is the essence of personal therapy, political and social change and religious conversion.

The implication of this understanding of revelation is that neither humankind nor the undifferentiated source is complete. Galileo and all members of the counter-tradition speak of necessary forms in which any concrete relationship must express itself. Thus, it follows that God is not all-powerful but is himself subject to the laws which are laws of relationship in motion. God also, therefore, ceases to be fixed and is still emanating creativity.³⁷

Human beings become creative gods in the realm of the concrete through participating in an ultimately significant relationship with the sacred. This perception of the human role in building the world, in incarnating the divine, further underlines the complete bankruptcy of detached, value-free, quantifying science carried on by the many social scientists. Our paradigm allows us to be dialectically related

35. Halpern, "Transformation," *op. cit.*

36. Barnard Lonergan, S. J., "Theology" *op. cit.*, p. 41

37. Halpern, "Transformation," *op. cit.*

or connected to our source as well as the concrete world. We can *scientifically* ask whether the *quality* of this connection allows us to change yet continue, to co-operate with one another yet leave us free to disagree so that we can go on creating new forms. Are we free to allow new consciousness to emerge from our unconscious source, to create new kinds of linkages with ourselves and others in such a way that our development opens up new possibilities for all? Let us repeat: *our* choice is crucial so that the above questions are posed in relation to self (intrapersonal), others (interpersonal) including the source, groups (intergroup) and nations (inter-national). Our freedom is rooted in the following :

We are free to choose which archetypal drama will best serve the purposes of transforming.

— Our freedom of choice is based on the realization that there are many and competing archetypes or gods from which to choose.

— Our choice is archetypal otherwise we would not be able to move beyond our own concreteness; this is the basis of our transcendence rooted in our own god-head or selfhood.

— All archetypes are not finally established; if they were, our freedom to participate in transforming would be an illusion. Thus, if the human being is to be freely creative God must be imperfect, that is unfinished.

— Finally, we must be able to participate in the creation of new archetypes which posit ourselves and the source as mutually vulnerable.³⁸

Our paradigm, based on a theory of human relationships, sees the encounter between self and other as the most fundamental dialectic in human life. According to this view, connection between individuals, groups, ideas and the source from which everything comes gives us the capacity to simultaneously change yet continue, to conflict yet co-operate and achieve justice. What constitutes our first world-wide revolution consists precisely in breaking our in-herited relationships.³⁹

38. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

39. Halpern, "A Redefinition," *op. cit.*

Let us now try to observe our new paradigm more closely. An illustration drawing may provide us with a symbol. It is a wheel of eight human relationships that are archetypal patterns by which we link ourselves to self, others and problems. Difficulties arise when our *inherited* relationships fail to give us the ability to deal with the five basic issues of performance, viz., continuity and change, collaboration and conflict and justice; or the five faces of capacity, viz., the unconscious, new consciousness, creativity, new linkages and justice as a means. Each relationship has a different ability to cope with our five issues of performance and five aspects of capacity. These relationships constitute the means by which we handle the daily tensions of life. Most societies and individuals usually employ only three or four of these archetypal patterns. There is a dominant relationship and two or three subdominant linkages. The patterns used to relate self and other are called repertory. When self and other confront problems in the daily world, the relationships available are called the network. Thus when the inherited patterns in the repertory cannot confront new problems in the outside world, incoherence occurs, that is, the breaking of connections. When this takes place, people may wish to return to what they had before and reaffirm it, they may choose to remain immobilized in a state of confusion, or else they may choose to create alternatives. The aim of our paradigm is to demystify inherited patterns so that when they break, as they do, people will recognize that they can reject relationships, institutions, and patterns that have come to dominate and to create new combinations of patterns to restore our capacity to re-order the world. This is to identify the problem by naming it clearly as patterns that in their present form cripple the human capacity to re-experience self and other.

But *inherited* archetypal patterns once broken can be recreated and become powerful sources of transformation. Now all eight relationships can be nourished, destroyed, created as they provide us with the means to live our lives creatively. We can become the archetypal centre that can persistently nourish, destroy and create new forms of all eight relationships so that no incarnation of any of the eight may ever become permanent. We have eight archetypal relationships linked with an infinite number of possible creations of each pattern. This constitutes our freedom—participation in relationships in motion. Strategies of transformation in the self, other, history and the Source consist in

breaking the container of Emanation (nourish), its reversal in such a way that the mystery is not to be permanently contained in the previous incarnation. Incoherence may be a blessing as well as a curse. We are broken (destroy) but new energies are released in quest of a new concretization (create).

Not everything which is fundamentally new is good. There are three qualitatively different ways by which people may employ these relationships. For example, the polarity of Boundary-Management may be used to prevent change and preserve power in the face of the suffering of others such as when the AMA might refuse to agree to an acceleration of medical training because it would lower the status and prestige of doctors and so ignore the health crisis of the nation. This constitutes an abuse of a relationship in the service of Incoherence, or destruction. Or a doctor might refuse to allow his son the freedom to choose a non-medical career because professional medicine is "all that there is." Emanation or possession is the god that is served here. Finally, there is the case of a union that protects its own members from hardship but also asks about the quality of life of others, seeks to form coalitions to expand a liberated zone that might end by qualifying its own particular interests. This is the service of transformation which knows no final state since its main intent is to continue to transcend the previous incarnation. Individuals live with these three services as their choice. It is in this regard that sociologists and political scientists do network analysis, that is, what C. W. Mills called the sociological imagination without sacrificing the vital need for value judgments.

What archetypal patterns are operative in a society? Those patterns constitute the linkages by which individuals are linked in a society; these personal linkages or relationships thus constitute the institutions of a society and the network of such institutions or personal patterns of relating are the social structure. Thus we do not have to attack systems, or establishments, but look behind the flux of life to point out the patterns that determine them. The quality of these linkages will determine the ability of a society to deal with the five issues of performance: continuity and change, collaboration and conflict, and justice; and the five faces of capacity: the unconscious, new consciousness, creativity, new linkages between people and justice as a means. Capacity here means the ability to engage in the process of transformation.

Now the five issues of performance and the five faces of capacity are intended to allow us to analyze relationships in motion. From one moment to the next, our paradigm makes us sensitive to the realization that a concept, person, group, or nation may be in the process of creation, nourishment or destruction. Furthermore, the energies expended in this process are given direction by the eight specific archetypal relationships each with its own capacity to relate ourselves to self, others and problems.

Our method is consistent with our central experience—that human relationships move as encounters from opposing positions. Even with regard to traditional relationships, we must therefore identify each relationship as a turning point in a flow rather than as a fixed label for an established box. Hence our requirement for describing any situation as a process of moments, choices, movements, and perspectives by way of encounter, repertory, network and service within an ultimate paradigm. This approach also forces us to start each inquiry into a situation afresh, to see how people actually connect or fail to connect with others.⁴⁰

Now let us proceed to see how a concrete application of this theoretical approach illuminates our understanding of a particular religion.

Re-Discovering Truth in the Personal Encounter : The Catholic Situation

Happily the archetypal human being is attracted to our participation both by necessity and by affinity. The story of creation speaks of a drama which moves teleologically, but not by the power of a single-minded will, either god's or ours, but through a dialectical struggle whose very nature was set in motion by the source of sources. Our kind of consciousness and work is needed in this struggle because it exists nowhere else in the links of transformation. Since the source of sources did not create anything *ex nihilo* but out of himself, he lives in us as we live in him. Therefore, our participation is the vocation of our being and a sharing in being.⁴¹

40. Halpern, "Four Contrasting Repertories." *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.

41. Halpern, "The Counter-Tradition," *op. cit.*

Most Catholics⁴² were brought up to believe that in religious matters they were never to follow their own interpretations. They always had to speak "the mind of the Church." Dreams, visions, speaking in tongues, other religious experiences were denied validity. Heresy was always near. The Roman Catholic faith was a powerful container that nourished and answered definitively all of the perennial questions: life, death, meaning, hope, love, God, the world and the whole of reality.

The crisis of this nurturing stage came quickly and furiously following Vatican II. The challenges to authority are familiar: The birth-control controversy, celibacy, collegiality, the Dutch Catholics, liberation theology, the demand for women priests, etc. Many Catholics were caught off guard by this upheaval. But the breaking of the secure container ended once and for all the monolith of the Roman Catholic Church. The new questions are: What is the quality of the connection that those who call themselves Roman Catholics have to their own tradition? Are Catholics in the process of nourishing, destroying or re-creating their tradition? And we cannot make the determination once-for-all since from one moment to the next a Catholic who has been secured in the tradition might find himself driven out of it by the exigencies of responding to concrete problems. Also such people can reject their own pain and choose to submerge themselves deeper in an inherited past. We only know that we cannot generalize about Catholics or any other group. We need to study the flow of life for all groups and ask not only what choices are available to them but also whether they will be willing to pay the cost of such choices. But how can such incoherence be transformed?

We spoke above of the three approaches to truth; propositional, reality-being and the truth of personal experience. We live in a period of religious history (as well as political and social) marked by the breakdown of the concretized traditions. The effect is painful but has great potential for liberation. We are free now to re-experience the source without the traditional filters that excluded as much as they

42. The author wrote his own doctoral dissertation as a personal statement describing the process discussed here, i.e., creation, nourishment, destruction, in his own life and as shared by other Catholics. *The Breakdown of Authority in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, for Princeton Theological Seminary, Nov., 1971.

included. The personal experiences of people are of crucial importance and especially those who are willing to participate in the very process by which the source and ourselves will incarnate the fundamentally new. This helps to explain the phenomenal rise of groups such as the Pentecostal movement within the American Catholic Church. There seems to be great fear of schism due to the heavy emphasis on personal conversion. Great pains have been taken to contain this movement by assigning bishops as spiritual directors and, more importantly, by reducing new insights into the old categories. This is an attempt to neutralize the holy. The choice of this example is not intended to express approval of all Pentecostals. Again, it will depend on the quality of their connections to the source and the faithfulness with which they participate in creating a new incarnation of the holy. Some Pentecostals may indeed be experiencing this source. But others may be seeking another container to provide security. It is such kinds of movements that will reveal the openness or refusal of the Catholic tradition to re-experience the holy. The issue is for Catholics to re-do, to re-create, to develop another community not because they are bored with tradition or angry with bishops but because it is demanded of them from within. If Christians find that they cannot experience their own mystery due to Church teaching, or structural authority, then they must alter that teaching and authority.

We hasten to insist that we need the Church as community. The community is neither an addendum nor an afterthought; it follows from the very essence of selfhood that can only emerge in creative relationship to self, other, world, and God. We need the community to test the quality of the gods that we are struggling with. The creation of the fundamentally new is not necessarily to the good; it can bring death. An example in our own time is the phenomenon of fascism, especially as exemplified in Nazism and Hitler. We need to ask ourselves in which of the three qualities the fundamentally new is emerging—Emanation (keeping people from new consciousness), Incoherence (preserving what is at the expense of mounting destruction), and Transformation (the creation of alternatives that present new possibilities for all included). The Church as community of transforming persons provides us with the necessary container which we now know to be temporary. Following the new experience of the source that breaks our previous container and sustains us through the chaos, we are in need to rest and build again—that is, to incarnate what we have

seen in a new way. Because of this, it is inconceivable that any Church in the future will ever be able to hold the kind of sway over its members that the Roman Catholic Church once did. The Catholic Church is being asked to make a harsh corporate conversion that is based upon the full Gospel message which it has preached. This means participating in the birth, death and resurrection of its founder and saviour, Jesus, which must involve the Church's own death and rebirth.

As we ask these new questions we recognize that there have always been Catholics who belonged to the Counter-Tradition, that is, that tradition of transforming that refused to be silenced in times of orthodox domination; these loyal rebels sought to break through the veil to express the freedom of persons to contact their own god or source. To live the tradition afresh, then, challenges us to re-experience these Catholics in a new way: Ignatius Loyola, Nicholas of Cusa, Master Eckhardt, John of the Cross, St. Teresa of Avila, Peguy, and Teilhard de Chardin. They all realized that the tradition had begun as a revolution—the mystery of the Father was manifested to us in a new incarnation as Jesus. But they also knew that the issue was to reject Jesus as the magic man so that they could live in the age of the Spirit who makes possible an infinite number of new incarnations. The Spirit is the god of the alchemists who use us as vessels to create other gods. Like Dante's Beatrice, Ignatius Loyola knew that through the Spiritual Exercises he could open up and guide the initiate to the source, but once there Ignatius and Beatrice had to remove themselves so that the source would communicate itself. *What the initiate experienced could not be pre-determined by any orthodoxy.* The radical risk of conversion stimulated Loyola and his colleagues to renew themselves and others by a new method.⁴³ It was this that constituted the hidden gnosis, or knowledge of the process of transformation. Loyola preached the "heresy" that God continues to reveal himself. Tradition, then, is not only what we remember but also what we forgot.

43. *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola*, translated with a Commentary and a Translation of the Directorium in Exercitia by W. H. Longridge, London and Oxford, A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1950. For a good explanation of the *Exercises* see Karl Rahner, S. J., *Spiritual Exercises*, translated by Kenneth Baker, S.J., New York: Herder & Herder, 1965.

Tradition itself is also created, nourished and destroyed by the persons living within that tradition. Today we are challenged to discover those traditions which liberate us to experience ourselves and the holy; similarly, we are compelled to give up that which cripples by permanently fixing the holy and ourselves in frozen formulae. The paradigm of genuine commitment to transformative growth demands nothing less.